EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A CASE AGAINST PROTECTIONISM AND FOR A MORE COMPETITIVE AMERICA

HON. BILL FRENZEL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Ed Spencer, chairman of Honeywell, Inc., delivered a paper on United States-Japan Trade and Investment Issues to the governing board of the Electronics Industry Association.

Mr. Spencer surveys the Japanese competition and the Japanese market in part I of his paper, and in part II he examines actions which threaten exports-embargoes, restrictions reciprocity legislation, and local content legislation—and suggests instead actions to protect import threatened industries and 12 specific measures to encourage U.S. foreign trade and investment.

The paper is must reading for those interested in foreign investment and export expansion. It is too long for full reproduction here, but I will furnish it on request. The section dealing with specific measures to encourage trade expansion follows:

TWELVE POSITIVE MEASURES TO ENCOURAGE U.S. FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT

There are a number of positive measures industry and government can and should take together to expand our foreign trade and investment. The Reagan Administration and Congress have taken some such steps, but much remains to be done to stimulate both exports and foreign investments, the latter in turn stimulating more exports as well as earning interest and dividends. This list is not all-inclusive, but indicates where action can begin.

1. *Fiscal and monetary policy.*—Nothing is more important to the economic health of our industry than fiscal policies that encourage saving and investment and monetary policies that assure long-term, non-inflationary growth. Recent steps to increase cash flow in some industries by speeding depreciation schedules, to improve tax credits for investments, to stimulate investment in new venture businesses by reducing capital-gains taxes, and to lower income taxes are very positive and over a long time period will increase the productivity and competitiveness of American industry. The 25-percent tax credit for an increase in qualifying R&D expenses is also a positive step, but should be expanded to include all R&D, or at least to permit a higher incremental portion of R&D to qualify for the credit. Also, the credit should become permanent, and not be allowed to expire in 1985. The suspension of IRS regulations on the allocation of R&D expenses to foreign source income should also be made permanent.

I won't comment on the massive Federal deficit, except to observe that it must be reduced. If not, industrial demands for credit in an expanding economy will compete with government borrowing, signaling higher interest rates and an early return of inflation.

2. *Industrial policy.*—We have been criticized for the absence of a national industrial policy and the Japanese praised for having one that builds future industrial strengths, rather than protecting non-competitive and out-of-date industries. The Japanese, incidentally also handle the latter very well and are already talking about what to do with displaced auto workers when Toyota, Nissan, and Honda are no longer internationally competitive. There are in the United States a rising number of proposals for some type of government-funded Reconstruction Finance Corporation or sectoral approach to channel low cost funds to target industries, or to industries in economically depressed areas.

The complexity and diversity of our political system may make the selection of such target industries impossible on a national basis. It might be done within states, and indeed is being tried in some. There are opportunities within the Federal R&D budget to help specific industries, and funds to help industry retrain displaced workers are of some value.

The best industrial policy, however, is to let the market decide which industries expand and which contract. This in turn will work best in a political climate which provides a fiscal and monetary policy that encourages productive investment.

3. *Federal Research and Development.*—5.6 percent of the federal budget is for research and development, the largest part going to the Department of Defense, National Institutes of Health, NASA, the Department of Energy (for nuclear related R&D) and the National Science Foundation. The administration's proposals to increase funding to universities through the NSF is a good sign, as that budget has shown no real growth over the past four years. There is a body of thought which is urging the federal government to set long-range goals and strategies for the nation's future, and then to target R&D for all agencies to accomplish these objectives in broad terms, rather than negotiating R&D on an annual basis through countless line items in the budget. While such a proposal may be politically difficult to achieve, it should be discussed and pushed.

4. *The Role of U.S. Government Contracts.*—The federal government has played a major role in industrial development, with substantial fall-out from government contracts benefiting related products subsequently sold in the private sector. Here are a few notable examples:

"Commercial aircraft which got a start with air mail contracts and benefited from military aviation needs.

"Synthetic automobile tires, which got their start in the government-sponsored synthetic rubber industry in the early 1940's.

"Commercial radar (plus its impact ranging from television transmission to microwave ovens).

"Lasers.

"Semiconductors, in which funding from the Department of Defense in the early 1960s accelerated the formation of a major new industry.

"Computers, an industry which grew out of government contracts in the 1940s."

A word about the Department of Defense's VHSIC program. VHSIC, of course, stands for Very High Speed Integrated Circuits. The program was initiated to jump the state-of-the-art of military integrated circuits by several years to a new generation. The rationale for the program developed when industry did not respond with its own funding for R&D in low-volume custom circuits needed in defense products. This has been called one of the most important DOD technology programs, and the Defense Science Board has rated it as the number one DOD technology program, even ahead of stealth technology, which is number two. The first phrase of the VHSIC program will end in 1984 with the early production of VHSIC circuits. Plans are already under way to incorporate these circuits in DOD programs in 1985 and beyond.

VHSIC is having an impact on the integrated circuit industry. Although a few semiconductor manufacturers opposed the program, it has stimulated the IC Industry to accelerate programs in finer-geometry integrated circuits with related systems benefits to the defense industry; in parallel, the use of these circuits in commercial markets has been accelerated. One criticism of the VHSIC contracts is that they were several years too late.

More federal funding of VHSIC-type programs in basic technologies affecting the future of our electronics industry will be essential to stay ahead in those technologies that are too far ahead of commercial feasibility to attract commercial funding.

5. *Industry Cooperation.*—Two recent examples illustrate how industry cooperation can further the objective of strengthening American ability to compete in international semiconductor and computer markets.

First, the Semiconductor Industries Association created the Semiconductor Research Consortium. The goal is to increase private-sector support for those university research programs that have the greatest potential for strengthening the U.S. semiconductor technology base in light of the Japanese challenge. SRC has a fulltime director (Larry Sumney) and a Board of Directors (chairman Erich Block of IBM). There are about 30 members, whose contributions are based on their integrated circuit use and/or sales. The director and the Board will distribute the fund in response to proposals from universities and will initiate new areas of research most needed by U.S. industry. Incidentally, many electronics companies are also independently funding microelectronic and computer studies in universities, quite apart from the SRC.

Second, a group of U.S. semiconductor and computer companies under the leadership of Control Data Corporation has established the Microelectronic and Computer Technology Corporation. There will be a small headquarters with a full-time chief executive officer. Each of the participating

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

11-059 O-87-31 (Pt. 3)

companies will be part of one or more research programs in areas such as computer-aided design, and manufacturing, software, packaging, and new computer architectures. The objective is to provide a mechanism for industry to conduct joint long-term research with special attention to areas that have been targeted by the Japanese. The research will be conducted by personnel of MCC and results will be available for licensing. Development of this research into competitive products will be carried on outside of MCC by the individual participants. This is similar to a limited partnership for R&D in which companies combine to form a vehicle that performs the R&D at arm's length and licenses the results to avoid antitrust problems.

6. U.S. Antitrust Considerations.—U.S. corporations are falling behind foreign competition in many areas today, largely because much of the competition comes not from individual foreign corporations but from consortium-like groups, if not outright cartels, of cooperating corporations aided by their national governments.

Under existing U.S. law, corporations in similar lines of business can't cooperate with one another without running the risk of violating the U.S. antitrust laws. If U.S. industry is to improve its global competitive position, some of our traditional antitrust principles need modification so that our free competition can survive in a form that is consistent with the requirements of today's world economy. Here are some suggestions:

A. In the area of research and development, individual U.S. companies face many projects too large and costly for them to handle alone, but they are reluctant to engage in cooperative joint R&D efforts with other companies because of antitrust risk. Some reduction of these risks came with the publication of the Justice Department's liberalized guidelines in 1980 recommending the issuance of "business letters" to specific joint ventures, indicating that the Justice Department had no intention to attack those ventures on antitrust grounds. However, since such letters are merely statements of present enforcement intentions and are not binding for the future, nor are they any protection against private antitrust suits, serious uncertainties and risks remain. The law should be modified to grant binding antitrust exemption, applicable to government as well as to private suits, for approved R&D joint ventures. Such exemptions would enable U.S. companies to combine complementary resources and skills to accelerate innovation and avoid duplication of effort.

B. In the area of production, there is a clear need in certain declining U.S. industries, such as steel, for combinations, rationalization of production and other forms of cooperation in order that they may once again compete in the world market. Such cooperative measures are now risky because of inherent antitrust complications. There is an existing exception to allow the merger of "failing" companies, but too many uncertainties remain. Legislation is needed to provide some official identification of the critical industries and to establish definite antitrust exemptions for the appropriate mergers, consolidations, transfers, rationalization and other cooperative action between companies within these industries.

C. In the area of marketing, there has long been a need for joint efforts to achieve economies in the administration of the complex export function as a way to encourage U.S. exports. A long step was taken in the enactment of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982, which enables companies to join together in handling export matters with less risk of antitrust violation. It provides for the formation of foreign-style trading companies to perform various marketing functions, shipping services, custom brokerage and insurance services for their shareholding companies and third parties. The law also enables certain banks to participate in the capitalization and financing of the trading companies. Each such trading company will have to be certified by the Secretary of Commerce and approved by the Attorney General in conformity with stated guidelines. There are still some uncertainties under the new law, but it is a step in the right direction.

7. U.S. Export Licensing and Controls.— None of us wants to help strengthen Soviet military capability, but considerable damage can be done to the position of U.S. industry in international trade by the too frequent and ill-conceived use of the U.S. export-control laws as a political weapon. The recent use of these laws to stop shipments of products and technology for the Siberian pipeline clearly illustrates this problem, but there are other examples.

Damage can also be done when restrictions are tightened—for example, recently tightened limits on the export of microprocessor-based products, which are not observed by European and Japanese competitors or included in parallel COCOM restrictions.

Here are some of the effects:

a. The U.S. economy is damaged by the resulting reduction in exports.

b. U.S. industry loses the profits on the banned business and often must absorb the loss of prior expense and investment related to the barred transactions.

c. The experience inevitably casts doubt on the reliability of the United States as a trading partner.

d. The possibility of such changes in regulations increases the uncertainty inherent in export-control enforcement, which in turn impedes and delays the negotiation of other agreements.

e. Enforcement of the rulings may compel foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations to violate their host country's laws, policies and customs.

f. The resulting restrictions on U.S. industry help foreign competition get established, improve their technologies and take more business, now and in the future, away from U.S. industry.

g. The enforcement may cause considerable harm to the interests of friendly nations.

h. The target nations, and sometimes even friendly nations, may be provoked into retaliatory action against the United States.

Experience has shown that the target country usually manages to find alternate sources for the embargoed products, services and technology. Rhodesia survived years of trade restrictions. South Africa built a military capability in spite of arms embargoes from the U.S. and Europe. The Soviet Union found alternate sources for grain and pipelaying machinery.

Embargoes and export license restrictions can only be effective if universally agreed to and applied by all producing nations.

Here are some suggestions for making our U.S. export licenses and controls more effective:

a. Consult in advance with other producing countries on embargoes and changes in license regulations. And then implement only if there is substantial agreement on the restrictions by all producing countries. Export license controls without OCOM support will not work.

b. Apply U.S. export-licensing regulations consistently, and make the procedures for approvals transparent and quick.

c. Limit to one agency, the Department of Commerce, final licensing authority. DoD license approval should be required only for truly strategic items and those in turn should be coordinated with COCOM before being put on the DoD approval list. In addition, many licensing requirements to non-Communist countries can and should be eliminated.

d. Don't use embargoes and licenses for short-term political purposes.

8. Export-Import Bank.—Under the Carter Administration, Exim's direct lending authority rose from $2.9 billion in fiscal year 1978 to $5.4 billion in fiscal year 1981. In terms of the proportion of total exports supported by government-backed financing, the U.S. in 1980 supported 5.7 percent of its exports with this financing. Comparable figures for government subsidized financing by other countries were: Japan, 44.3 percent; U.K., 39.0 percent; France, 27.2 percent; and Germany, 7.5 percent.

As part of its 1981 budget reduction program, the Reagan administration identified the Exim Bank as a business sector program that could be cut. The proposal was from $5.9 billion in the Carter budget to $3.9 billion in the first Reagan budget. The director of OMB was the main proponent of this cut. It was opposed unsuccessfully within the Administration by the Secretary of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative. Congress restored part of the proposed Administration cut and set a limit of $4.4 billion of direct lending authority in fiscal year 1982. It continues to operate at that level in fiscal year 1983 under the continuing resolution, although the Administration has been seeking a $3.8 billion limit.

Exim's loan-guarantee program currently has a limit of $9 billion. Changes in the loan-guarantee limit have generally followed the direct lending authority, although it has been less controversial. A substantial increase in export guarantees, as well as independent and direct lending authority, would be a positive step to support increased exports.

As far as interest rates are concerned, Exim has far less freedom than government-backed export financing institutions in other countries. The result is that when export-credit charges become a means of subsidizing export sales, Exim interest charges become noncompetitive. Attempts by the Reagan Administration to get minimum interest rates on export financing are a step in the right direction, but more needs to be done and promptly.

A suggested three-part program to increase the role of the Export Import Bank in helping U.S. exporters might be as follows:

a. Continue the effort to get minimum interest-rate agreements by Finance and Treasury ministries in other major exporting countries so as to remove subsidized interest as a competitive factor in export markets.

b. Gradually expand the lending authority of the Exim Bank so that it becomes a major source of export financing rather than a last resort.

c. Gradually expand the loan-guarantee limit.

9. DISC, ISC and ESC.—DISC (Domestic International Sales Corporation) legislation has provided cash-flow benefits for U.S. exporters by deferring some federal income tax on export sales. DISC, however, has been attacked by other countries as a form of export subsidy in violation of the GATT agreement. DISC benefits have also been subject to changes in accordance with congressional mood on fiscal policy and in 1982 were reduced.

Congress and the Trade Representative are now looking for alternatives consistent with GATT that would help stimulate small firms to more aggressive exporting. One such alternative is an International Sales Corporation (ISC) which would be incorporated abroad and would act as a sales arm for an exporting company. Another is an Export Sales Corporation (ESC), which would perform a similar function from a foreign place of incorporation where local taxes on profits would be paid. If DISC is to be replaced, an alternative must be found that is consistent with GATT rules and provides the equivalent flow benefits.

10. OPIC.—A federally backed insurance against political expropriation is available under OPIC (Overseas Private Investment Corporation). The Reagan administration has been aggressively pushing this disaster insurance as an export stimulator, with positive results.

11. Trade Fairs and Exhibitions.—The U.S. Department of Commerce has long had the responsibility for participating as a nation in international trade fairs and for establishing special U.S. exhibitions in other countries. Unfortunately, budget limitations have restricted this activity, to the detriment of smaller U.S. firms and companies newly trying to establish export activities. This activity needs to be expanded.

12. Equal National Treatment.—A major responsibility of the U.S. Trade Representative's office should be to search out and publicize countries and regulations that treat U.S. and other foreign firms differently from domestic firms with regard to making investments, having ownership, establishing branches or offering services. The United States is among the most open countries of all in offering foreign firms all the same advantages, rights, legal protection and access to government markets that domestic companies are permitted.

We should insist on the same from other countries, and in particular, advanced industrial countries whose companies are aggressively pursuing business opportunities in the United States. We have no MITIs, FIRAs or Ministries of Industry to limit or control foreign investments in our country, nor do we want such bureaucratic limitations on investments that create jobs and expand markets. We should insist on the same from Japan, Canada and France—in the cases cited—and be prepared to negotiate bilaterally and hard to get such equal national treatment for our investments in those countries. The only exception should be for national strategic reasons, where control of certain technologies in domestic hands is desirable.●

PRIVATE SECTOR SOLUTION FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have received an excellent letter from my constituent, Tom Waldrop, a 28-year-old realtor in Mayfield, Ky., with regard to the ongoing efforts to restore social security's financial solvency.

Tom recommends that we look at the private sector, specifically an IRA-like account in lieu of automatic inclusion into social security, as a possible solution to cure the system's problems. I receive many letters from young people such as Tom Waldrop who are concerned that they will never receive the benefits from a financially unsafe retirement system. Tom's comments are worthy of consideration, and his letter follows:

MAYFIELD, KY.,
December 15, 1982.

Congressman CARROLL HUBBARD,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARROLL: Enclosed you will find a reproduction of an article published this morning in the Louisville Courier Journal by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick. I enclose the article because it states far more succinctly than I, the only plausible solution to the Social Security disaster.

Each day, the news accounts are dominated by efforts of Congress, the Administration, and the Presidential Commission to save the present system, to which I respond, "Don't Save It For Me." Being 28 years old, I cannot forsee any way that I will see any return on my annual Social Security contribution. In the four years since I started my IRA, I have wished that the mandatory Social Security contribution could go into my personal retirement plan, but until now, that wish was too good to be true.

As a Realtor, I depend on lending institutions to finance property for clients and my own investments. Mr. Kilpatrick doesn't even mention the enormous impact these jumbo savings accounts would make on the capital base of our nation's Banks and Savings and Loans. I recall several "bail out" bills making their way around Capitol Hill for this beleagered industry. How convenient to kill the proverbial two birds with this one stone.

In response to this letter, I would like your honest opinion. Is it too much to ask of 535 professional lawmakers with limitless staff and resources to arrive at the same conclusion as a Western Kentuckian with only a B.S. in Economics?

Social Security can no longer survive demographically in its present form seems to be an accepted fact. The shape of federally mandated retirement programs is yet to be determined. Please consider the options available in the private sector, the stakes are too high to risk another system like the present.

Sincerely,

TOM WALDROP.●

VOA BROADCASTS IMPORTANT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America is one of the most important and cost effective national security programs we have today. Americans have difficulty realizing the powerful impact truthful radio broadcasts can have, since we are never without multiple sources of news. But for struggling peoples under tyrannical regimes these radio broadcasts can break the information darkness that surrounds their day-to-day lives.

Radio, and not television or newspapers, is the principle source of information abroad. For instance, there are 10 times more shortwave radio sets in Soviet Russia than in America. The Voice of America now presents an objective and balanced presentation of news to a weekly audience of approximately 100 million people worldwide.

The operations of the Voice of America reflect American democratic principles in action—the free flow of information and ideas that inform other peoples on international events and help build trust between them and the American people. The more we can build that trust, the better our chances to weaken the will toward war that is such a tragic part of 20th century history.

I want to recommend to my colleagues this superb article by Ken Tomlinson, the new director of the Voice of America. Mr. Tomlinson makes a brilliant case for expanding our international broadcasts and outlines the need to modernize the Voice of America's broadcasting equipment. The most outstanding aspect of this article, however, is Mr. Tomlinson's ability to transcend our old ideological labels while proving to be a forceful advocate for American prestige around the globe. He certainly has my support and I urge my colleagues to help advance democracy by giving him their support as well.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1983]

AMERICA'S STIFLED VOICE

(By Kenneth Y. Tomlinson)

Shortly before the Senate confirmed me as director of the Voice of America, I was approached separately by two political figures concerned about what we were going to do to VOA. One, a Democrat, was worried that we might be preparing to turn the institution into the propaganda voice of the right. The other, a Republican, feared we would not be tough enough to change VOA's alleged '50s-liberal slant.

The two represented exactly opposite attitudes toward the VOA, but, as each conversation developed, I found the two agreed on one important point. Both confessed that when abroad they listen to the BBC—not

VOA. Each declared the BBC's programming was far more informative, far more relevant.

Without question, the director of the Voice of America faces an extraordinarily difficult job. Within this institution are Foreign Service diplomats who frequently want to keep the broadcast lid on, VOA journalists who often want to blow the lid off and representatives of 42 separate language services, a number of which have a rich tradition of old-world guerrilla warfare. A fact often overlooked in articles about VOA is the managerial task involved in working with groups where interests are so widely separated. But the real challenge facing the new leadership at VOA is not to come up with a new scheme for running a radio station like a city council. *The real challenge is to reverse the years of official neglect that constitutes the real source of problems at VOA.*

This neglect has deprived us of credibility in strategic portions of the world where the use of old transmitting equipment means that our voice barely can be heard. Equally important, it has resulted in public affairs programming that conservatives and liberals alike recognize as often dull and irrelevant.

The solution to VOA programming inadequacies is really quite simple. The Voice of America should reflect the voices of America.

The principle is an extension of the philosophy on which this nation was founded. The founders believed that a great body of people, when exposed to a diversity of information and opinion, could decide for themselves—and do it well. That is precisely what we propose to do in broadcasting to the people of the world. Our news at the top of the hour is competitive with any international broadcast organizaiton. In VOA editorials we crisply identify and reflect the views of the U.S. government. But in current affairs programming VOA has never succeeded in reflecting the voices of the nation's opinion leaders on the important issues of the day.

Ironically, it will take greater resources to reflect opinions across the political spectrum. It is far easier and less expensive to produce in-house commentaries than it is to break outside our institution to reflect American viewpoints. But we are going to do this in the months ahead.

Whether those voices will be heard, however, is another issue.

In recent days a cable crossed my desk from an important capital in the Arab world. An American diplomat reported Radio Moscow's signal is loud and clear—as are the radio voices of numerous other nations large and small. The United States is not among them. VOA's signal is weak and often difficult to receive.

Anyone who wants to can come down to our studios at the base of Capitol Hill and see us broadcasting to the world using vintage 1950s equipment worthy of a broadcast museum. At a key relay station, we are actually using transmitter equipment captured from the Nazis at the end of World War II. So ancient are our facilities that we must maintain a machine shop to fabricate parts because they are no longer made by commercial dealers. The reminders of what this means abound:

In recent weeks, broadcasters from China and India came to tour our headquarters facility. I can only describe their reaction as one of shock. As one put it, "How can the world's most advanced nation be using some of the world's most backward equipment?"

In the last decade the number of high-power, short-wave transmitters worldwide has increased eightfold. During the same period, the VOA has added a number of languages and broadcast hours, but its technical capabilities have remained practically unchanged.

The Soviet Union spends more to jam Western broadcasts coming into the Soviet Union than we allocate for the entire VOA worldwide budget.

There is a bottom line to all this, of course. Listen to the words of a letter we received in recent weeks from Iran: "It bewilders me why a country whose astronauts can easily speak to Earth from outer space is not able to transmit her own voice across the world."

This administration is committed to a technological modernization program that would restore strength to the Voice of America.●

VOTING TAX CREDIT

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation, by request, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a $30 refundable tax credit to taxpayers who vote in a Federal general elections.

The concept of a voting tax credit is the brainchild of Mr. Frank Martino, president of the International Chemical Workers Union. It proposes a voting tax credit as a method to get more Americans out to vote in Federal elections. According to the ICWU, the credit is "designed to provide an incentive for all Americans, rich and poor alike, to exercise their franchise as responsible citizens of our country."

Mr. Speaker, the low percentage of voter turnout in Federal elections has become a deplorable situation in this country. Apathy on the part of eligible voters has soared, and lately we have seen trends which indicate that many Americans do not vote simply because they are frustrated with politicians. More and more Americans seem to believe that their vote is not really important any more.

The extent of voter alienation is apparent in statistics released by the Census Bureau. These figures are disheartening as well as alarming. In the 1968 Presidential election, there was a 60.9 percent voter turnout. In the 1972 election, after 18-year-olds got the vote, voter turnout dropped to 55.6 percent. And in the latest Presidential election, only 53.2 percent of the American population eligible to vote participated. The figures are even more alarming for off-year elections. In 1970 there was a 43.5-percent turnout compared to 35.5 percent in 1978—with a population increase of 21 percent.

The nationwide decline in voting should be of serious concern to anyone who believes in democracy. One of our basic freedoms as American citizens is to choose our public officials through the election process. Then if we are not satisfied with those in office, we can make changes by exercising our right to vote. Those who cite disillusionment or disgust with the system as their reason for not casting a ballot are simply perpetuating the situation they dislike. We cannot stand back. It is time for all Americans to realize that our votes do count, and we must do something to encourage eligible voters to participate.

The voting tax credit is one way to encourage eligible voters to take the time to vote. Taxpayers who vote in a Federal general election—or the equivalent thereto—will receive the credit—$60 for a joint return—by attaching their ballot stub to their Federal income tax return. In those States where a ballot stub is not used, a stamp or other document which is evidence of voting will be issued.

Critics of a voting tax credit argue that increased voter turnout does not guarantee an improvement in the quality of legislators being elected. Certainly there is some merit to that argument, but we have to examine the overall picture. We all have to work for improved voter turnout, but we also have to help educate voters so that they can cast a responsible vote.

I think we owe it to the country to give this proposal our attention.●

POETS ON A COFFEE BREAK

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following poem which was forwarded to me by its author, a constituent of mine, Mr. Thomas Dunphy.

POETS ON A COFFEE-BREAK

The poets of America
Have gone on a coffee-break
Sitting on Congressional decisions
About MX-missiles.
We smile, for the nonce,
For we are dreamers
Dreaming of a world
Of Peace
Remembering John Lennon today
On the second anniversary
Of his death
And hoping our pens and inspirations
Will not meet such tragic oblivion
On the end of MX missiles.
And today we affirm life
Love and the pursuit of happiness
We have delved into the endless
Beauty of humanity
And we would rather sing
Of its glories
Then mourn its passing, like John's.

Yes, we poets are on prolonged coffee-break
Holding onto our inspirations like the
Dove of peace his olive branch
And waiting our opportunity
To return to work with joy! ●

TAX RELIEF FOR RENTERS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide major new tax relief for some 28.6 million Americans who rent their homes.

Under my bill, renters would be allowed for the first time to deduct from their Federal taxes that portion of their rent which is used to pay State and local property taxes. Current law permits only landlords or homeowners to take the property tax deduction.

Nationwide, 20 to 25 percent of a person's rent goes toward the payment of property taxes. Furthermore, renters often pay a higher rate of property tax than homeowners because many apartment buildings are considered to be commercial property.

The current tax deduction law clearly favors homeowners over renters. My bill is aimed at correcting this tax inequity. It is based on the premise that taxpayers with the same taxable incomes should be taxed the same.

According to the 1980 U.S. Census of Housing, 28,591,179 or 35.6 percent of homes are renter-occupied and 51,787,104 or 64.4 percent are owner-occupied. In eight States, rental units comprise more than 40 percent of all housing units.

This bill would be of special significance to New York City and other major urban areas, where renters far outnumber homeowners. In New York City, 76.6 percent of all housing units are rentals. In San Francisco, the figure is 66.3 percent, in Washington, D.C. 64.5 percent, in Boston 70.8 percent and in Chicago 47.9 percent.

Over the last decade, tenants have paid an increasing percentage of their income toward rent. Presently, more than 50 percent of tenants pay in excess of 25 percent of their income toward rent. Because tenants are in a significantly lower income bracket than homeowners, they are in desperate need of relief. In 1977, over 56 percent of tenants had incomes of less than $10,000 compared ot 30 percent for homeowners.

Mr. Speaker, home renters have absorbed the cost of inequitable property taxes for too long. Therefore, I would urge that this bill receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to submit a breakdown of the percentage of rental units by States.

RENTAL UNITS BY STATE

	Total units	Rentals (percent)
Alabama	1,341,302	29.9
Alaska	131,463	41.7
Arizona	956,717	31.7
Arkansas	815,664	29.5
California	8,630,198	44.1
Colorado	1,061,249	35.5
Connecticut	1,093,678	36.1
Delaware	207,081	30.9
District of Columbia	253,143	64.5
Florida	3,741,356	31.7
Georgia	1,872,089	35.0
Hawaii	294,052	48.3
Idaho	324,107	28.0
Illinois	4,042,744	37.4
Indiana	1,926,978	28.3
Iowa	1,052,847	28.2
Kansas	872,239	29.8
Kentucky	1,263,565	30.0
Louisiana	1,411,113	34.5
Maine	395,184	29.1
Maryland	1,460,635	38.0
Massachusetts	2,032,717	42.5
Michigan	3,195,015	27.3
Minnesota	1,445,616	28.3
Mississippi	827,169	28.9
Missouri	1,793,720	30.4
Montana	283,742	31.4
Nebraska	571,400	31.6
Nevada	304,327	40.4
New Hampshire	323,493	32.4
New Jersey	2,548,594	38.0
New Mexico	440,575	31.9
New York	6,339,762	51.4
North Carolina	2,040,562	31.6
North Dakota	227,664	31.3
Ohio	3,833,706	31.6
Oklahoma	1,118,532	29.3
Oregon	991,593	34.9
Pennsylvania	4,220,520	30.1
Rhode Island	338,590	41.2
South Carolina	1,029,981	29.8
South Dakota	242,523	30.7
Tennessee	1,618,361	31.4
Texas	4,928,965	35.7
Utah	448,603	29.3
Vermont	178,325	31.3
Virginia	1,862,854	34.4
Washington	1,539,681	34.3
West Virginia	686,311	26.4
Wisconsin	1,652,354	31.8
Wyoming	165,624	30.8

●

INTERNATIONAL FLOWS OF DATA

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I have occasionally brought the issue of international flows of data to the attention of the House. While this is something of an esoteric area, it is of enormous importance to U.S. companies doing business abroad.

If the United States is serious about expanding opportunities for international commerce, the impact of restrictions on information flows will have to receive more attention from our Government.

Recently, Mr. Harry Freeman of the American Express Co. addressed a conference on "New Directions in U.S. Foreign Policy" here in Washington, D.C. His remarks are, I think, a cogent expression of the issues involved in international data flows.

I do not agree with all that Mr. Freeman says. But his remarks are an important contribution to our understanding of this issue, and I commend them to your attention.

A TRADE APPROACH TO INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

(By Harry L. Freeman)

I am delighted to be a participant in these two days of talks on new directions in U.S. foreign policy. Telecommunications and information may seem to pale when compared with some other topics at the conference. But I believe this sometimes arcane pair of subjects should be a serious focus of U.S. foreign policy in general and of trade policy in particular. And my remarks today are to that end.

There is a disturbing trend—the growth in barriers to the flow of information across national borders—or transborder data flows. I believe these barriers should be viewed in a trade context. Further, I think it is possible to develop a trade approach that is responsive to the diverse, and even conflicting, needs of differing sectors and differing societies.

One of the crucial economic issues today for the U.S.—and many other developed countries—is productivity and competitiveness at home and abroad. At the heart of business and its competitiveness is how business uses communications.

International businesses have come to depend on computer-communications technologies for the rapid transmission of information. Companies from all countries rely on these systems for the coordination of production and marketing; for planning, accounting and financial management; for inventory control and sales coordination; for the communication of complex engineering and design computations; and for servicing both customers and suppliers on a global basis.

American Express, my company, is typical. We are a major user of communications for the delivery of financial and information services. All of our principal businesses—insurance payment systems, asset management, international banking and securities—could not function without rapid, reliable global communications. In 1981, for example, American Express on-line systems:

Processed 310 million American Express Card transactions;

Authorized daily 250,000 Card transactions from throughout the world within an average response time of 5 seconds;

Processed more than 350 million American Express Travelers Cheques sold by more than 100,000 banks and other selling outlets around the world;

Completed 56 million insurance premiums and claim transactions;

Automatically executed approximately $10 billion a day in international banking transactions; and

Responded instantaneously to 500,000 daily messages directing high-speed trading in securities, commodity futures, bonds, Treasury bills and a host of other items.

These systems support 17,000 on-line terminals within the company, 5,700 American Express point-of-sale terminals in the U.S. and abroad, and over 50 direct links to approximately 30,000 terminals at airlines and department stores. American Express is steadily interconnecting many of these networks and terminals into a single corporate data network.

Please forgive the commercial. It is, however, a testament to the variety of computer-communications needs of modern business. At American Express we rely on every form of communications media, from private leased line to public data network, from microwave to satellite transmission, and, soon, optical fiber. The cost of developing, operating and maintaining our information processing systems, including data and voice communications, exceeds several hundred million dollars annually. And we are not atypical.

Communications provides the life support systems for our company—and, I can attest, for most other international businesses.

Obviously, telecommunications and information technologies have become essential to international production and international trade.

This brings me to a second point: telecommunications and information are especially vital for the most dynamic sector of the U.S. economy—the service sector. One of the important trends we see today is the steady and dramatic shift of the U.S. and other developed economies from an industrial base largely dominated by manufacturing to one heavily reliant on services. In the U.S., services have come to represent 67 percent of economic output and 72 percent of employment. According to OECD statistics, services accounted for more than half of gross domestic product in 13 developed countries.

In international trade, services are a bright spot. World service exports during the past decade expanded at an average annual rate of 17 percent. In 1980, service exports from France increased by 28 percent to $51 billion; from Britain, by 16.5 percent to nearly $50 billion; and from Japan, by 33 percent to $26 billion. According to a study of the International Trade Commission, services will amount to $135 billion in the U.S. current account in 1982, a 52 percent increase over 1980.

Clearly, communications and the closely tied information industry are emerging as major factors in this growth. OECD statistics show that between 1960 and 1977 exports of information services, which are so dependent on communications, rose annually by 25 percent in Japan, 19 percent in West Germany, 16 percent in Canada, 12 percent in France and the United States, and 11 percent in Britain.

Through applications of computers and communications, the world has seen a virtual explosion of business innovation, productivity and trade. Trade has particularly advanced through new forms of communications, better communications infrastructures and greater transparency of service across national borders.

Were I to stop here, the prognosis for the decade would appear rosy indeed. On the other side of the coin, however, I see a disquieting picture.

As growth in world trade as a whole and world trade in goods in particular have grown stagnant and even declined, the communications industry is emerging as a strategic sector in many countries. In this environment, communications is becoming an instrument of nationalism and protectionism. The new protectionism does not receive the same public attention as steel, autos, agriculture, pipeline technology and semiconductors. But its consequences are just as disruptive and possibly even more far-reaching. The new protectionism takes the form of invisible barriers to the international flow of electronic information, the transborder data flows that I mentioned earlier.

Countries have quite rightly come to view information as fundamental to a secure economic future. They are understandably anxious about questions of sovereignty, jurisdiction, confidentiality and the cultural consequences of unconstrained international information exchange. But in the 1980s, the motivation for national information policies appears to be more openly economic. Countries are seeking to promote domestic processing and technologically advanced information industries by discouraging the flow of data across national borders. And telecommunications authorities are becoming the instruments of these policies.

Restrictions on the activities of international users more often than not resemble classic non-tariff trade barriers:

Discriminatory pricing of data transmission services for international users;

Local content laws requiring the processing of data within the country of origin, as a condition of the user's transmission requirements;

Mandated use of national data networks;

Outright denial of certain types of circuits; and

Restrictions on the use of leased lines that deny the user the ability to offer competitive services.

Particularly dangerous are the emerging policies which provide the basis for customs duties and value-added taxes on classes of information.

To some countries, tariff and non-tariff barriers may seem justified from a short-term national perspective. Moreover, because of its dominant role in international communications and information markets, it may also appear that the U.S. is the only party interested in liberalizing the flow of information.

Such a view overlooks the fact that impeding the flow of information, like other trade barriers, damages all national interests. A protected market raises costs, decreases efficiency and lowers technical quality for domestic companies and local citizens. It reduces the competitiveness of other domestic industries in which communications and information have become a major factor. And it endangers a country's own suppliers who may suffer from retaliatory measures when exporting to foreign markets—markets such as the U.S., where, I strongly regret to say, strong signs of protectionism are also growing.

Few remedies exist against arbitrary and discriminatory actions of another country. The principle of "free flow of information" when applied to business is too often simply that—a principle, without teeth and without force in international law. In the United States, some argue that the Federal Communications Commission has the authority to consider the openness of foreign markets when granting licenses to foreign applicants; however, it rarely exercises such authority.

So, we have a rapidly emerging foreign policy issue. What, then, can be done to improve the communications environment in the 1980s?

For one thing, discussion, at such meetings as this one, helps.

Second, business and government must work together on telecommunications policy. New and beneficial signs of liberalization are beginning to appear. Britain, for example, is liberalizing telecommunications and turning to the market to foster a competitive and healthy national information industry.

Third, in the U.S., liberalization of telecommunications is also moving apace. In liberalizing telecommunications, however, recognition of the international context of decisions should be taken into account. Communications is a cooperative effort, in which the differing structures of national policy must receive consideration.

Finally, the international flow of commercial data is moving rapidly from being a communications issue to becoming a trade issue. As a trade issue, it should be subject to international trade negotiations and a system of internationally agreed trade rules.

I urge, therefore, that services, including communications and information services, be dealt with by the GATT, and that the GATT launch a work program on these issues. While the communique of the GATT Ministerial in November received mixed reviews, its three paragraphs on services may prove an historic economic milestone. Out of those intensive negotiations, trade ministers agreed to examine service issues at a national level and to exchange information on services through the GATT.

The objective is to determine by 1984 whether an international agreement on services is desirable and, if so, how to proceed. It marks the first time the GATT has formally taken up the question of services and, in the calculus of international trade issues, that constitutes a clear step forward.

How could the GATT address communications and information services? There are a number of ways:

One approach would be to expand existing GATT codes on government procurement, standards and subsidies to cover these two industries.

Yet another approach would be a separate code or agreement on trade in telecommunications and information.

But the approach which we think most promising is to address telecommunications and information as a part of a comprehensive approach to trade in services. GATT provides a remedy for any restriction on services that has the effect of impairing concessions on trade in goods. While the application of GATT to services has not been tested, discriminatory treatment of information flows would appear to be illegal in any case where discrimination would affect the sale of goods in a foreign market. Clearly, communication and information serve as integral support mechanisms for international trade in goods. Moreover, banking, insurance, shipping, and other services fundamental to the export of goods could not function without unrestricted information flows.

In addition, GATT codes also contain references to services used in the production of goods. These are criteria which could easily apply to data processing and software.

Let me hasten to say, the work needed to develop internationally accepted rules and remedies in the communications sector will take many years at both national and international levels. But the work should begin now. And that work in my view, should begin with the GATT. Other international organizations, such as the OECD, are already involved.

In the interim, we believe the U.S. should take steps to integrate communications and information with evolving trade policy.

We also need changes in U.S. communications legislation which we understand are under development in both the House and Senate. This legislation should provide guidance for negotiations or regulatory decisions and remedies for situations of trade discrimination. It should also give telecommunications and information higher-level policy attention in the trade context.

I want to underscore here and now that strict bilateral or sectoral reciprocity in communications and information, as in other areas of trade, would be a significant and dangerous departure from the unconditional most-favored-nation principle that the United States has followed since the formation of GATT.

We are optimistic that out of the principles and process of a trade approach will come the recognition that liberalization of trade in communications and information products and services will provide the same benefits as liberalization of trade in goods, that liberalization in these areas will, in fact, expand trade in goods as well as services, and that liberalization will prepare the way for future communications and information exports now in embryonic stages of development in every industrialized country.●

A CONGRESSIONAL WHITE PAPER; HILTON HEAD ISLAND BOARD OF REALTORS

HON. THOMAS F. HARTNETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a congressional white paper prepared by the Hilton Head Island, S.C., Board of Realtors. The paper addresses issues which the board of realtors believes to be of national economic importance. As you know, the housing industry has been hard hit by the recession. I trust their statement will be of great interest to the Congress.

The material follows:

A CONGRESSIONAL WHITE PAPER; HILTON HEAD ISLAND BOARD OF REALTORS

The Hilton Head Island Board of Realtors respectfully submits this Congressional White Paper in an attempt to accentuate it's support for issues which it feels are important to economic prosperity in our area of the Lowcountry of South Carolina.

Government spending, the size of the Federal Deficit and Tax Policies—especially those that induce savings and investment are of primary concern to the Hilton Head Island Board. The Board acknowledges and commends the progress that Congress has shown in the past year in beginning to restrain Federal deficit spending and hopes more strides for continued improvement will be made in this area. The Board advocates the need to curb the Federal deficit so that interest rates can stabilize. It is our desire that if Congress considers another balanced budget/tax limitation constitutional amendment as it did last year, that they avoid a situation in which taxes would be arbitrarily raised to balance the budget rather than pursuing the moderation or restraint of spending. In the area of budget restraint, it is our opinion that the entitlements programs and the defense budget should be scrutinized. It is also our opinion that future projected spending be kept at a minimum. We see no room for recovery if deficits remain high.

In the area of taxes, the Hilton Head Island Board opposes any change in the home or second home mortgage interest deductions. This would cause negative and adverse effects on real estate investment and/or would be highly detrimental to the National economy and especially those communities which are now heavily dependent upon the second home industry, as is Hilton Head Island. Communities with economies similar to Hilton Head Island are highly dependent on tourism. If the second home industry is impaired by the termination of mortgage interest deductions, unemployment and business failures surely will increase in those areas. The building industry is just beginning to lead the U.S. economy out of its slump and the second home industry is a very important part of this recovery. The proposed changes in the mortgage interest deduction would certainly hinder this recovery.

The Board urges Congress to consider changes in laws that would encourage pension investment in mortgages. It believes that this is an important alternative source of housing capital and should be explored. This activity in mortgages should prove beneficial to both pensions and the housing industry.

The Board is in agreement with the Administration's proposed Federal Land Sales on a selected basis and urges that the proceeds from the sales be earmarked for reducing the Federal Debt.

The Board also favors the continued support for Federal Flood Insurance for seashore oriented development, such development to be carried out with strong environmental considerations. It is the Board's resolve that the Federal Flood Insurance Program be given support by Congress to encourage future development. Also, it is our belief that as a result of our special environmental relationship, that in order to maintain a reasonable level of economic growth in our area and similar areas, Federal funding for the construction and maintenance of seawalls is mandatory.

The necessity for the maintenance of the extraordinary beauty and quality of environment of the Lowcountry is widely accepted. Just as widely accepted is the fact that the special requirements of reducing the impact of even existing economic activity in such a delicate area is generally beyond the jurisdictional and financial means of most communities. Therefore, we, the Hilton Head Island Board of Realtors, feel that the development of the Lowcountry requires Federal assistance for water and sewer projects so that the personal and economic health of our citizens may be guaranteed.

A solution to the budget problems of the Social Security System is necessary for a healthy economy, as well as for the continued flow of retirement and other Social Security benefits. Both tax and benefit revisions are needed, but those must not fall unfairly on any single group. We do not feel that self employed men and women should suffer under an increase of $450.00 in higher taxes next year, while corporate and other employees will pay no additional taxes under the proposed Social Security Tax Plan. The Board opposes this unfair treatment of the self-employed as we support equal sacrifice for a solvent Social Security program.

It is the Board's belief that increased industrial productivity is essential to the well being of the American Economy. We advocate a cooperative and coordinated effort between Federal, State and Local government, business, industry and labor so that economic development will provide our nation and individual communities a solid tax base, jobs, and a healthy environment for people to live and work in. In addressing this matter, a center for business, government and labor studies should be created to act as a consultant on issues that impact on these sectors individually and as a group. It is our feeling that such a center could be profit oriented and become self-supporting after a few years of existence. Its impact could more than pay for itself. In conjunction with the above center, an indepth study of the American Economy supported by the Private and Public sector should be carried out to, among other considerations, measure the effects of supply side economics on the economy and chart a path for future economic growth and stability.

The Hilton Head Island Board of Realtors wishes to continue to work with the elected representatives of South Carolina and advocates a liaison between those officials and the Board.

This report is respectfully submitted by RPAC representatives and the Hilton Head Island Board of Realtors.●

JOSEPH PETRONELLA: AN EXTRAORDINARY POLICEMAN

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, without question, police have one of the most difficult and demanding jobs in our society. Within that profession, the undercover cop is a particularly rare and dedicated individual.

Western New York is privileged to claim one of the most outstanding undercover police officers in the United States. He is Joseph A. Petronella, now assistant chief of the Narcotics Enforcement and Intelligence Bureau of the Erie County Sheriff's Department.

During his 10-year career in law enforcement, Joseph Petronella has made more than 1,000 arrests and he has a 99-percent conviction record. A pioneer in the art of disguise, he has received numerous commendations for utilizing innovative and effective techniques that have been instrumental in apprehending criminals.

Noted authorities in law enforcement have stated that Mr. Petronella is very possibly the best undercover narcotics officer in the country.

While Joseph Petronella's identity must remain concealed, his tremendous accomplishments should and must be recognized.

Last December, the Buffalo News published an article praising Joseph Petronella's achievements. I hope my colleagues will read this article with the knowledge that our communities are safer places because of policemen such as Joseph Petronella:

[From the Buffalo News, Dec. 19, 1982]

PETRONELLA TO DON A NEW ROLE—MASTER OF DISGUISE PROMOTED

(By Anthony Cardinale)

Detective Sgt. Joseph A. Petronella, who has made more than 1,000 arrests during his 10-year career as an undercover lawman, has been promoted to assistant chief of the

Narcotics Enforcement and Intelligence Bureau by Sheriff Kenneth J. Braun.

He will assist the narcotics chief, Captain Santo Costantino, but will continue his undercover work on the street, Sheriff Braun said. He is about to embark on a new type undercover investigation, the sheriff added.

Coinciding with the announcement was the release this weekend of the fall issue of the Empire State Sheriff magazine featuring a cover story on Sgt. Petronella headlined, "Under the Cover of Many Different Faces."

The promotion and the article recognize an undercover career that has brought renown to the Erie County Sheriff's Department across the state for its imaginative "sting" operations to infiltrate the drug market and burglary rings.

"As far as I'm concerned," Sheriff Braun said, "Joe is the equivalent of a Congressional Medal of Honor winner in civilian service. He's a brave and very smart police officer. In my 34 years in law enforcement, he's the best I've seen. No one else can do what he can do, but pretty soon we're going to use him in a new technique on the street."

Capt. Peter Scaccia, chief of investigative services, said he has worked closely with Sgt. Petronella and is looking forward to "a very innovative technique we are in the process of formulating" for combating street crime.

"Joe has arrested over 1,000 suspects in his career," Capt. Scaccia said. "He has a 99 percent conviction ratio. When he gets them, he gets them."

The undercover lawman has been able to survive a decade of undercover work in the same county "because of his ability to change his appearance effectively and realistically" and because he is "a natural actor," according to the story in the magazine published by the New York State Sheriffs Association Institute.

Calling Sgt. Petronella "very possibly the best domestic undercover narcotics officer in the United States," the Empire State Sheriff said the "gutters and alleys" haven't given him the glamour of the Serpicos in real life and movie fiction. "The closest Joe has been to big-time media is an appearance with Sheriff Braun on 'Good Morning America,'" it added.

But Joseph Petronella has made big headlines in Western New York since his first big "sting" operation, in which he infiltrated the food-stamp black market after the Blizzard of '77. Two years later, he was promoted to criminal deputy, and in 1980 he was named a detective sergeant.

The 15 major "sting" operations—in which an undercover man masquerades as a criminal while a team of agents photographs and taperecords the illegal transactions—have come in such quick succession that many people have asked how he can avoid running into the same street criminals a second time.

The answer, he says, is that he often does cross paths with convicted defendants. Not only has he deftly avoided the ones who might have recognized him, but he actually has dealt with and arrested some criminals a second time.

After the food stamp investigation there followed a series of primarily drug-related probes starting with Operation Scatter, in Kenmore and Town of Tonawanda, and Operation Delaware, in which a pound of cocaine was confiscated.

Then came Operation Siamese, in the twin Tonawandas; Operation Bittersweet, near Sweet Home High School; Operation Pied Piper, near Southside High School; Operation Needle, near the methadone center at Buffalo General Hospital; Operation Rock in Black Rock and Riverside, and Operation Polar Bear in North Buffalo.

Next came Operation Market near the Broadway Market, Operation Operation at Erie County Medical Center, which centered on the thefts of hospital property; Operation Stripcaine, on the Elmwood strip; and Operation Grasshopper, in which youths on bicycles sold pot at Burgard High School.

More recently, Sgt. Petronella spearheaded Operation Pac Man, arresting drug dealers and other criminals hanging around video arcade rooms.

Honored with a public service medal from the New York State Bar Association in 1981, Sgt. Petronella used the $500 award to establish a scholarship fund for a high school student wishing to study criminal justice in college.

The first award was given to a Riverside High School graduate last June, and now the scholarships also have been opened to law enforcement officers wishing to further their education. A foundation to administer the Joseph A. Petronella Scholarship has been formed by several friends under the leadership of businessman Robert Rich Jr.●

HONORING DR. JOHN J. COLLINS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues the long and distinguished career in education of Dr. John J. Collins, president of Bakersfield College, who is retiring this month after 25 years with the college.

It gives me particular pleasure to honor John Collins today, because he is a close friend and former colleague whom I have known since I first came to Bakersfield College as an instructor in 1965. I have always held John Collins in the higher regard, and I am proud to have been associated with him.

This respect is shared among community college presidents throughout California and indeed, the Nation. In a State which boasts the finest community college education system in the Nation, Dr. Collins has helped to make Baskerfield College one of the top community colleges, not only in California, but in the United States.

Dr. Collins was an instructor and coach at Bakersfield College when the school—finally—received its own campus in 1955. Except for a tenure as president of Moorpark College from 1961 to 1966, Dr. Collins has served the students of Bakersfield College continuously since then.

He has been a leader and an innovator on behalf of Bakersfield College. Dr. Collins helped to plan and establish two learning centers which have brought the college to the community in Delano and downtown Bakersfield. He has helped to bring computers into the classroom, establishing a new high technology curriculum and computers to aid in teaching the more traditional disciplines.

Under Dr. Collins' direction, Bakersfield College has become more accessible to the community and more responsive to the training needs of local industry and business, but it has also maintained its national standing among the more traditional curricula. Many of the learning programs at Bakersfield College have served as models for other colleges throughout the Nation. As a charter member of the League for Innovation in the Community College, the school shares its methods with educators around the country. Dr. Collins had a role in forming this forward-looking body.

All of these achievements speak well for John Collins' abilities as an administrator, but they are grounded in his experience and dedication as a teacher of students. John Collins spent 41 years in education, and everything he has accomplished has sprung from his dedication to learning.

In addition, Dr. Collins has served his community as a member of the board of directors of the United Way and Red Cross chapters. He also interrupted a budding teaching career in 1941 to serve as an infantry company commander in the Pacific theater during World War II.

I am delighted for this opportunity to honor Dr. Collins before this body. I wish him well as he leaves Bakersfield College. He has been an outstanding educator and a good friend, and the college will miss him. He has earned his retirement many times over.●

CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL TESTIFIES ON CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRANSFER LIMITATIONS LEGISLATION

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1983, I had the honor of testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs on the issue of conventional arms transfer limitations.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the text of my remarks follows:

CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRANSFER LIMITATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to have the opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee today to discuss the issue of conventional arms transfer limitations. The Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs, under your leadership, Mr. Chairman, deserves to be commended for the efforts it has made over several years to focus attention on this serious international issue.

My interest in conventional arms transfer policies was stimulated in part by the Falkland Islands conflict last year. I was deeply concerned that a country like Argentina could acquire the sophisticated military equipment capable of challenging—and almost defeating—the British navy. Ironically, over $200 million worth of this equipment was sold by Great Britain itself to Argentina.

My study and research of conventional arms transfers led me to introduce H. Con. Res. 415 on September 29, 1982. In November and December of last year I contacted over 125 individuals and organizations to stimulate interest in the legislation in preparation for this 98th Congress. The positive and enthusiastic response I received has encouraged my efforts this year with the reintroduction of the conventional arms transfer limitations measure as H.J. Res. 128.

Most of the discussion about arms limitation has focused on the important issue of nuclear arms control. The nuclear freeze legislation has succeeded in stimulating national and international debate on the prospects of nuclear war, and led to broad citizen involvement in one of the most critical issues facing all of humanity.

It is my hope that similar attention can now be directed to another challenge of arms limitation: the alarming escalation of global conventional arms sales. The hearings scheduled by this Subcommittee on the issue are a significant part of this process.

It is worthwhile to recall that while there have been no deaths since World War II as a result of the use of nuclear weapons, between 12 and 15 million people have been killed in wars and conflicts involving conventional weapons.

Currently, the world spends $22 on military purposes for every $1 it spends on development aid to poor countries. According to the U.N. Center for Disarmament, the money required to provide adequate food, water, education, health and housing for everyone in the world has been estimated at about $18.5 billion per year. The world spends this much on arms every two weeks. In the developing world, ten times more is spent on arms than on health, education, and welfare combined.

According to the Congressional Research Service, between 1978 and 1981 conventional arms transfer agreements between developing nations and arms supplying nations totaled $120.6 billion. During this period, the Soviet Union was the developing world's leading individual arms supplier, with arms agreements with developing countries totaling $33.2 billion. Third World arms deals on the part of the United States trailed at $30.7 billion.

The most interesting statistic for conventional arms agreements for these four years is the $45.5 billion worth of agreements with developing nations by free world nations other than the United States. Our Western Allies, such as France, the United Kingdom, West Germany, and Italy actually have the largest share of the conventional arms market.

Particularly alarming is the fact that the world's leading arms developers are now exporting their most advanced weapons with little or no time lapse between introduction into their own arsenals and transfer abroad. Among the examples of this are the transfers of advanced French Mirage fighters and Exocet missiles, Soviet T-72 tanks, and United States F-15 and F-16 fighters and Phoenix and Sidewinder missiles.

Weapons and warfare have been an ongoing element of the human experience. Clearly, it is unrealistic to expect that all arms transfers can be stopped or that swords will be beaten into plowshares around the globe.

Nevertheless, I do believe that there are specific, practical steps that the United States can take to rein in the runaway conventional arms race. The stituation becomes hopeless only if we refuse to act.

The legislation I have introduced, H.J. Res. 128, calls for a four-point program to achieve conventional arms transfer limitations. It prescribes a simultaneous multitrack approach to conventional arms restraint. Permit me to briefly outline the four tracks recommended in H.J. Res. 128.

RESUMPTION OF THE CAT TALKS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

The first point of my resolution is that the United States and the Soviet Union should immediately begin negotiations to resume the Conventional Arms Transfer (CAT) talks. It is my contention that we should commence discussions with the Russians to provide for the formal resumption of the talks initiated by the Carter Administration in 1977.

A possible first step might be to establish a bilateral working group to consider the means of moving forward with renewed CAT talks. I make this recommendation fully aware of the traditional difficulties of finding common ground for any arms-related agreement between the superpowers.

Observers and participants have cited several reasons for U.S. difficulties with the CAT talks of 1977 and 1978. Some contend that the internal clash between the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and State Department perspectives on the talks was the principal factor. Others point to the restraining impact of improved relations with the People's Republic of China. Yet a consensus seems to be that a significant element was the failure of the Carter Administration to pursue parallel discussions about conventional arms limitations with the Western arms suppliers.

In my opinion, the problems that led to the lack of success of the first CAT talks are not insurmountable. Indeed, the CAT experience under the Carter Administration provides a valuable guide for a renewed effort with the Soviet Union.

First, the CAT talks proceeded further than most observers ever thought possible. Genuine progress seemed to have been made prior to the fourth round of negotiations. Second, the talks showed that there might be room for some reasonably specific restraints on certain classes of weapons, such as those useful to terrorists. Third, the Soviet Union did not flatly reject the American proposal to discuss specific regional guidelines. This particularly was a most encouraging development.

The most important reason for a continued United States-Soviet dialogue is that regional arms races are most often a direct result of competition between our two countries. The attempt to win friends or to compete through proxies has been a dangerous and destabilizing dimension of superpower competition. Such local conflicts carry with them the potential for eventual direct involvement of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is therefore in both countries' interests to discuss the conventional arms competition between them in the Third World.

The CAT talks offered hope that progress could be made on conventional arms transfer limitations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States should take the initiative in attempting to get these talks back on track. Let us demonstrate to the world our willingness to restrain and set rules for the conventional arms competition both nations are supporting in the developing world.

CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRANSFER LIMITATION DISCUSSIONS WITH THE FREE WORLD ARMS SUPPLYING NATIONS

The second point of my resolution is that the United States should immediately begin discussions with the free world arms supplying nations to limit conventional arms transfers to developing nations and to establish qualitative guidelines for conventional arms transfers. While bilateral talks between the Soviets and the United States are necessary if long-term progress on arms restraint is to be realized, the most immediate goal should be to encourage multilateral initiatives. As I mentioned in discussing the CAT talks, these bilateral talks might have been helped if simultaneous arms limitation discussions with our Western allies had been in progress.

It is important to re-emphasize that the major Western suppliers combined deliver a majority of the weapons traded in the international market. Moreover, they are more often in direct competition with each other than are Eastern and Western suppliers. It makes sense for some coordination to take place among the Western suppliers, since a joint effort on their part would limit the ability of the Western-oriented arms recipients to "shop" elsewhere.

Initially, this free world arms suppliers track might proceed without formal agreements in order to accustom the participants to a new coordinating mechanism. This might then lead to more formal agreements at a later stage.

Developing channels of communication on conventional arms restraint among the Western allies would be especially valuable during times of crises. For example, a consultative mechanism would have been most useful during the Falkland Islands crisis.

While there is bound to continue to be competition among the free world suppliers, it would be beneficial if an effort could be pursued to develop a market-sharing approach. Such an approach could begin by acknowledging French and British interests, for example, in continued production of certain weapons systems. Thus, French supersonic aircraft and helicopters and some types of British missiles or surface ships could be given assurances of adequate export outlets. It is in the interests of the Western alliance to bring important suppliers into the restraint framework and to reenforce common security interests.

Discussions among the free world suppliers should aim to establish criteria for what will be sold and where it will be sold. Qualitative restraints on certain classes of equipment should be a primary initial goal. An example here might be advanced missiles of the caliber of the French Exocet.

In addition, agreements should be sought with respect to not introducing certain sophisticated weapons into regions of the world where those weapons presently are not available. A reasonable goal might be a consensus on the part of the Western arms sellers not to sell advanced supersonic fighter aircraft to regions like South America and sub-Saharan Africa.

The Western or free world track poses some of the greatest challenges to conventional arms restraint, but at the same time, offers the hope of some of the greatest rewards. Moreover, cooperation on the arms selling issue could lead to cooperation on other vital issues affecting the alliance.

DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE ARMS BUYERS AND THE ARMS SELLERS—THE GENEVA TRACK

The third point of my resolution is that the United States should immediately, through the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva or through some other appropriate international forum, begin conventional arms transfer discussions between nations selling conventional weapons and nations purchasing such weapons to limit such arms transfers.

This third track focuses upon the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva, more formally called the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which was created in 1962 as a multilateral forum for negotiations on disarmament. It reports to and is instructed by the U.N. General Assembly. Its membership includes nations of both Eastern and Western blocs, as well as a number of non-aligned nations. This multilateral forum has been the site of discussions on general disarmament, nuclear testing, demilitarization of the seabeds, chemical and biological weapons, and humanitarian laws. Several advantages might be derived from a dialogue in such a body.

First, a better understanding of the legitimate defense requirements of developing nations could be a primary target. It is important that this sensitivity be considered and addressed.

Second, some initial gains might be achieved by focusing on weapons useful to terrorists. This focus might defuse the more volatile aspects of such a dialogue by concentrating on common problems.

Third, such a forum might be able to discuss the outlines for an internationally recognized code of principles regarding legitimate arms transfer practices. This approach could be modeled after discussions of internationally recognized standards of human rights.

Fourth, such a forum might begin to serve as a vehicle for differentiating among various regional interests and concerns. This, in turn, could serve as an impetus for initiatives within the existing regional organizations, such as the Organization of American States.

It is imperative to initiate a supplier/recipient track for conventional arms transfer limitation talks. The Committee on Disarmament offers a pre-existing forum with which members of the international community have had some experience. In addition, it offers the advantage of not being closely identified with U.S. interests.

SELECTIVE SELF-RESTRAINT

The resolution finally calls upon the United States to reaffirm a commitment to the self-restraint it has demonstrated with respect to selective conventional arms transfers to developing nations and a commitment to qualitative guidelines for conventional arms transfers. I refer to this approach as the self-restraint track.

I want to emphasize that this is not a call for unilateral abandonment of conventional arms agreements with the Third World. Rather, it urges the Administration in selective cases to follow a common-sense policy of refraining from transfering sophisticated weapons to certain countries. Examples of this policy were cited in the Congressional Research Service report "Changing Perspectives on U.S. Arms Transfer Policy" which was prepared for this Subcommittee in 1981. The report mentioned the Carter Administration's turndowns of the F-5E aircraft for Guatemala, the A-7 for Pakistan, the F-4 for Taiwan, the F-4G for Iran, and F-16's for Turkey.

Used carefully, a measure of self-restraint can signal continued willingness to engage in negotiations. Such restraints also may encourage reciprocal action by other suppliers—creating tacit multilateral agreements in those cases where explicit negotiations are not possible. We engaged in such restraint with the Russians during both the Korean and Vietnamese conflicts.

At the very least, selective self-restraint can play an important, if limited, part in the initial stages of a larger effort to encourage conventional arms control and also allow a nation to refuse to transfer weapons on grounds of principle. Human rights, economic development, and other general principles supported by the United States are vital threads in the fabric of U.S. diplomacy.

There also is the less esoteric consideration of the potential adverse impact of overseas sales of sophisticated U.S. equipment on our own military supplies. The C.R.S. report for this Subcommittee called attention to the issue of an aggressive arms sale policy resulting in a draw-down of U.S. service inventories. That report cited the example of the impact of F-16 aircraft sales to non-NATO countries. I would urge this Subcommittee to pursue the draw-down issue further with Administration officials and to solicit the comments of the appropriate Pentagon personnel.

The Administration should be encouraged by Congress to continue selective self-restraint and to continue to observe qualitatitve guidelines with respect to the levels of sophistication of the weapons transferred. The United States should resist the temptation to unilaterally up the ante in regional balances of power. Inevitably, the balance of power will be restored, but at a higher and more potentially explosive level.

SUMMARY

The legislation I have introduced, H.J. Res. 128, is intended to offer a concerted, broad-based conventional arms transfer limitation effort on several tracks. The multitrack approach recognizes the complexity of the international arms transfer network. Regional differences, bloc competition, economic considerations, and security needs are but a few of the factors which make conventional arms restraint difficult to accommodate within just one negotiating framework or track.

I believe it is essential for the Congress at this juncture to urge the Administration to develop a coherent and visible conventional arms transfer limitation strategy. Further, the Administration should immediately begin multitrack discussions that will lead to both informal and formal agreements and guidelines with respect to conventional arms sales.

In order to facilitate Congressional oversight of this endeavor, H.J. Res. 128 requires the President to report to Congress every six months on the actions taken by the United States in accordance with the resolution and the progress being made toward achievement of the objectives expressed in this resolution. The report envisioned by this legislation would be a most useful and valuable document concerning the global efforts at conventional arms transfer limitations. I would hope that it could serve as the basis for Congressional and other initiatives on the issues relating to conventional arms transfers.

In conclusion, I would like to again thank the Subcommittee for holding this hearing and for providing leadership on this issue. I am grateful for the attention the Subcommittee has given to H.J. Res. 128, and I hope that this legislation will receive favorable consideration by the Subcommittee.

It is my hope that H.J. Res. 128 will be a catalyst for further efforts concerning conventional arms transfer limitations. My objective in introducing this legislation is to stimulate debate and interest, and encourage the active involvement of those who are in a position both to influence and to direct the conventional arms transfer policies of this country.

The issues relating to conventional arms transfers will not be resolved in this Congress. We can, however, begin the processes through which these issues can be addressed. I look forward to working with this Subcommittee on these efforts.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1983

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the 65th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Born in the ravages of World War I, the Lithuanian nation had a brief but noble existence. For 24 years their democratic institutions and climate of intellectual vigor stood in marked contrast to the Gulag of their Soviet neighbors to the east.

This brief freedom was short lived. In 1940 over 300,000 Soviet troops invaded and illegally annexed the independent Lithuanian nation. Little did anyone know that this action portended a future and equally cruel Soviet expansion into other nations of Eastern Europe.

While we in the United States have refused to legitimize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania by not recognizing this status, the people of Lithuania must live with the hard reality of Soviet domination. Most of the 3½ million people in Lithuania are devout Catholics who face systematic harassment and obstruction of their right to practice their religion freely. The Kremlin continues to deny them religious freedom and cruelly suppresses and denies Lithuanian ethnic and cultural development.

Lithuanian is a small nation composed of hard working and industrious people. Many of its sons and daughters have come to live in my district in New Jersey where they are admired and respected members of the community. The history of the land which they left reaches back nearly 1,000 years. It has not always been a happy history, for most of that time it was dominated by foreign powers. Nevertheless, the Lithuanian people have remained strong in spirit and successfully fought off efforts to replace their culture with that of their conquerers. For that reason, they are especially well prepared to withstand the continuous efforts by the Soviets to eradicate their national identity.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I am not alone when I say that our prayers and hopes lie with the Lithuanian people whose courage under domination is an inspiration to us all. Our prayers must be matched by vigilance in our actions to pressure the Soviets to exhibit respect for human rights and liberties in their policy toward all the oppressed nations of the Soviet empire.●

ARMS CONTROL AND FORCE MODERNIZATION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my Foreign Affairs newsletter for February 1983 for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ARMS CONTROL AND FORCE MODERNIZATION

The prevention of war and the control of arms are the most important issues of our time. These paramount tasks require a strong commitment to maintain sufficient strength so that we can protect our interests and deter aggression. Peace and security must also be preserved by a strong commitment to secure the agreement of potential adversaries to verifiable cuts in military forces. There are no serious voices today who would deny that both these tasks must be undertaken.

Our record in arms control in the recent past is cause for concern. We have not completed an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union since 1976. For the first time since the administration of President Dwight Eisenhower, we are not engaged in negotiating a comprehensive test ban treaty. We have not ratified the second strategic arms limitation treaty, and we are now trying to renegotiate the peaceful nuclear explosions treaty and the threshold test ban treaty. We have just removed the head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and are engaged at the moment in a fight over its direction. Most disturbing is that we have given the impression of building up our defenses pell-mell while delaying arms control. The rationale behind the buildup included the goal of negotiating mutual cuts in military forces from a position of strength, but the buildup has been pursued with an urgency and a momentum which has, as a practical matter, pushed that goal into the background.

The need to modernize our strategic forces is genuine. A few statistics tell a large part of the story. Seventy-five percent of our nuclear warheads are on weapons which are aged 15 years or more, while 75% of Soviet warheads are on weapons which are aged five years or less. In the decade of the 1970's, the Soviets deployed four new submarine types, two new submarine-launched missile types, and three new intercontinental ballistic missile types, while we deployed new types in none of these categories (though we expanded our arsenal of warheads at a faster rate).

Arms control and force modernization should be seen as equal partners, not competitors, in the drive to achieve peace and security. An example which makes the point is the anti-ballistic missile treaty, a pact under which both superpowers agreed not to build more than a small number of anti-ballistic missiles. The agreement was a successful piece of defense planning in that it made large investments in a new military technology unnecessary. There are other instances where we can see with hindsight that problems could have been avoided by an arms control agreement. If the American negotiating team had been allowed to follow the advice of its chief negotiator during talks on the first strategic arms limitation treaty, there would now be a ban against the arming of missiles with more than one independently targetable warhead ("MIRVing"). We had an advantage at that time in the appropriate technology, but the Soviets now have the advantage because they have larger missiles and can put more warheads on each one. It is this MIRVing which has made our land-based missiles theoretically vulnerable. Problems like this do not have to be solved if they are avoided.

If arms control is to play a key role in defense planning, certain conditions have to be met. First, the organization of government must reflect the equal partnership of arms control and force modernization. This has not been the case in recent months. In the President's first budget, there was no money for the resumption of negotiations, but there was $1,600 billion for a five-year military buildup. Important positions in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency were left unfilled, and it took until November of 1981 for the formulation of proposals to control intermediate-range arms, and another six months for the formulation of proposals to control strategic arms. Arms control must be brought in as a concern in defense planning at the start. Once programs to develop weapons are almost complete, it is hard for arms controllers to do any more than formalize the upper limits on planned deployment.

The second condition is that arms controllers need to have criteria for deciding which weapons they most want to control. A freeze on all warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems is a desirable goal, if it is done by both sides in a situation of strategic parity and if it is verifiable. But it does not give us a way to distinguish among weapons. This is why I support efforts to give special emphasis to destabilizing weapons. Nuclear weapons which threaten a first strike to either side seem to be the most destabilizing because it is the existence of these weapons that tempts a preemptive strike, or the adoption of a launch-on-warning strategy which leaves the retaliatory response to the computers.

Third, the commitment to increase our armed strength and the commitment to pursue arms control need to be under firm political control. Decisions on defense must not be taken autonomously, with a momentum of their own. Leading defense planners have testified in Congress that they have not had adequate guidance from political authorities. If this guidance is not provided, the perception grows that the arms race is out of control. Without the active intervention of political leaders, this momentum cannot be halted. Arms control needs political support from the highest levels of our government.

There are great difficulties in educating political leaders to play this sort of role. The details of defense planning are complex, and these are disguised in almost impenetrable jargon. However, we can take encouragement from the large number of people who familiarize themselves with much of this detail. There is a startling contrast with a few years ago in the number of participants knowledgeable in the public discussion of these topics. This in turn has caused the political leadership to get more involved. The debate in Congress is more informed than it used to be. If this interest and this educational process can be maintained, we may yet be able to give arms control the importance it deserves in national security policy.●

GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to pay tribute to our former colleague, the Honorable George P. Miller of California, one of my distinguished predecessors as chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology.

George P. Miller served in this House for almost three decades, having been elected first in 1944. He was chairman of our committee, then known as the Committee on Science and Astronautics, for more than 10 years, from the fall of 1961 until he left Congress in January 1973.

Chairman Miller was a dedicated and effective spokesman for America's space program. He was a charter member of the Science and Astronautics Committee which was created as part of the Nation's response to the Soviet space program. From the time he became chairman in 1961 until he retired, his leadership helped to guide a massive scientific and engineering effort which proved to the world that American ingenuity and determination would more than meet the Soviet challenge. Some of the most spectacular achievements of the space program were accomplished during his chairmanship, the most remarkable being the landing of American astronauts on the Moon. It will come as no surprise to my colleagues when I say that I believe our national space program deserves our continued enthusiastic support, and if George P. Miller were here today he would surely urge a more vigorous space program.

One of the few Members of Congress who was a graduate engineer, George P. Miller seldom missed an opportunity to remind his lawyer colleagues in this Chamber that, "You guys think in circles. I am one of the few guys around here who has been trained to think in straight lines." That comment was characteristic of a man who was serious about his work, but who never took himself seriously.

He never lost the common touch. Nor could he ever forget those who were left behind by our economic system. He experienced some hard times himself and often told how during the Great Depression of the 1930's he had worked as a street-sweeper in his hometown of Alameda, Calif.

One of the highlights of Mr. Miller's life was his service as an officer in the field artillery during World War I when he was involved in active combat on the European front. It provided him with special insight and deep respect for our brave men in the military services.

During his service in the Congress he acquired a reputation for honesty, sincerity, and friendliness while always evidencing the best traits of an older statesman—maturity, sensitivity, diligence, and wisdom.

Perhaps his fine sense of humor, his optimistic spirit, and his selflessness which he expressed in his sympathy for the common man all contributed to his long life, for he lived 91 years and so many of them were spent helping his fellow man.

George P. Miller was a credit to this House, a distinguished committee chairman, and a dedicated citizen of our great Nation. I am proud to say he was my friend, and I am grateful for his stewardship of the Science Committee in its formative years. He has passed on to all of us who have served on the committee since then a legacy of dedication and excellence. We are grateful for his example and his contributions.

I offer my sincere condolences to his loved ones.●

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

●Mr. AuCoin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to listen to Mark Talisman, vice chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, present his organization's budget request for fiscal year 1984.

There is nothing I need add to what Mark said yesterday as to why there should be a Holocaust Memorial. I commend and endorse the work of the council. While it may be slightly unusual to insert a budget request statement in the Record, I believe that, in this particular case, it is something that all of us should be aware of and support.

Statement of Mark Talisman, Vice Chairman, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Before the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, on the 1984 Budget for the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

This spring will mark the 40th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising—one of the many, yet all too few, examples of heroism and martyrdom in the Holocaust period. In the Warsaw Ghetto, thousands of unarmed Jews held out against the Nazi war machine longer than did the entire armies of some European nations. Under P.L. 96-388, the Council will encourage Days of Remembrance Commemorative Ceremonies in 50 state capitals, as well as many other cities, and conduct the national ceremony in Washington, D.C. during the week of Days of Remembrance April 10. We will welcome to our Washington ceremony more than 10,000 Jewish survivors of the Holocaust who will convene here, as the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, not to petition their government, but to give thanks to the United States for liberating the death camps and offering sanctuary and citizenship to several hundred thousand of their numbers.

Fifty years ago this January, Adolf Hitler came to power with a pseudo-messianic vision of the one thousand year Reich, the total domination of western civilization, and a so-called pure-blooded, aryan race to be achieved through genocidal policies and practices. The Third Reich was destroyed within a dozen years, primarily because America entered the war. Even so, Hitler accomplished the most horrible of his primary goals, slaughtering of two-thirds of the Jews of occupied Europe, six million in all. As our Chairman, Elie Wiesel, wrote in his report of the President's Commission on the Holocaust, "not every victim of the Holocaust was a Jew, but every Jew was a victim."

In the several thousand years of recorded history only a handful of events have been so great or so evil as to change civilization for all time to follow. The Holocaust was such an event. It well may have been, if you will, the Flood of our millennium. No human response to such a catastrophe can be very adequate. Yet the passage of four decades since this awesome tragedy allows us now to begin to institutionalize remembrance of those events and the lessons from them. Thus it was in wisdom that Congress unanimously passed P.L. 96-388. We must never forget, and today the urgency of our task grows with ever-quickening pace, especially for the only living witnesses of the event—the survivors and the members of the liberating armies, the average age of whom is now in the sixties.

Occasionally we are asked, why build a living museum memorial to the Holocaust in the Nation's Capital, adjacent to the Mall which is consecrated to American values? The answers, which underlie the Congressional mandate, are many. First, perhaps, Hitler declared war on America's values and ultimately was stopped by our determination to preserve western civilization at an enormous cost in American lives and materials. Second, America is the home of the most allied liberators in the free world and the most Jewish survivors other than the State of Israel. Third, such lessons as the moral, economic and national security costs of anti-Semitism, racial discord and prejudice, appeasement of oppressors, and military unpreparedness still remain to be learned. And all of these lessons are ever central to the problems of governing the leading democracy of the world in a period that presents greater perils to human survival than even Hitler threatened in the pre-nuclear age. As distinguished from genocidal acts on the one hand, and World War II on the other, the Holocaust represented a governmental policy to purge from the human society an entire "race," i.e., all human beings with Jewish blood in their veins, regardless of their economic, political, religious or military views or circumstances. But the consequences for all free societies, and the lessons to be learned by participants and by-standers alike, can and must be generalized. In this respect it is especially fitting that a living educational museum/memorial to the Holocaust be established in the Capital of the free world.

To plan and implement this endeavor is an unprecedented task, calling forth the best efforts of skilled professionals and consultants working as a uniquely structured interdisciplinary team. In the first two years the Council, aided by a very small staff, established a pattern for the annual Days of Remembrance ceremonies, convened at the State Department an historic, International Liberators Conference, and worked with a number of historians and educators to frame the major issues and themes for the museum exhibits.

As this the third year began, the Council expanded its executive leadership and the tempo of professional planning increased dramatically. A comprehensive and detailed outline for museum planning has been adopted by the Council and a dedicated museum planning team is at work. Planning for the educational foundation and archival activities that will be integral to this living museum plan is now being sketched out. Finally, this spring will mark the inauguration of a national development campaign to raise the private funds necessary to design and build the museum memorial.

Fiscal Year 1984 will be a critical year because we will be making the transition from preliminary planning to final planning and the beginning of implementation. If, for example, we cannot during the coming year flesh out in minute detail the components of a full-scale information retrieval center, then our Museum will have no computer services when it is built. Similarly, if, by the end of 1984, we have not taken the fundamental steps toward a complete museum design for interior and exterior spaces alike, then it will be impossible even to begin to solicit and review bids for construction.

The move from preliminary planning to final planning and implementation will require three categories of major increases in funding: new full-time professional and support staff; a considerably expanded use of professional consultants; and substantially increased travel for the establishment of professional working relationships between the Council staff and related United States and foreign agencies and institutions.

It must be understood that Fiscal Year 1984 will find the United States Holocaust Memorial Council aggressively engaged in its major fundraising drive for approximately $75,000,000 to construct and endow the on-going life of a U.S. Holocaust Museum and Education Foundation. Thus, the Federal appropriations for the Council's budget in the coming year represent essential seed money for what will be a national undertaking of unparalleled proportions.

We are happy to report that the Council and its staff already have drawn up detailed plans and timetables for all activities up to and including the construction, staffing and opening of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. We have every confidence that this project will unite the Federal government and broad sectors of the American people in what is one of the most worthy undertakings of our generation.●

WE LOVE LUCI

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a delightful event will be held at the Governor's Mansion in Austin, Tex., this coming April 14. Texas Governor and Mrs. Mark White will help culminate the "We Love Luci" project, honoring Luci Baines Johnson, the youngest daughter of our beloved former President and Lady Bird Johnson. A $50,000 goal has been set by the sponsors to endow the Luci Baines Johnson Chair in the University of Texas School of Nursing. And under a unique agreement in this, the university's centennial year, the University of Texas Board of Regents is embellishing this endowment and all others with matching funds.

This event is not only a way to celebrate one of the Nation's foremost nursing schools, but to pay tribute to one of our country's outstanding citizens.

Luci Johnson could have sat back and have been satisfied with wearing the label of "former President's daughter." But she has taken her family's love of public service in many creative directions. For several years, she has focused her activities in health education. She once chaired the University of Texas School of Nursing Development Board and currently serves on the National League of Nursing Board of Review, which helps accredit all nursing programs in our country. She is also a member of the Boston University School of Medicine Board of Review.

Many of us know Luci as the president of the nationwide group, Volunteers for Vision, which seeks to discover visually disadvantaged children for treatment.

You would think Luci's time is consumed with these pursuits of health care improvements. But she is also a full-time mother of four children and takes her family duties so seriously that you will often find her on field trips with her children and raising money for school activities. She also guides her children in Bible studies.

At the same time Luci's feet are planted firmly on the ground in the business world. She is vice president of the family's communications and real estate company and serves as chairman of the board of an Austin bank.●

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—NO PLACE FOR AMATEURS

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, while it is not in the province of this body to confirm Presidential nominations, nonetheless it is incumbent upon all of us to take a stand on the madness of the nuclear arms race and its threat to the future of human achievement.

The other body soon will be asked to cast a vote of confirmation on the nomination of Kenneth Adelman as Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Certainly, there is reason to question Mr. Adelman's suitability for the post in light of his performance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and his general qualifications for the job.

In the past 2 years, the American people have sent out a clarion call to their leaders on the subject of arms control. The Reagan administration has chosen largely to ignore the sentiments expressed in town forums and elections across the land, apparently feeling that it holds a monopoly on intelligent arms control strategy. I also do not doubt that sentiment exists within the White House that the people will "return to their senses" in the near future, and that the fervor for nuclear disarmament constitutes no more than a fad. Like hula hoops, disco, and deely bobbers, this too shall pass.

As has been the case with a variety of subjects in the past 2 years, the administration once again is patronizing the intelligence and commitment of the American people. I have no doubt that we have yet to see the full fury of the people unleased on the subject of serious, efficacious arms negotiations. The nuclear threat is with us for all time—only our determination to keep the genie bottled can save us.

The administration's likelihood to succeed on arms control suffers with the nomination of Mr. Adelman to accomplish this sensitive task. The President has made the nomination a matter of personal prestige, and it may be that the other body will acquiesce to pressure and approve the nomination, despite the recommendation of rejection delivered by the Foreign Relations Committee.

But approval of Mr. Adelman's nomination should not translate into cause for optimism by the American people on the subject of arms control. In recent weeks, radio station WGSM has provided listeners in my district with a pair of succinct, thoughtful editorials on the subjects of Mr. Adelman's nomination and arms control. I would like to share these thoughts with my colleagues today, and urge an expeditious consideration of the matter of arms control in the coming days in this body.

The WGSM editorials follow:

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—NO PLACE FOR AMATEURS

You might not be familiar with the name Kenneth Adelman, but he could well hold your life in his hands. Adelman is President Reagan's nominee for arms control chief, the man who will negotiate life or death agreements with the Russians. He will be dealing with weaponry that can obliterate the human race.

Two weeks ago he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for confirmation hearings. When asked if he thought a nuclear war could be limited, not exactly an unimportant question, the fate of mankind might rest on the answer, Mr. Adelman replied, "I have no thoughts in that area." When asked whether the Soviet Union was violating terms of the Salt II treaty, Mr. Adelman said, "I am not knowledgeable at all." When asked if the U.S. would seek ratification of Soviet/American treaties to limit underground nuclear testing, Adelman said he hadn't talked to the experts and would be very reluctant to give a date for any decision.

Adelman was rushed back to the Senate last week with a consultant at his side and answered all the questions he didn't answer previously. But this is not the position for a cram course candidate. The trouble with all this is that Adelman is supposed to be the expert. Until now, the chief negotiator for the U.S. in disarmament talks has been a truly bipartisan type appointment, usually a person of great knowledge, stature, background and judgment.

President Reagan fired Eugene Rostow from this position a few weeks ago. The reason was significant—Rostow, it was said, sought arms control too zealously. In other words, Rostow wasn't just going through the motions. To fire him made friends and foes alike feel that Ronald Reagan doesn't want disarmament or arms control. To nominate an obscure, uninformed, inexperienced person for this most vital position not only emphasizes Mr. Reagan's lack of enthusiasm for peaceful solutions but is downright dangerous.

MISSILES DO NOT DEFEND—THEY DESTROY

Currently, we're hearing a lot about the defense budget. In truth, there is no more defense in the defense budget—it's a military budget. Once, the money we spent for the military was largely defensive unless we were involved in war.

To defend means to shield, to protect, as coastal artillery might defend a shoreline sinking hostile ships so they could not do damage to our nation, or an anti-aircraft gun could shoot down a bomber to prevent it from dropping bombs on us. That's when the defense budget really bought defense.

Now the nature of warfare has changed. Our so-called defense budget is spent on missiles and bombers. There are offensive weapons. They can be used on a first strike or retaliatory basis but if used, they cannot prevent anyone from attacking us. Their purpose is to kill huge numbers of people, whether they are used by the Soviet Union or United States. With nuclear warheads on them, they can annihilate entire civilizations, all life as we know it.

The hope, of course, is that such weapons will deter an attack but if that attack comes, no one will be defended. Since there is no defense, the difference between calling it the defense budget and calling it the military budget is more than just one of words. We should stop calling it the defense budget because it gives us a false security. It makes it easier to forge ahead toward the unthinkable. What we are talking about in this nation right now is spending nearly one third of every dollar the federal government takes in and giving it to the military. When that military budget is spent, we will be no safer than we are now. We will not be defended any more than we are now—quite the opposite. We will be that much closer to confrontation.

Only a scaling down, a sincere, enthusiastic, flexible policy toward disarmament and arms control is a viable defense in the 1980's. Record military expenditures by the Soviet Union and the United States take us in the wrong direction. Now, while there is still time to reason, discuss, and persuade is probably the time for citizens to inform their representatives that bigger military budgets are not the way to peace, that the only true defense lies in the opposite direction.●

CONGRESS MUST REPEAL THE "MILK TAX"

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 I joined several hundred farmers in my congressional district at a meeting called by Mr. Bob Engel of Shamel Mills to discuss the disastrous impact the "milk tax" will have on the dairy farmer and the farm economy in general. Also participating in this very interesting and productive meeting were New York State Assemblyman Bill Paxon, New York State Senator Bill Stachowski, Erie County Executive Ed Rutkowski, Erie County Legislators Mary Lou Rath and Tom Reynolds, as well as representatives of Senators AL D'AMATO and DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN.

All the participants in this meeting agree that the dairy industry is suffering from a serious—and expensive—surplus production. Total milk production has risen from 122.5 billion pounds in 1979 to 134.3 billion pounds in 1982, a 9.6 percent increase. At the same time, commercial use of dairy products has risen only 1.4 percent. The result is a net Government removal of over 10 percent of U.S. dairy production from the market, at a cost to the taxpayer of over $2 billion.

But while these costs are troubling, the costs of staying in business to the dairyman are even more so. Support prices have remained steady since October 1980; but the large surplus has reduced the actual market price paid to producers below the support level. These declining real prices, coupled with the rising cost of production, have reduced the average dairyman's return on labor, management, and investment and have forced some dairy farmers to "live off the depreciation."

We all agreed that something must be done to correct the imbalance of production and consumption in the dairy industry. But we also agreed—emphatically—that the milk tax is not the solution. This assessment will cost the average New York State dairy farmer $4,000 per year—a total revenue loss of $55 million annually to New York State dairymen. Yet while the dairy farmer receives a lower price for his milk, the consumer continues to pay the same high price for dairy products. In addition, the milk tax will actually increase dairy production as farmers struggle to maintain their income while receiving a lower price for their production. Therefore the milk tax fails to address the two central problems in the dairy industry—overproduction and underconsumption.

While failing to address the underlying causes of the dairy surplus, the milk tax will "succeed" in one tragic way—by forcing young, highly leveraged family farmers out of business. The Government must not assume the responsibility of keeping every farmer in business—like all small enterprises, the family farm is a high risk operation. But neither should the Government unfairly burden the family farmer by imposing a tax on his efficiency and productivity. That is why the milk tax must be repealed. Congress gave permission for the dairy tax to be imposed, and it is the responsibility of Congress to revoke this permission. I commend my colleagues Senator AL D'AMATO and Congressman STEVE GUNDERSON for their leadership on this issue, and I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor the legislation they have introduced to repeal the dairy assessment. I ask that all the farmers who will be hurt by the milk tax to write your representative and ask for his cosponsorship and support for these important bills.

Many of my colleagues may not realize that New York State is the Nation's third largest dairy producing State. We have 14,000 dairy farms, that provide a stable economic base for hundreds of upstate communities, many of them in my 31st Congressional District. The family farmer is a hardworking entrepreneur struggling to stay afloat in an economic climate that often punishes him for being a productive and efficient businessman. The New York State Farm Bureau, under the able leadership of Dick Maguire, has formulated some very worthwhile recommendations for a 1983 dairy promotion program; an increase in the FDA's minimum standards for fluid milk to assure a better tasting product; and a short-term reduction in the dairy price support coupled with a long-term "trigger" that will allow the dairy industry to effectively respond to the signals provided by the market. I hope my colleagues will consider these proposals as we tackle the issues facing the dairy community.

The dairy tax must be repealed. Congress must take responsible action to correct the distorted signals the Government has given the dairy industry; but we must not penalize the farmer for responding efficiently and productively to those signals. Mr. Speaker, in all my years of Congress I have never met finer people, more industrious and patriotic families nor more courteous constituents. I am honored to represent them and I believe this issue goes to the heart of what is troubling our Nation today, and that is every time someone thinks up a tax it further discourages production, free enterprise, and the incentive system so integral to our American family value system. I offer this editorial from the Buffalo News as a concise, well-reasoned argument against the milk tax. I hope my colleagues will join me in fighting for its repeal.

MUDDLED MILK LEVY

The October rise in milk production in both Western New York and the state as a whole gives credence to the complaints of many dairy producers that the new 50-cent per hundredweight federal tax on milk production, far from relieving mountainous government dairy surpluses, will only make them worse.

The "milk tax" on all U.S. dairy farmers was voted by Congress earlier this year to reduce costs of the dairy-support program. It called for an initial 50-cent levy beginning Dec. 1 to be deducted from federal price-support payments, and an additional 50-cent assessment next April if milk surpluses remain high.

Dairy leaders have protested that the federal levy will do nothing to lower consumer prices, but will take money out of farmers' pockets at a time when their costs are still rising. In the view of these critics, the net effect will be to spur farmers to offset their losses by stepping up production.

That seems to be the pattern now emerging in anticipation of next month's exaction. According to the New York Crop Reporting Service, statewide milk production during October was the highest on record for that month and 2 percent above October 1981.

Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block last month voiced his own lukewarm view toward the congressionally-mandated assessments. Noting that dairy surpluses are still increasing and now are valued at $3.1 billion, Secretary Block said of the tax: "I don't think it's a very good solution, but it is my obligation to administer it."

While farmers may eventually reduce their output, he noted, the immediate outlook is for still larger dairy surpluses that add to government costs while doing nothing to relieve consumer prices.

Dairy leaders in the Northeast stress that the growing surpluses are largely the product of Midwestern and California dairymen. Because they are close to markets, New Yorkers produce much closer to demand.

Instead of approving the 50-cent levy, Congress would have done better to reduce current price-support levels in an effort to bring down prices and stimulate consumer purchases of dairy products. The trifling overall savings that the new milk tax can achieve in the federal budget are likely to be greatly offset by storage costs for growing surpluses in government warehouses.

One possible solution for the milk muddle advanced by some quarters is the adoption of a two-price support program. Under this approach, the government would pay one price for milk produced within a specified quota, and a much lower price for production beyond that quota. In any case, no one is apt to be helped by the pending milk-tax device—not farmers, not consumers and not a government drowning in surpluses.●

EXPORTING CLUSTER BOMBS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation to prohibit the sale, credit sale, or grant transfer of cluster bombs and cluster artillery shells to any country by the United States.

Cluster bombs are basically large canisters filled with submunitions. When a fuse in the nose of the canister detonates, the canister opens, spewing the "bomblets" over a wide area. Some of the bomblets, slightly larger than golf balls, explode on contact with the ground. Some hit the ground and bounce back into the air before exploding. Others may have delayed action fuses, detonating hours or days after deployment, making the area where they lie extremely hazardous to anyone who passes through it.

While most cluster bombs are designed to be used against hardened military positions or lightly armored vehicles, there is nothing to prevent the bombs from being used against personnel or, accidentally, against civilians in a battle area. It doesn't take much imagination to figure out what happens to a human body that gets in the way of a weapon detonating with sufficient force to penetrate light armor.

Cluster bombs are not precision weapons. A recent publication by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) notes, "A cluster bomb * * * can be used only as an area weapon—and even in areas far to the rear of the battle zone where civilians are more likely to be affected. Added to this is the fact that the bomblets of a cluster bomb are in many cases fitted with unrealiable delayed-action fuses and may thus remain a long-term hazard."

I am deeply concerned by our emphasis on weapons sales as a means of promoting U.S. national security interests. I am not sure what benefits U.S. weapons bring to a subsistence farmer in Africa or Latin America. Nor can the massive export of U.S. weapons perpetuate repressive regimes that have lost the support of a majority of their people. It is ironic that Khomeini's Iran has been using U.S.-made tanks and F-4's and F-14's to attack Iraq. These weapons did not keep the Shah in power, and are now being used, in part, to help export the Ayatollah's revolution.

I am not suggesting a wholesale cutoff of U.S. military sales. However, I think the time has come for the United States to stop exporting weapons like cluster bombs, which have such devastating effect on innocent civilians who have the misfortune of being in a battle area. Accordingly, my bill would expressly prohibit the United States from selling, or guaranteeing the sale of cluster bombs and fragmentation artillery shells. The bill would also suspend the delivery of any such weapons which may be "in the pipeline," and would also prohibit the export of any data or information relating to the design or manufacture of cluster bombs or any components of cluster bombs. The sole exception to the prohibition is for components, such as fuses, which are not designed primarily for use in cluster bombs. However, the power of the President to waive the restrictions in specific cases, as provided in existing law, will not be impaired by this bill.

The Washington Post asked in a July 21, 1982 editorial, "if a particular weapon is so liable to misuse, why ship it in the first place?" The cluster bomb invites serious abuses and accidental deployments. It is time for the United States to stand up and say that we will no longer provide these weapons to the armies of the world.●

PROJECT INDEPENDENCE—TO STRENGTHEN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, responsible elected officials at the county, city, and special district levels in this Nation often complain, with considerable justification, that Federal and State governments frequently impose upon them fiscal and discretionary restraints that stifle the efforts of those local governments in dealing effectively with their unique problems.

On February 1, 1983, the board of supervisors of Tulare County, Calif., in the 17th Congressional District approved at the suggestion of Supervisor John R. Conway a resolution dealing with this issue and suggesting strategies on how it can be addressed.

I submit this resolution in its entirety to remind us all of the problems faced by local government.

RESOLUTION NO. 83-116—BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of Support of Project Independence, a Proposal to Strengthen Local Government in California.

Whereas, the conditions and circumstances under which American local government must function today are perilous and difficult; and

Whereas, the issue now is whether the counties and other local agencies of this land, great and small, shall have the means to survive—in the interest of their own people, and in the interest of their states and the nation at large; and

Whereas, American government is today faced with a severe fiscal squeeze that begins at the federal level and proceeds straight to the smallest counties and townships; and

Whereas, the era of unlimited federal aid and government services to address society's ills will inevitably come to an end against the backdrop of ferocious and uncontrollable fiscal pressures of entitlement programs and federal pensions, massive defense buildup, deep tax cuts, and fast-mounting interest charges on the national debt; and

Whereas, the State of California and her local agencies, lacking the financial cushion to fill the gaps left by withdrawn federal aid, must innovate new and resourceful approaches to the problems of everyday life in our neighborhoods, counties and communities; and

Whereas, counties and other local agencies must now step beyond past expectations of local government—as a service caretaker for roads, fire protection, jails, code enforcement—working with business, other governments, and neighborhoods to plan for and safeguard the well-being of our citizens; and

Whereas, if federal and state governments are unable or unwilling to aid their counties and cities with cash, then they must grant us freedom, legal and financial, to plot our own survival unmanacled by their mandates;

Now, therefore, be it resolved,

That the Tulare County Board of Supervisors does hereby declare its support for Project Independence, a proposal to strengthen local government in California, and hereby calls for a fundamental guarantee of the following rights and liberties:

That local governments shall be guaranteed a stable source of revenue along with the flexibility, upon voter approval, to increase or decrease revenues to meet local needs;

That California counties shall have authority, under duly adopted local charters, to manage our administrative and fiscal affairs in the most effective and efficient manner possible, notwithstanding the edicts of state and federal bureaucrats and regulators;

That the Legislature and the Congress shall stop imposing, and start repealing, burdensome spending and program mandates on local governments;

That counties shall aggressively pursue new full-fledged partnerships with business, other governments and neighborhoods to assure that essential services are available to Californians at the least possible cost.

The foregoing was adopted upon motion of Supervisor Conway, seconded by Supervisor Mangine, at an official meeting of the Board of Supervisors held February 1, 1983, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Gould, Conway, Mangine, Swiney, and Webb.

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.●

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is considering a number of changes designed to insure the solvency of the social security system. These are based largely on the recommendations of the National Commission on Social Security Reform. I would like to share my views on how we can best resolve the financial problems of social security with my colleagues.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER ON SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM PROPOSALS

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to have an opportunity to share some of my views with you on how we can best resolve the financial problems of the Social Security program.

The National Commission on Social Security Reform has put together a pragmatic package of recommendations to resolve the Social Security financing problems, recognizing the wide divergence of opinion in Congress and with the Administration on how funding deficiencies should be met. I'm grateful that this package doesn't rely exclusively on benefit cuts as the Reagan Administration proposed in May, 1981. That plan would have reduced Social Security benefits by more than $81 billion from 1981 to 1986 and much more in future years. In light of the Administration's clear preference for benefit cuts as a solution to the problems of Social Security, I feel the Commission members did the best they could to put together a balanced package. There are still glaring inadequacies, however, that should be addressed by the Ways and Means Committee and Congress.

At this point, what we need is a plan to meet the short-term financing problems through the 1980's. From 1990 to 2015, the system should again be in comfortable balance as the lower birth rates of the Depression years will decrease the number of eligible retirees and those born in the "baby boom" after World War II will swell the workforce and pay into the system. What will happen in the long-term is impossible to know. Any structural changes or cuts in benefits in order to deal with a problem that may well not exist would be unwise and premature in my view.

BACKGROUND

It's important to point out that the problems and choices we are facing now are not due to flaws in the basic Social Security system, but are the result of the poor state of the economy over the past several years. The Reform Commission accepted this view when it agreed not to change the fundamental structure or undermine the principles of Social Security. It considered, but rejected, proposals to transform Social Security into a voluntary system, pay benefits exclusively according to an individual's contributions, or tie old age payments to financial need.

In 1977, we enacted substantial increases in the payroll tax, and made adjustments in benefit levels. At that time, we believed these changes would be sufficient to keep the system solvent into the next century. I supported this legislation only because of the urgent need to ensure the viability of the system.

Unfortunately, economic conditions—particularly under this Administration—have been much worse than anyone expected even 5 years ago. Higher than expected unemployment resulted in a drop in payroll tax receipts and in more unemployed older workers who were forced to start collecting Social Security earlier than they might have otherwise. In addition, inflation was much higher than Congress anticipated at the time of the 1977 tax increase. Social Security expenditures have exceeded revenues, producing the deficit and the crisis we presently face. If the economy were healthy, we wouldn't be forced to make the hard choices we're confronted with now.

GENERAL REVENUES

Since the well-being of Social Security is tied so closely to the overall state of the economy, and since benefits are not tied strictly to contributions, I believe it makes sense to fund part of the program with general revenues. These are derived from broad-based sources and the burden wouldn't fall disproportionately on low and middle income workers as the regressive Social Security tax does now. I've pushed this idea for a long time as have many senior citizen groups and others. Even the National Federation of Independent Businessmen recently stated, "The utilization of general revenues in proper proportions is appropriate."

The previous chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee, Rep. James Burke, proposed funding Social Security: One-third from employees, one-third from employers, and one-third from general revenues. I support this plan which was contemplated when the original Social Security Act was enacted in 1935. General revenues could be used in other ways. President Carter proposed a more modest, countercyclical plan: when unemployment is high (over 6 percent) general revenues would replace the "lost" Social Security taxes. Another possibility would be to fund the Medicare and Disability programs from general revenues leaving the Social Security tax for retirement benefits.

The Reform Commission added general revenues in several ways, either directly or by requiring the expenditure of general revenues through an offsetting tax cut. Many have called this a "back door" approach. Why not accept the principal of general revenues for Social Security and make this a permanent feature? This would underscore our intent to ensure that Social Security will be viable well into the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

As with most compromises, there are parts I support, and others I do not. First, I'd like to briefly mention the recommendations that I support.

Social Security was proposed to be removed from the Federal budget. Social Security funds are kept separate from other government funds and cannot be spent for any purpose other than Social Security. Including Social Security in the budget improperly subjects Social Security to pressures to reduce the federal deficit.

The compromise provides for the investment of Social Security trust funds so as to ensure that funds not needed to pay current beneficiaries are earning the best rate possible. This is long overdue. Also, adding two public members to the Social Security Board of Trustees is properly designed to increase public confidence in the integrity of the trust funds.

Social Security is proposed to be credited for uncashed Social Security checks, which presently are charged against the Social Security trust funds. Although not mentioned in the Commission's report, I think we need to look into more aggressive ways to prevent Social Security checks worth millions of dollars from being issued to deceased individuals—either fraudulently or inadvertently.

The bonus for delayed retirement is proposed to be increased. It is far better to provide incentives for workers to delay their retirement and collecting benefits than to reduce benefits for those who choose—or are forced—to retire at 65 or earlier as the Reagan Administration advocates. Increasing these incentives complements our efforts to eliminate mandatory retirement and to encourage individuals to develop additional sources of retirement income.

The Commission properly recommended a few improvements in the Social Security treatment of certain categories of women. This issue really deserves more attention. Our present system is grossly unfair—it was set up when men were largely the breadwinners and women stayed home and were expected to receive benefits as wives or widows. As a result, the work effort of most married women is discouraged by providing essentially no additional benefits in return for their taxes. Some improvements were recommended by the Commission but I hope this whole issue will receive careful attention as soon as possible.

Five proposals of the package need additional work before they are acceptable to me.

1. Taxing social security benefits

The Commission has recommended that one-half of Social Security benefits be considered as taxable income for federal income tax purposes for taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes exceeding $20,000 for single persons or $25,000 for married couples. This tax revenue would be credited to the Social Security trust funds. According to the Commission, about 10% of the Social Security recipients—those more able to pay—would be required to pay higher taxes as a result of this change.

I've never supported taxing Social Security benefits. In 1980, I introduced a sense of the Congress resolution providing that Social Security benefits would not be taxed; this resolution was enacted by a wide margin. In addition, this provision unfairly penalizes those who saved to supplement their Social Security—we certainly don't want to discourage this saving. Finally, if it is to be, the change is not phased in slowly as any change should be.

At this point, however, it seems clear that some taxing mechanism will be included in the final plan. The one recommended by the Commission seriously discriminates against married people. Therefore, I hope that this Committee will consider a different threshold; $20,000 for an individual and only $25,000 for a couple isn't fair and is destructive to marriages.

2. Participation of nonprofits and State and local government workers

The Commission has recommended requiring participation of employees of all non-profit organizations and prohibiting further state and local government withdrawals from Social Security. I'd go farther than this. Social Security is a program with a national purpose and should be all-inclusive. Some say there may be some Constitutional problems involved with bringing in presently exempt state and local government workers, but I think this is without substance.

3. Raising the self-employment tax

The Commission recommends raising the Social Security tax rates paid by self-employed persons to 100 percent of the combined employer-employee rate, but permitting them to deduct for income tax purposes one-half of the taxes they pay. This is regressive. The burden of the increased tax falls most heavily on low-income self-employed. The percentage of increase in Social Security tax would be uniform across all income groups, but tax deductions would be worth more to higher-income individuals. Tax deductions always favor high-income groups. I would prefer to make this a tax credit or find another way to resolve this clear inequity.

4. Accelerating the payroll tax increases

I'm concerned that increasing the regressive payroll tax will have an adverse impact on the low and middle-income workers and further damage the economy. These increases could be a real disincentive for hiring additional people, which in turn affects both Social Security and general revenue collections. Substituting general revenues would be much more equitable, as I earlier indicated, and I am pleased that this has been at least partially effected by the tax credit for further increases in employee taxes.

5. Bringing new Federal employees into social security

The Commission recommended extending Social Security coverage to all newly-hired federal employees as of January 1, 1984, and the establishment of a separate supplemental plan similar to plans in private industry for those workers on top of Social Security. This seems to be the most controversial part of the whole package.

First, let me say, that I support universal Social Security coverage, but only if it is done in such a way as not to prejudice federal employee benefits. Social Security represents this nation's basic commitment to its elderly—everyone should participate. I'd like all workers to be covered. Because 80% of federal workers are eligible for Social Security when they reach 65, by reason of non-federal employment, I believe it makes sense to provide for Social Security coverage of the remaining 20%.

I cannot support coverage of federal employees, however, unless absolute assurances are provided:

1. that all pension rights of current civil service workers are protected at no additional cost to these workers; and

2. a supplemental plan is simultaneously adopted which provides new federal employees with retirement benefits comparable to that of other public employees and those in the private sector. It's not fair to expect workers to accept a plan the details of which have not been disclosed, particularly in light of this Administration's callous attitude toward Federal workers.

The new supplemental plan should be designed so that when combined with Social Security it will supply as good protection as the present civil service system does alone. Good pension benefits are one of the most important incentives for joining the federal government; we need this to continue to attact qualified people to federal service.

Representative Pepper has suggested postponing the implementation of this provision for a year (until January 1, 1985) in order to give Congress time to work out this supplemental pension plan. I would support this if more time is needed in order to meet the conditions I've set out above.

It was a stupid omission to exclude Members of Congress from Social Security from the outset and the Commission should have so provided. Congress should rectify this inequity as part of this package.

COLA DELAY IS UNACCEPTABLE

I strongly object to the six months delay in providing the cost of living adjustment (COLA) which will cost the average recipient $120 in 1983. While a one-time delay is preferable to even more serious permanent benefit cuts, I feel the Ways and Means Committee should look for other ways to save this money.

For many the COLA is money they can ill afford to lose. A study done in 1982 by Data Resources Inc. found that the COLA cut proposed last year would have thrown an additional 1.2 million elderly into poverty by 1985 and 2.1 million by 1990. This cut will be especially devastating in conjunction with the cuts already enacted in Medicare, food stamps, low-income energy assistance, housing assistance and other federal programs to help the poor.

Finally, I'd like to add that I'm extremely disturbed that the proposed delay in the Social Security COLA is being used to justify similar delays in other retirement benefits and in the food stamp benefit adjustment. A recent New York Times editorial stated, "How many Americans—who pay 50¢ for a diet soda at a lunch counter—could manage on an average benefit that comes out to about 45¢ for a whole meal?" Not many. This delay would be unconscionable.

In conclusion, I hope this Committee will consider the points I've raised. While it is essential to ensure that the Social Security fund is adequately financed to ensure payment of benefits, the Commission's recommendations propose some very inequitable measure which the Committee and Congress should address.●

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to you and our colleagues the following editorial on the need for campaign finance reform, written by Mark Shields, the Washington Post, February 25, 1983.

As a long time proponent of campaign finance reform, I believe that we must move speedily on this issue, before the public's confidence in this institution is completely destroyed by the events Mr. Shields very correctly warns cannot be far off.

THE COMING CAMPAIGN SCANDAL

An unconditional prediction: a new federal campaign finance law—one that imposes severe limits on all political action committees and provides for some form of public financing of congressional elections—will be enacted within the next 24 months. While a majority in Congress and the president now almost surely oppose any such law, their resistance will be overwhelmed by future public events. A major political money scandal will be uncovered that will guarantee passage of the laws.

All congresses respond to crisis. The criminal excesses of Watergate, particularly in the illegal raising and spending of campaign funds, probably made full disclosure and public funding of presidential campaigns inevitable. We and Congress will learn, sooner rather than later, of another (probably more than one) major political money scandal. Once again, promising careers will be ruined, prison sentences will be handed out and Congress will pass and the president will sign a tough new campaign finance law.

Able and committed politicians in both parties see the problem clearly. Bob Teeter, the Republican pollster whose 1976 strategy brought President Ford from a deficit of 16 million votes to within an eyelash of victory in 11 weeks, is worried by the rivers of campaign money now drowning American politics: "It's just like 1972," he says. "There's too much money around not to have a scandal." Missouri Democratic Sen. Tom Eagleton, who has been winning statewide races since 1960, argues that contemporary political fund-raising is "a national scandal" that "is taking place every day." New York Rep. Barber Conable, the ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, sees the ever-growing public perception of scandal in present fund-raising practices as producing more pressure for public financing of elections. Conable, who refuses campaign contributions of more than $50, compares the existing system of candidates' dunning all who represent interests before the House for contributions to his days in private law practice, when judges running for reelection raised their compaign budgets by "putting the arm on all of us lawyers who appeared before their court."

Public financing will not be entirely unwelcome. Most candidates would, if given the alternative, choose root canal work over asking anyone for money. Most of the current resistance to public financing comes from the Republicans, many of whom, after telling us there is no connection between contributions and a congressman's vote, then remind us that "there is no free lunch," that every program has a price tag. Apparently altruism only applies to contributions by political action committees. But it will probably make little difference what anyone argues, because a major scandal will end the debate and move the previous question.●

RULES OF PROCEDURE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY ON PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to our colleagues attention the new Rules of Procedure and Statement of Policy on private immigration bills which were adopted by the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law. These rules and policy will guide the subcommittee in scheduling private

bills as well as making determinations on their merit.

I insert into the RECORD, at this point, a letter describing the rules sent jointly by the subcommittee's able ranking member and myself to our colleagues and the rules themselves.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1983.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On February 9, 1983, the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law unanimously adopted its Rules of Procedure governing consideration of private immigration bills. These Rules were ratified by the full Judiciary Committee on February 15, 1983.

At its February 9 meeting, the Subcommittee also adopted a Statement of Policy and Procedures setting forth general precedents and procedures for the handling of Subcommittee business—particularly the category of business called "private immigration bills."

The Subcommittee would like to take this opportunity to acquaint you with the Rules and Policy which will govern Subcommittee consideration of private bills in the Ninety-eighth Congress. The Rules and Statement are enclosed.

I. NATURE OF THE PRIVATE BILL

A private immigration bill is an effort to provide extraordinary relief to an alien—one who is not a U.S. citizen or permanent resident. The private immigration bill seeks to legislate an exception to the general immigration laws of the United States.

The Subcommittee examines each private bill carefully to determine whether there is sufficient equity to make an exception to the law. Often hearings are held to develop the facts further.

Introduction of a private immigration bill does not alone, under House procedures, stay the deportation of any alien. Stays are possible but only after the case has been examined and action taken by the Subcommittee at a regular meeting. No action to intervene in a pending deportation will be taken by the Chairman of the Subcommittee prior to a Subcommittee hearing.

II. RULES OF PROCEDURE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Subcommittee Rules and Statement of Policy guide the consideration and processing of private bills. We urge you to review these materials. They will help you and your staff handle the inevitable requests and inquiries which will come during the Ninety-eighth Congress.

The Subcommittee rarely takes any legislative action on a private bill where an administrative remedy under the existing Immigration and Nationality Act is available and has not been pursued to exhaustion.

And, while the Subcommittee is not bound by precedent—its action in earlier Congresses—it rarely deviates from precedent when handling private immigration bills.

A private bill commences with a letter from the Member to the Chairman of the Subcommittee outlining the facts of the case. The Subcommittee recommends that you and your staff develop the facts fully before offering the private bill. Our experience is that a fully documented file serves the best interests of the beneficiary, but it also protects the Members from embarrassment in the event the beneficiary has omitted certain salient facts in the initial review.

We offer the assistance of our able Subcommittee staff in providing you and your office people advice on all aspects of your immigration casework. Call us at 5-5727 at your pleasure. Sometimes a call saves a lot of extra—and futile—work in your shop.

We appreciate your taking the time to review the Subcommittee's Rules and Statement of Policy.

Sincerely,

ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law.

DANIEL E. LUNGREN,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law.

Enclosure.

RULES OF PROCEDURE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. The introduction of a private bill does not stay the deportation of aliens illegally in the United States or who have overstayed the terms of their visa. The Committee shall not intervene in any such deportation proceedings and it will not address any communications to the Attorney General to request stays of deportation on behalf of beneficiaries of private bills, except as indicated in Rule 4.

2. No bill shall be scheduled until all administrative remedies are exhausted, including suspension of deportation, asylum, and labor certification.

3. The Subcommittee shall not take any further action on legislation which has been tabled by the full Committee.

4. The Subcommittee shall entertain consideration of a request for a departmental report upon receipt of a letter from the author of the bill. In the case of beneficiaries who are in the United States, a determination on the request shall be subject to debate at a formal meeting of the Subcommittee and only those cases designed to prevent extreme hardship to the beneficiary or a U.S. citizen will merit a request for a report. The Immigration and Naturalization Service may honor a request for a report by staying deportation until final action is taken on the legislation.

5. A quorum of the Subcommittee shall consist of two Members for the purpose of holding hearings on private bills.

6. Testimony at private bill hearings shall not be received from any person other than the author of the private bill. All requests to testify shall be addressed in writing to the Chairman of the Subcommittee.

7. No private bill shall be considered where court proceedings are pending.

8. Action on legislation shall not be deferred on more than one occasion due to nonappearance of the author.

9. The Subcommittee shall await receipt of departmental reports before taking final action on any legislation.

10. All requests for consideration of a private bill shall commence with a letter directed to the Chairman of the Subcommittee outlining relevant facts of the case and attaching thereto all pertinent data. The following shall be submitted in triplicate:

(a) Date and place of birth of all beneficiaries. Address and telephone number in the United States.

(b) Dates of all entries (legal and illegal) and departures from the United States and type of visas for admission. Consulate where the beneficiary obtained a visa for entry to the U.S.; or where the beneficiary shall seek a visa.

(c) Status of any proceedings with the INS and whether any nonimmigrant or immigrant petitions have been filed on the beneficiary's behalf.

(d) Name, address, and telephone number of intersted parties in the U.S.

(e) Names, address, dates and places of birth of all close relatives in the U.S. and abroad.

(f) Occupations, recent employment record and salary of beneficiaries.

(g) Copies of all communications to and from INS or the State Department.

The information above represents the minimum requirements for Subcommittee consideration. Pertinent data about the case and an explanation of the extreme hardship to the beneficiary or U.S. citizen must also accompany a request for processing of the private bill.

11. Requests for consideration of a bill shall be accompanied by a statement by the beneficiary that he or she desires the relief sought by the bill and waiving the Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act.

12. A notice of meeting date shall be sent to the authors of all legislation which is scheduled.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

On February 9, 1983 the Subcommittee adopted as an addendum to its Rules of Procedure a Statement of Policy on private immigration bills which is set forth below.

The Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law has jurisdiction over all aspects of immigration law. In considering private immigration bills, the Subcommittee reviews cases which are of such an extraordinary nature that an exception to the law is needed. In fairness to those immigrants who are awaiting legal immigration, it is the policy of the Subcommittee generally to act favorably on only those private bills which meet certain precedents.

This policy statement will set forth the types of legislation which fall within the general parameters of favorable action and the criteria for reviewing certain categories of bills.

A. ADOPTION

Existing law provides for the immigration of foreign born adopted children if the adoption takes place while the child is under the age of 16 and (1) the child is an "orphan" as defined by immigration law or (2) the child has resided with the adoptive parents two years. Those cases where the Subcommittee has favorable precedents are when the child is of a young age and there has been a long-standing parent-child relationship. In support of any private bill relating to adoption, the following must accompany the request for Subcommittee action:

(1) Home-study on the home of the prospective parents.

(2) Evidence of support of child—cancelled checks, letters, clothing.

(3) Statement detailing ages and occupation of natural parents and brothers and sisters.

(4) Communications with the Immigration and Naturalization Service regarding applicable U.S. adoption laws.

B. DOCTORS AND NURSES

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides for the admission of foreign medical graduates if the doctor or nurse has passed certain exams required prior to seeking immigration. A doctor must pass the Visa Qualifying Exam which is given extensively throughout the world and a nurse must pass the Commission on Graduate Foreign Nurses Exam.

Any alien seeking immigration must also have a job offer certified by the Department of Labor indicating there will be no displacement of U.S. labor.

In the past several years, the Subcommittee has experienced a deluge of bills introduced on behalf of foreign medical graduates. The legislative history relating to this group indicates many doctors enter the United States as non-immigrants with the clear intention of remaining permanently. Legislation enacted in 1976 and 1977 sought to tighten the law requiring the return of such doctors to their home country; and recent legislation in 1981 generously grandfathered certain doctors for admission as permanent residence because of their length of time in the U.S. It is the Subcommittee's opinion the 1981 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act was the final chapter in a long and arduous struggle to provide equity to certain foreign medical graduates.

The Subcommittee is also dismayed to find that doctors who are beneficiaries of private laws often swiftly seek more lucrative employment upon gaining permanent residence, thereby leaving medically underserved areas without any medical assistance. Because of these experiences, the Subcommittee intends to look with very little favor on doctor bills. Further, if a bill on behalf of a doctor or nurse is pursued, the following is required before scheduling will occur:

(1) Passage of the Visa Qualifying Exam for doctors, and the Commission on Graduate Foreign Nurses Exam for nurses.

(2) Residence by the doctor or the nurse in a health manpower shortage area, or a recommendation by a U.S. Government Agency indicating the doctor or nurse's services are needed. It is the Subcommittee's desire that the beneficiary show substantial community ties over a long period of time. Extensive periods of residence would give the Subcommittee some assurance there is every likelihood the doctor or nurse would maintain residence in the area and provide medical services.

(3) Waiver of the two-year foreign residence requirement (this applies to all exchange visitors).

Legislation approved by the Subcommittee on behalf of doctors shall provide for suspension of deportation during an interim period while a doctor is serving in a community and permit adjustment of status to permanent residence upon completion of the designated time period.

C. DRUGS AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

The Subcommittee has few precedents for waiving grounds of exclusion relating to criminal activity. In the event such a bill is pursued, the following documents where available will be required:

(1) Complete transcript of court proceedings relating to the conviction.

(2) All other records relating to offenses, including state, and local police records.

(3) Waiver and Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act by the beneficiary.

(4) An affidavit (notarized) from the beneficiary describing his criminal record in full.

It is the intent of the Subcommittee that all available information be submitted to the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee will conduct its own investigation with appropriate government agencies.

It is also the Subcommittee's desire to review testimony and affidavits relating to the beneficiary's behavoir after any criminal offense. Such information is helpful in making a determination as to whether legislation will serve the best interests of the community. In this regard, letters of reference, bank records, and employment records are particularly helpful.

D. MEDICAL CASES

The Subcommittee shall be reluctant to schedule bills on behalf of persons who enter the United States on nonimmigrant visas or who are paroled for the purpose of seeking medical treatment. This type of visa is available to accommodate persons seeking advanced medical treatment which may be available only in the United States.

Many cases have come to the attention of the Subcommittee where the medical visa is used to enter the U.S., and shortly thereafter, the person seeks permanent immigration. This type of activity undermines the intent of the medical visa; and flagrant abuses may seriously jeopardize its availability for those whose only recource is treatment in the United States.

The Subcommittee's reluctance to schedule such bills is based on the premise that persons may seek all available medical assistance while in the United States, but upon completion of any medical treatment the purpose of the visa expires and the alien must return home.

E. DEFERRED ACTION CASES

The Subcommittee shall be reluctant to schedule any bills on behalf of aliens who are in "deferred" status. It is the Subcommittee's understanding that the Immigration and Naturalization Service reserves the conferral of such status to cases of a particularly compelling nature. In view of INS action in this regard, the Subcommittee does not see any need for legislative action.

F. INVESTORS

Recent public legislation enacted on behalf of investors provided relief for persons who were able to establish their qualification for a nonpreference visa prior to June 1978.

The Subcommittee has studied the many cases relating to investors and has found many beneficiaries did not sufficiently acquaint themselves with the law prior to making an investment and operated under illusions with respect to qualifying for immigration.

It is the Subcommittee' opinion that most investors who entered the United States after the June 1978 date were aware that immigrant visas would not be available in the forseeable future, and there are no precedents for enactment of a private law solely based on a person's investment in the United States.

In the event a Member wishes to pursue this type of bill, the following is required: tax records, contracts, bank statements, and other pertinent information relating to the investment.

G. WAIVER OF EXCLUSIONS

1. Health—

All bills waiving the grounds of exclusion for mental or physical infirmities will require the posting of a bond. The Subcommittees notes there are few precedents for cases in this category. In order to obtain the best possible information, the Subcommittee will require all medical records as well as information from the state and/or federal government concerning possible public charge aspects of the case.

2. Draft Dodgers—

There are few precedents for favorable action on behalf of draft dodgers, and it shall be the Subcommittee's policy to continue to view such bills unsympathetically.

3. Fraud—

The Subcommittee has been extremely reluctant to act favorably on cases involving visa fraud, and it shall be the policy of the Subcommittee to adhere closely to precedents in this category.

H. NATURALIZATION

The Subcommittee shall require any bill relating to expediting naturalization be accompanied by evidence indicating such action would be in the national interest, as opposed to personal gain. There are few precedents for favorable action on bills waiving any naturalization requirements or granting posthumous or honorary citizenship. It is the Subcommittee's intent generally to view unfavorably legislation in this area and notes more appropriate mechanisms for rewarding individuals may be in the form of honoraria, medals, awards, statues, etc. The Subcommittee also notes there are few instances of favorable action on behalf of individuals who renounce U.S. citizenship, and the policy of the Subcommittee shall be to adhere to precedents in this category.

I. BILLS TABLED IN A PREVIOUS CONGRESS

Commenting on requests for reconsideration of legislation, Thomas Jefferson noted the right of reconsideration is not "a right to waste the time of the House in repeated agitations of the same question, so that it shall never know when a question is done with * * *"

The Subcommittee has been confronted with an increasing number of requests for reconsideration of private bills which have been tabled by the full Committee in previous Congresses. It has been the experience of the Subcommittee that each bill is given sufficient review during the meetings of the Subcommittee and the authors are afforded ample time to present the merits of the case. Repetitious consideration of these cases operates to the detriment of other private bills which are pending and reflects poorly on the integrity of the private bill process. For these reasons, the Subcommittee will be reluctant to reverse or reconsider its prior action absent new evidence or information that was not available or could not have been obtained by the author at the time of actual consideration by the Subcommittee.

PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING PRIVATE BILLS

Processing of private immigration bills is guided by the Subcommittee Rules of Procedure. Upon request for consideration of a private bill, the Subcommittee shall determine whether departmental reports will be requested.

The request for a report shall be addressed to the Attorney General and the Secretary of State by the Committee, at the request of the Subcommittee. In the event the person is in the United States, Rule 4 of the Subcommittee Rules of Procedure applies. That Rule states in part: ". . . the request shall be subject to debate at a formal meeting of the Subcommittee and only those cases designed to prevent extreme hardship to the beneficiary or a U.S. citizen will merit a request for a report."

If the Subcommittee has requested a report on behalf of a person in the United States, the Immigration and Naturalization Service may honor the request for a report by staying deportation until the reports are received and the full Committee acts on the bill. When a bill is adversely reported to the full Committee, and the Committee tables the bill, a stay of deportation expires. In cases where legislation is favorably reported to the full Committee, the stay of deportation is in effect until the bill completes the legislative process.

The author is notified at such time as a report from the Executive Branch is requested and copies of the reports are forwarded to the author upon receipt.

When a bill is ready for consideration by the Subcommittee, the appropriate documentation is reviewed and an agenda prepared for a meeting of the Subcommittee.

The authors of the legislation and the Subcommittee Members are notified of the date of a hearing on private immigration bills. If adverse action is taken by the Subcommittee at the first hearing on the legislation, the author is given two weeks to submit additional material which may have a bearing on the case; or if the author requests an opportunity to be heard on the legislation, such a request shall be in writing to the Chairman of the Subcommittee within two weeks of Subcommittee notice.

Adversely acted upon legislation shall be forwarded to the full Committee within two weeks, unless the author has addressed a communication to the Chairman of the Subcommittee.

In the case of final action where a bill was adversely acted upon on two occasions, the legislation shall be ordered reported directly to the Committee with an adverse recommendation. Any bill tabled by the full Judiciary Committee shall not be scheduled again by the Subcommittee.

When favorable action is taken, the bill is ordered reported favorably to the full Committee. The author is requested to submit a statement for inclusion in the Committee report to the House on his bill as soon as the legislation is reported from the full Committee.●

PUBLIC CITIZEN RAISES RED HERRING

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, while accusing opponents of interest and dividend withholding of engaging in gross distortions and shameless preying upon the fears of the elderly, Public Citizen's Congress Watch has reduced the level of debate on this issue to a new low by issuing a statistically indefensible study of bank support for opponents of withholding. Public Citizen has engaged in the same type of gross distortions which it accuses its opponents of making.

The Public Citizen study fails even the most rudimentary rules of scientific analysis by failing to include any type of a control group. While listing bank support for opponents of withholding, the study does not include any data on bank support for supporters of withholding. Had such data been included it would undoubtedly have shown little or no statistically significant relationship between a Representative's or Senator's position on interest and dividend withholding and support from banking groups.

While the study shows, for example, that the average House opponent of withholding received $2,438 in the last election, it fails to note that the most prominent House supporter of withholding received over four times that amount—$11,000—even though that Representative had an easy election race and won with over 83 percent of the vote. Similarly, while the average Senate opponent of withholding received $7,881 the study fails to note that the most prominent Senate supporter of withholding received even more—$9,000—and won with 64 percent of the vote. It is clear that there is no direct relationship between bank support and a Representative's or Senator's position on the withholding issue.

Public Citizen is unwilling to recognize the fact that it is on the wrong side of a genuine, grassroots consumer issue. In its desperation to rationalize its position on this issue Public Citizen has issued a disingenuous and indefensible study which would fail Statistics 101. Public Citizen does little to contribute to the public debate on this issue by raising a point which is in reality a red herring.●

TRANSIT AMENDMENT TO EMERGENCY JOBS BILL

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I testified before the Rules Committee today to request that the rule on the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1983 permit me to offer an amendment to restore mass transit funding to the levels proposed in the bipartisan jobs package agreed to by the House leadership and the administration.

The text of my statement before the Rules Committee follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES J. HOWARD, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, MARCH 2, 1983

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate having the opportunity to appear before you today.

When the House considers the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1983, it is my intent to offer an amendment to the provision in the bill which provides additional funding for mass transportation. My purpose in testifying here today is to respectfully request that the rule on the bill make it in order for me to offer my amendment, and that it waive all points of order against such amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me start by directing your attention to the provision which appears on page 7, line 20, of the committee print of the bill. This provision provides an additional $110 million for mass transportation for fiscal year 1983.

Of the $110 million, $44 million is for interstate transfer projects. The committee report earmarks these funds for the following areas:

	Millions
Boston	$20.0
Northeast Illinois	10.0
Oregon	1.9
Sacramento	8.0
Twin Cities, Minn	4.1
Total	44.0

The remaining $66 million is for urban discretionary grants. The committee report earmarks these funds for the following areas:

	Millions
Dade County, Fla	$33.8
Hartford, Conn	6.0
Long Island, N.Y	15.0
Philadelphia, Pa	7.2
Detroit, Mich	3.5
Hillsdale, Mich	.5
Total	66.0

I have two major problems with this provision.

First, the entire $110 million is earmarked for specific projects. The Secretary of Transportation would not have any discretion with respect to any of the funds, even though other projects might be more worthy or might create more jobs. Only eleven localities in the United States would benefit from this provision.

And second, the $110 million provided in this appropriation bill is far less than the $400 million which was included in the bipartisan jobs proposal supported by the President and the Democratic leadership. Mr. Chairman, as you know, this administration has not been a strong supporter of the mass transit program, and I certainly can find no justification for reducing the level of funding it has proposed.

I, therefore, intend to offer an amendment to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act which would restore the $400 million in transit funding along the lines in the bipartisan proposal.

My amendment, a copy of which is attached, is a substitute for the provision in the appropriations bill. It is quite simple and would do two things.

First, it would provide an additional $171 million for section 3 capital grants. These grants would be available at the discretion of the Secretary for capital improvements to mass transit systems.

I do not intend to earmark any of these funds. All $171 million would be available at the discretion of the Secretary. All communities would be eligible to apply for a grant. I might note, however, that the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 requires the Secretary of Transportation to emphasize projects that are labor intensive and that can begin construction or manufacturing within the shortest possible time. This is certainly consistent with our effort to create jobs.

The second part of my amendment would have the effect of disapproving the President's deferral of $229 million in mass transit capital funding.

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 provided contract authority of $779 million for fiscal year 1983 to be funded from the newly established mass transit account of the highway trust fund. This funding was to be distributed to both urban and nonurban areas in accordance with a new block grant formula and was to be available for capital expenditures only.

Mr. Chairman, less than 1 month after the President signed this historic piece of legislation, the administration took action to defer $229 million or nearly one-third of the authorized funds.

Frankly, this came as a shock to many of us who fought so hard to provide a reasonable and stable base of support for public transportation.

I think it is safe to say that we are still numbed by the speed and the extent to which the administration has abandoned the basic commitments to public transportation contained in the new act—a bill they fought doggedly to see passed, a bill the President signed into law with great fanfare, and a bill whose key provisions they now propose to disregard only 1 month after enactment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would see to it that the full $779 million in authorized gas tax funds would be made available as soon as possible. Not to do so will:

Frustrate our ability to step up vital capital improvements;

Restrain productivity;

Perpetuate the past pattern of deferred investment in basic facilities; and

Greatly reduce the job-creating potential of this new source of funds.

These funds will be made available to both urban and nonurban areas. Attached to my statement is a copy of the Federal Register notice making the initial apportionments for fiscal year 1983. If my amendment is adopted, each State or locality will receive an additional amount equal to roughly one-half of what it received under the initial apportionment.

If you look at the first page of the attachment, you will see, for example, that Tucson, Ariz., would receive one-half of its initial apportionment of $1,248,000. This would roughly amount to an additional $624,000. Likewise, the State of Arizona would receive about $67,000, or one-half of its initial apportionment of $134,000, for the nonurbanized portions of the State.

The total price tag on my amendment is $400 million, the same amount envisioned in the bipartisan jobs proposal. But this needs some explanation. Only $171 million of the $400 million is actually new budget authority. The remaining $229 million has already been provided in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 and, thus, would not be new budget authority. But, I repeat, to make this $229 million available will require disapproval of the President's deferral.

As I mentioned previously, my amendment is a substitute for the provision in the appropriations bill. Thus, the $171 million in new budget authority in my amendment is only $61 million more than the $110 million in the appropriations bill.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I request that you make my amendment in order under the rule on the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act and that all points of order against my amendment be waived.

Unlike the provision in the appropriations bill, my amendment does not earmark the funds for 10 or 11 cities.

Instead, $229 million—or more than half the money—would be distributed among all States and urbanized areas. You can tell roughly how much any area would receive by looking at the attachment and multiplying the amount it received under the initial apportionment by one-half.

In addition, the remaining $171 million would be available at the discretion of the Secretary. All areas of the country would be eligible to apply for these funds.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I am available for any questions which you might have.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE PRINT DATED FEBRUARY 25, 1983, OFFERED BY MR. HOWARD

Page 7, strike out line 20 and all that follows through line 2 on page 8 (relating to mass transportation) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TO SPEED UP IMPROVEMENT OF MASS TRANSPORTATION

To accelerate the construction, modernization and improvement of urban mass transportation systems, to increase the mobility of the urban work force which will result in productive jobs, an additional amount of $171,000,000, to remain available until expended, for "Urban discretionary grants", to be obligated at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation in accordance with section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

The Congress disapproves the proposed deferral of budget authority in the amount of $229,000,000 for the Mass Transportation Capital Fund (deferral numbered D83-59), as set forth in the President's special message which was transmitted to the Congress on February 1, 1983. This disapproval shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

FISCAL YEAR 1983 PRELIMINARY APPORTIONMENT OF THE FUND MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AS PROVIDED UNDER THE FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1982

[Total funds apportioned are 65 percent of the fiscal year 1983 level; in thousands of dollars]

State/urbanized area	Proposed obligation level
Alabama:	
Birmingham	1,152
Mobile	457
Montgomery	318
Huntsville	213
Tuscaloosa	156
Anniston	104
Gadsden	96
Florence	102
Decatur	76
Dothan	66
Auburn	64
Nonurbanized	354
State total	3,158
Arizona:	
Phoenix	2,203
Tucson	1,248
Yuma	104
Nonurbanized	134
State total	3,689
Arkansas:	
Little Rock-North Little Rock	536
Fort Smith, Ark.-Okla	128
Pine Bluff	115
Fayetteville, Springdale	84
Nonurbanized	286
State total	1,149
California:	
Los Angeles-Long Beach	29,184
San Francisco-Oakland	20,505
San Diego	4,830
San Jose	4,202
Sacramento	2,094
Riverside-San Bernardino	1,450
Oxnard-Ventura-Thousand Oaks	647
Fresno	1,069
Bakersfield	489
Stockton	454
Modesto	380
Santa Barbara	351
Santa Rosa	278
Santa Cruz	199

FISCAL YEAR 1983 PRELIMINARY APPORTIONMENT OF THE FUND MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AS PROVIDED UNDER THE FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1982—Continued

[Total funds apportioned are 65 percent of the fiscal year 1983 level; in thousands of dollars]

State/urbanized area	Proposed obligation level
Seaside-Monterey	257
Antioch	201
Salinas	246
Simi Valley	175
Fairfield	127
Palm Springs	90
Yuba City	118
Napa	133
Visalia	112
Santa Maria	113
Lancaster	81
Hemet	97
Redding	74
Chico	92
Nonurbanized	648
State total	68,696
Colorado:	
Denver	3,754
Colorado Springs	559
Pueblo	214
Boulder	195
Fort Collins	146
Greeley	141
Grand Junction	94
Nonurbanized	145
State total	5,248
Connecticut:	
Connecticut Rail	2,486
Hartford	1,561
Bridgeport	819
New Haven	965
Stamford	348
Waterbury	301
New London-Norwich	227
New Britain	276
Norwalk	201
Danbury	140
Bristol	137
Meriden	111
Nonurbanized	132
State total	7,704
Delaware:	
Wilmington, Del.-N.J.	933
Nonurbanized	38
State total	971
Florida:	
Miami	4,685
Fort Lauderdale	1,909
St. Petersburg	1,628
Jacksonville	1,448
Orlando	889
Tampa	1,029
West Palm Beach	1,031
Sarasota-Bradenton	469
Pensacola	337
Melbourne-Cocoa	209
Daytona Beach	273
Fort Myers	216
Tallahassee	196
Lakeland	176
Gainesville	183
Fort Walton Beach	128
Panama City	117
Winter Haven	114
Fort Pierce	102
Naples	73
Ocala	73
Nonurbanized	386
State total	15,671
Georgia:	
Atlanta	5,177
Augusta	375
Columbus	476
Savannah	285
Macon	237
Albany	133
Athens	98
Warner Robins	93
Rome	74
Nonurbanized	476
State total	7,424

FISCAL YEAR 1983 PRELIMINARY APPORTIONMENT OF THE FUND MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AS PROVIDED UNDER THE FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1982—Continued

[Total funds apportioned are 65 percent of the fiscal year 1983 level; in thousands of dollars]

State/urbanized area	Proposed obligation level
Idaho:	
Boise City	247
Pocatello	96
Nonurbanized	126
State total	469
Illinois:	
Chicago, Ill-Northwestern, Ind	40,926
Davenport-Rock Island-Mobile	583
Peoria	529
Rockford	437
Joliet	322
Aurora-Elgin	301
Springfield	248
Champaign-Urbana	280
Decatur	202
Elgin	224
Alton	149
Bloomington-Normal	197
Round Lake Beach	104
Kankakee	131
Danville	97
Nonurbanized	542
State total	45,272
Indiana:	
Indianapolis	1,723
Fort Wayne	619
South Bend, Ind.-Mich	493
Evansville	365
Muncie	184
Lafayette-West Lafayette	204
Elkhart-Goshen	143
Anderson	127
Terre Haute	138
Bloomington	143
Kokamo	132
Nonurbanized	480
State total	4,751
Iowa:	
Des Moines	605
Cedar Rapids	244
Waterloo	172
Sioux City, Ind	151
Dubuque, Iowa-Nebr.-Ill	134
Iowa City	103
Nonurbanized	329
State total	1,738
Kansas:	
Wichita	651
Topeka	223
Lawrence	108
Nonurbanized	251
State total	1,233
Kentucky:	
Louisville, Ky.-Ind	2,073
Lexington	385
Owensboro	139
Nonurbanized	404
State total	3,001
Louisiana:	
New Orleans	3,479
Baton Rouge	552
Shreveport	571
Lake Charles	189
Lafayette	219
Monroe	178
Alexandria	147
Houma	96
Nonurbanized	333
State total	5,764
Maine:	
Portland	174
Lewiston-Auburn	90
Bangor	76
Nonurbanized	146
State total	486
Maryland:	
Baltimore	5,877
Hagerstown	111
Annapolis	114
Cumberland	95
Nonurbanized	179
State total	6,376
Massachusetts:	
Boston	15,419
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass.-Conn	1,203
Worcester	601
Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass-N.H	327
Brockton	373
Lowell	318
Fall River, Mass-R.I	321
New Bedford	317
Fitchburg-Leominster	109
Pittsfield	83
Taunton	67
Nonurbanized	215
State total	19,353
Michigan:	
Detroit	9,983
Grand Rapids	418
Flint	653
Lansing	331
Ann Arbor	491
Kalamazoo	272
Saginaw	310
Muskegon-Muskegon Heights	178
Jackson	149
Battle Creek	126
Bay City	145
Benton Harbor	105
Port Huron	108
Nonurbanized	579
State total	13,848
Minnesota:	
Minneapolis-St. Paul	4,433
Duluth-Superior, Minn.-Wis	177
Rochester	129
St. Cloud	114
Nonurbanized	336
State total	5,189
Mississippi:	
Jackson	368
Biloxi-Gulfport	271
Pascagoula-Moss Point	94
Hattiesburg	83
Nonurbanized	321
State total	1,137
Missouri:	
St. Louis, Mo.-Il	4,709
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans	2,108
Springfield	243
St. Joseph, Mo.-Kans	131
Columbia	101
Joplin	79
Nonurbanized	382
State total	7,753
Montana:	
Billings	158
Great Falls	139
Missoula	104
Nonurbanized	96
State total	497
Nebraska:	
Omaha, Nebr.-Iowa	1,440
Lincoln	359
Nonurbanized	156
State total	1,955
Nevada:	
Las Vegas	488
Reno	302
Nonurbanized	34
State total	824
New Hampshire:	
Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester	131
Manchester	201
Nashua	138
Nonurbanized	104
State total	574
New Jersey:	
Trenton, N.J.-Pa	1,485
Atlantic City	248
Vineland-Millville	106
Nonurbanized	178
State total	2,017
New Mexico:	
Albuquerque	931
Las Cruces	92
Santa Fe	80
Nonurbanized	129
State total	1,232
New York:	
New York, N.Y.-NE-NU	116,739
Buffalo	2,436
Rochester	1,698
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	1,395
Syracuse	1,172
Binghamton	318
Utica	267
Poughkeepsie	223
Elmira	138
Newburgh	101
Glens Fall	81
Nonurbanized	626
State total	125,194
North Carolina:	
Charlotte	886
Fayetteville	335
Raleigh	427
Winston-Salem	270
Greensboro	322
Durham	287
Gastonia	160
Asheville	146
High Point	152
Wilmington	124
Jacksonville	102
Concord	103
Burlington	104
Hickory	86
Goldsboro	81
Nonurbanized	644
State total	4,229
North Dakota:	
Fargo-Morehead, N. Dak.-Minn	197
Bismarck-Mandan	108
Grand Forks	114
Nonurbanized	79
State total	498
Ohio:	
Cleveland	5,726
Cincinnati	2,768
Columbus	2,088
Dayton	2,737
Akron	1,067
Toledo, Ohio-Mich	1,378
Youngstown-Warren	651
Canton	564
Lorain-Elyria	211
Hamilton	199
Middletown	142
Springfield	196
Mansfield	126
Steubenville-Weirton, Ohio-W. Va	128
Lima	127
Newark	85
Nonurbanized	709
State total	18,902
Oklahoma:	
Oklahoma City	919
Tulsa	835
Lawton	160
Enid	77
Nonurbanized	292
State total	2,283

FISCAL YEAR 1983 PRELIMINARY APPORTIONMENT OF THE FUND MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AS PROVIDED UNDER THE FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1982—Continued

[Total funds apportioned are 65 percent of the fiscal year 1983 level; in thousands of dollars]

FISCAL YEAR 1983 PRELIMINARY APPORTIONMENT OF THE FUND MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AS PROVIDED UNDER THE FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1982—Continued

[Total funds apportioned are 65 percent of the fiscal year 1983 level; in thousands of dollars]

FISCAL YEAR 1983 PRELIMINARY APPORTIONMENT OF THE FUND MADE AVAILABLE FROM THE MASS TRANSIT ACCOUNT OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AS PROVIDED UNDER THE FEDERAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1982—Continued

[Total funds apportioned are 65 percent of the fiscal year 1983 level; in thousands of dollars]

State/urbanized area	Proposed obligation level
Oregon:	
Portland, Oreg.-Wash	3,237
Eugene	393
Salem	273
Medford	97
Nonurbanized	227
State total	4,227
Pennsylvania:	
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J	24,571
Pittsburgh	7,274
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre	876
Allentown-Easton-Bethlehem, Pa.-N.J	1,386
Harrisburg	531
Erie	431
Reading	402
Lancaster	302
York	266
Johnstown	179
Altoona	168
Monessen	105
Williamsport	117
State College	125
Sharon	102
Nonurbanized	781
State total	37,616
Rhode Island:	
Providence-Pawtucket, R.I.-Mass	3,184
Newport	95
Nonurbanized	26
State total	3,305
South Carolina:	
Charleston	308
Columbia	311
Greenville	219
Spartanburg	148
Florence	83
Anderson	79
Rock Hill	74
Nonurbanized	321
State total	1,543
South Dakota:	
Sioux Falls	152
Rapid City	88
Nonurbanized	92
State total	332
Tennessee:	
Memphis, Tenn.-Miss	2,350
Nashville-Davidson	1,082
Chattanooga	576
Knoxville	578
Kingsport	118
Johnson City	114
Clarksville	116
Bristol, Tenn.-Va	72
Jackson	74
Nonurbanized	416
State total	5,496
Texas:	
Dallas-Fort Worth	4,286
Houston	4,086
San Antonio	3,187
El Paso	1,120
Austin	804
Corpus Christi	430
Lubbock	299
McAllen-Pharr-Edinburg	311
Amarillo	254
Waco	193
Beaumont	192
Port Arthur	171
Texas City-La Marque	141
Odessa	189
Abilene	143
Laredo	263
Wichita Falls	160
Brownsville	198
Killeen	162
Bryan-College Station	137
San Angelo	128
Tyler	129
Midland	125
Longview	102
Harlingen-San Benito	107
Texarkana, Tex.-Ark	98
Galveston	111
Sherman-Denison	80
Temple	73
Victoria	101
Nonurbanized area	848
State total	18,628
Utah:	
Salt Lake City	2,127
Ogden	194
Provo-Orem	310
Nonurbanized	68
State total	2,699
Vermont:	
Burlington	121
Nonurbanized	72
State total	193
Virginia:	
Norfolk-Portsmouth	1,642
Richmond	1,245
Newport News-Hampton	600
Roanoke	310
Petersburg-Colonial Heights	175
Lynchburg	127
Charlottesville	128
Danville	91
Nonurbanized	383
State total	4,701
Washington:	
Seattle-Everett	5,542
Tacoma	935
Spokane	624
Richland-Kennewick	180
Yakima	158
Olympia	109
Bremerton	109
Longview, Wash.-Oreg	89
Bellingham	88
Nonurbanized	251
State total	8,085
West Virginia:	
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.-Ohio-Ky	346
Charleston	291
Wheeling	210
Parkersburg	138
Nonurbanized	257
State total	1,242
Wisconsin:	
Milwaukee	3,670
Madison	938
Green Bay	230
Appleton	305
Racine	280
Kenosha	222
Eau Claire	118
La Crosse	133
Sheboygan	119
Wausau	93
Oshkosh	116
Janesville	97
Beloit-Wis.-Ill	90
Nonurbanized	394
State total	6,805
Wyoming:	
Casper	123
Cheyenne	106
Nonurbanized	59
State total	288
Alaska:	
Anchorage	242
Nonurbanized	38
State total	280
Hawaii:	
Honolulu	2,939
Kailua-Kaneohe	237
Nonurbanized	46
State total	3,222
Washington, D.C., Maryland-Virginia	14,045
State total	14,045
Puerto Rico:	
San Juan	3,523
Ponce	546
Caguas	329
Mayaguez	232
Vega Baja-Manati	170
Arecibo	141
Aguadilla	122
Nonurbanized	246
State total	5,309
American Samoa:	
Nonurbanized	5
State total	5
Guam:	
Nonurbanized	3
State total	3
Virgin Islands:	
Nonurbanized	16
State total	16
Available for immediate obligation	506,343
Reserved obligation	272,657
Total	779,000

TIMES BEACH, MO.

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the dioxin contamination of Times Beach, Mo., is unfortunate and I share the feelings of the people in that town who are afraid and anxious about the ailments they may suffer because of the indiscriminate disposal of toxic waste within their community.

We are all aware that the EPA has agreed to buy the entire town for some $34 million. It appears that under these circumstances—the Federal Government paying for the damages—that the Federal Government is partially responsible.

It also appears that most of the dioxin dumping in the area was done by an individual, a Mr. Richard Bliss, a waste hauler who serviced the area. We should also keep in mind that dioxin was not well researched 10 years ago, and the EPA was newly born with no regulations for the use of dioxin on the books.

And all these facts takes us back to the central question, or what should be the central question: Who is at fault here? The city of Times Beach, Mo., contracted the work done on the roads by choosing Mr. Bliss. According to commonsense, both Mr. Bliss and the city of Times Beach contributed to the contamination of the properties of the citizens in that town. It is they who should be held accountable for this action.

If we as a legislative body continue to ignore accountability in incidents such as this, we will be giving a license for States and municipalities to be reckless in their administrative duties because uncle sugar will bail them out in the end.

This incident appears to be the largest disaster involving toxic chemicals, secondary to Love Canal. It should be pointed out that the property now known as Love Canal was originally purchased from Hooker Chemical Co., which had used the area as a chemical dump and had specified in their sales contract to the purchasers, which happened to be the local school board, that residential properties should not be constructed in the area. How many citizens and legislators are aware of these facts? Again, the taxpayer was asked to bailout this community because of the reckless decisionmaking of a local government.

I have long been a dissenter to many policies of the Federal Government, especially when it comes to financing boondoggles and granting subsidies to corporate interests. It appears that we are now in the business of subsidizing stupidity as well.●

THE 1983 CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great privilege to join in the 1983 Congressional Call to Conscience. At this time, I would like to remind my distinguished colleagues of the plight of the noted Ukrainian writer, Mykola Danylovych Rudenko, who has been serving a 12-year sentence in a corrective labor colony in the Mordovian complex in the Soviet Union since 1977. The innerstrength and profound courage of Rudenko is never ending. He serves as a model for all of us here today who join together in affirming our conviction to insuring human rights for all mankind.

Rudenko's life is filled with a series of great accomplishments. As an active member of the Communist Party he fought in World War II where he received a serious spinal injury. After the war, he began his literary career by publishing collections of his poetry and later was appointed chief editor of the Kiev literary journal, DNIPRO. Ultimately, he was elected secretary of the party organization of the Writer's Union of Ukraine. Rudenko's later poems and essays began to reflect his subtle protests of the Soviet lifestyle. As a writer in the Soviet Union, he became increasingly aware of the limits to his freedom of speech. His writings caused him severe reprisals by the Soviet authorities. His protest became more evident as he began writing letters to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CCCPU) outlining his philosophy on ways to improve the social and economic conditions in the Ukraine. After disapproval of Rudenko's writing, the Soviet authorities expelled him from the party and forbade him to publish any more of his literary work. In 1976 he was expelled from the Union of Writers for behavior incompatible with membership. It was at this point in Rudenko's life that he became actively involved in his quest to obtain improvements in human rights. He joined the Moscow chapter of Amnesty International and is most noted for his founding of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accords. In 1977, Rudenko was arrested and sentenced to 7 years of strict labor followed by 5 years of internal exile. The Soviet authorities charged him with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda.

As Rudenko continues to serve his sentence, a matter that remains of great concern to me is the state of his health. There are reports that his health has deteriorated considerably during his imprisonment because of the spinal injury he received during the war. Despite his condition, Rudenko is required to work long hours making cords for electric irons. This work, which involves keeping the body in one position and bending the spinal cord, is quite dangerous to his physical condition. Recently, his handicap was reclassified to a lesser degree of severity requiring him to work even longer hours. The authorities are planning punitive measures against him, because of his refusal to comply with this latest command.

It is no secret that the conditions in these labor camps are grueling and the prisoners receive inadequate nourishment and medical care. When Rudenko's wife, Raisa, visited her husband in 1980, he was so ill that he was unable to stand. She, too, was arrested and is currently serving a sentence because she attempted to smuggle some of her husband's writing out of prison.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged by these reports on Rudenko's condition. He has not committed any crime and to subject him to such inhumane torture is yet another example of the flagrant disregard for human rights by the Soviet Government. We must continue to remind the Soviet officials of the terms of the Helsinki accords on human rights which they signed in 1975. The plight of Rudenko, and other prisoners, will not be forgotten by the free nations of the world. We must continue to speak out against Soviet aggression and their denial of basic human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the Helsinki Commission has again nominated Mykola Rudenko and seven others for the Nobel Peace Prize. I can think of no greater honor for this man. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for this opportunity today to pay tribute to Mr. Rudenko. He is truly an inspiration to all of us in the free world that continue our fight for human rights.●

PEOPLES BANK CHIEF ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute and honor to Mr. B. Frank Wilson, who will be retiring in June from the duties as board chairman and chief executive officer of Peoples Bank in Selma, Ala.

Not many people achieve the measure of admiration and respect that Frank has enjoyed in his past 47 years of service with the bank. He earned that admiration and respect because he genuinely cared about the people he served and about the welfare and growth of his community.

Following is a wonderful article written by Jeanette Berryman of the Selma Times-Journal staff about Mr. Wilson's retirement announcement that I would like to share with my colleagues in the House.

PEOPLES BANK CHIEF ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

(By Jeanette Berryman)

"I hate to say goodbye, but that's what it is," Peoples Bank board chairman and chief executive officer B. Frank Wilson told stockholders as he announced his impending retirement Tuesday night.

But Wilson, seated under a "Happy Birthday" banner at the Selma Convention Center, was caught by surprise when the annual stockholders' meeting became a belated birthday celebration and tribute for the man who worked his way from runner to board chairman.

The festivities followed a business session in which Dr. Clyde Cox Jr. was added to the bank's board of directors and a 100 percent stock dividend was declared.

Wilson smiled broadly as bank employees recounted his 47 years at Peoples Bank. Seven employees clad in green-and-white bank jackets and caps sang choruses to Wilson as other officers gave a history of Wilson's rise in the growing bank.

Schuster Siegel, senior vice president, said Wilson came to the bank in 1936 after working as a soda jerk at Swift's Drug Store. He was a runner, and one of seven employees. A few years later, Wilson was named head teller and married Margaret Elebash.

As Siegel's story came to 1942, the year the Wilson's first son was born, Ben Wilson, who now lives in California, made a surprise appearance. A few minutes later, Wilson was surprised again to see son Joe Wilson and his wife, Kay, join the party. They live in Vermont.

As Peoples Bank grew from 12 to 49 employees, Wilson worked as bookkeeper, assistant cashier, cashier, vice president and executive vice president. He became the fifth president of Peoples Bank in 1971.

During the next 10 years, the bank's assets grew from $37 million to $93 million, Siegel said. The board chose to remain home-owned, with no affiliation to any holding company.

"When we say people make the difference, we mean it because of you," bank president Dick Morthland told Wilson. "We are now the strongest financial institution in this section."

Wilson's retirement is effective June 30. In the meantime, Morthland said, the Wilsons will enjoy a week-long cruise of the Caribbean, then represent the bank at a meeting in Bermuda.

Morthland also presented Wilson with a gobbler and pair of turkey hens hand-carved by Selma artist Dennis Bushey as the bank's retirement gift.

"I can't say how much I appreciate this," said an overwhelmed Wilson to the 300-plus dinner crowd. "I knew nothing of this. My birthday was Saturday, and I thought maybe I'd get a birthday cake."

During the business session, Morthland said he believes the local economy has "turned the corner" from last year's lows.

Wilson said the new stock dividend is the ninth time since 1933 that the bank has declared a dividend or stock split. One share purchased in 1933 would be 166 shares today, he said.

Cox, a surgeon, was elected to the board at the recommendation of the bank's directors.

"The board is proud to have Clyde nominated," Wilson said. "He is not only a skilled surgeon, but also a Christian gentleman and an astute businessman."

As one can see, the city of Selma has truly been fortunate to have a man such as Frank Wilson as a community leader. His influence and past decisions in the financial arena will be felt for generations to come in the city's history.

It takes a man of a certain outstanding caliber to devote 47 years of his life to one profession. He has assisted so many people through the years and I know will be missed by those who have worked with him.

I am honored to be able to share this tribute about B. Frank Wilson with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. All of us need to salute outstanding Americans like B. Frank Wilson, who believe in our free, democratic ideals and represent the true meaning of hard work and success.●

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Black History Month, celebrated during February, has just ended. Once again it served as an important time for all Americans to focus attention on the countless accomplishments of black Americans from the beginning of our Republic. Despite the years of slavery, injustice, and discrimination through which black people suffered, they endured and with unswerving courage and tenacity have made significant progress toward becoming part of America's mainstream.

I think most Americans are aware of the contributions of many black Americans in major fields of endeavor. Crispus Attucks fought in our Revolution for Freedom from Great Britain. Frederick Douglass and Harriet Tubman led in the fight for emancipation. George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington are noted names in education and science. More recently, black Americans have made outstanding contributions to our cultural and artistic life and to the high quality of American amateur and professional sports.

And we must certainly single out Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who stirred the conscience of Americans and inspired the movement that brought about adoption of long overdue laws and actions to guarantee civil rights, equal opportunity, and an end to discrimination.

What has impressed me, beyond national commemorations such as the fine presentations on public television, are the myriad local exhibits and events calling attention to the many lesser known but outstanding and talented black Americans and the rich cultural heritage our black citizens have brought us.

In my State of New Jersey, a special conference on Black Historical Scholarship and the Black Historian was held on February 19 at Rutgers University's Paul Robeson Campus Center in Newark. Supported by a grant from the New Jersey Committee for the Humanities, the conference was also sponsored by black study programs at Jersey City State College, Trenton State College, Rutgers University, Seton Hall University, Essex County College and the New York Public Library; the Newark branch of the NAACP; the New Jersey Federation of Colored Women's Clubs; and the New Jersey Historical Commission.

I am particularly proud of the fine and varied series of exhibits and events presented by the Newark Museum during Black History Month. On view was an exhibit on "Black American Landmarks: Interpreters of History", a Smithsonian traveling exhibition which focused on 76 sites selected as national historic landmarks for their significance in black American history. Another exhibition, originated in the Newark Museum, was of over 80 textiles celebrating events of local and international significance in 26 African countries. "Art in African Living", in the Permanent African Gallery, featured traditional objects of sub-Saharan Africa including household items, representations of the spirit world, ritual objects and articles of clothing and adornment.

The museum's schedule of concerts, lectures and films was dazzling, with programs including gospel music, jazz, African dance, song and drumming. A family heritage workshop was conducted the day before the highlight of the month on February 20—Alex Haley's first appearance as a lecturer in Newark.

Mr. Speaker, this year's Black History Month was a time of celebration and of learning. But it was also a time to reflect on the enduring need to continue the struggle to achieve full equality and opportunity and freedom from discrimination for our black citizens.●

THE FRENCH NUCLEAR FORCE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, among the most cynical of Soviet ploys when it comes to the question of nuclear disarmament is its insistence on counting French and British nuclear weapons in negotiation aimed at reducing Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) in Europe. As Claude Cheysson, Foreign Minister of France, has pointed out, the French force is not a threat to Soviet security. The French are a sovereign nation and have chosen to build their own independent nuclear force for their own national purposes. To suggest this force—and the British force—should be counted in negotiations involving Soviet SS-20's aimed at Europe is, as Mr. Cheysson pointed out, a "disastrous" idea.

At this point I wish to include in the RECORD, "French Defense Policy and the U.S." by Claude Cheysson, Foreign Minister—France, in the Wall Street Journal, Friday, February 25, 1983.

FRENCH DEFENSE POLICY AND THE U.S.

(By Claude Cheysson)

The present debate on defense issues may have far-reaching consequences for the West. If unhappily it were to compound misunderstandings and embitter mutual criticism, the discussion might unsettle public opinion, introduce profound divisions between the U.S. and the European countries and weaken security all around.

However, an examination of the difficult problems that defense poses for all our democratic societies may, if we approach it with a clear mind and make an effort to understand each other, lead to a stronger alliance and greater confidence in the future.

France has its own views on these problems. These have been clearly stated by my country's successive governments since the presidency of Charles de Gaulle, and I think it is useful at a crucial time to make these known to the American public.

Despite major changes on the international scene over the past 34 years, none of the reasons that made the Atlantic Alliance necessary have lost their value. As then, the peoples of Western Europe and those of North America are linked by the same concept of society, the same respect for man, his freedom and his rights. As then, the future of the U.S. is irrevocably linked to that of our European countries. As then, the European countries cannot by themselves secure the defense of their "space." As then, the presence in close proximity of powerful Warsaw Pact armies and the Soviet nuclear forces gives rise to a link of security across the Atlantic.

This link implies that any idea of aggression against the European countries should be made impossible and senseless through the prospect of response by American nuclear weapons. The allies of NATO's integrated command have structured this concept of deterrence into the "flexible response," that is, a series of graduated responses. It is their responsibility not to allow any doubt to emerge with regard to deterrence in its entirety.

The Soviet Union deployed the SS-20s with the express purpose of dividing and compartmentalizing the rationale of deterrence. These arms cannot reach the heart of the alliance, the U.S., yet have the capacity to destroy in the space of a few moments all the means of retaliation of Europe itself. The objective is clear: to destroy the first components of the flexible response so that the sole remaining threat is that of strategic arms, which are the most feared, with the hope that this threat will not be used.

TRYING TO UNDO THE LINK

In political terms this means that an attempt is being made to undo the transatlantic link and to separate the defense of Europe from that of the U.S. The aim is to decouple the ultimate means of deterrence from those of the defense of the "European glacis."

Thus, doubt as to the credibility of American deterrence is surreptitiously creeping into the picture. In some quarters in Europe—fewer than they are said to be—there is a vague and growing feeling that American protection is uncertain and that uncertain protection is more dangerous than no protection at all. So Europeans are coming to feel more frightened of the arms you are sending to Europe to protect them than of the arms buildup in the East.

This malaise is difficult to understand in the U.S. It is wrongly perceived as a sign of relinquishment, of giving up, and many Americans are being tempted by the idea of pulling back. Reacting this way would consummate the very thing that must be avoided. The remedy therefore lies in greater deterrence backed by American strength and in dispelling all doubt regarding it.

The malaise I have described here does not affect France because French defense has remained national and independent and because public opinion has thus not been aroused by the installation of foreign nuclear arms on our soil. Nor has public opinion been subject to the key question of the credibility of the Allies determination.

France acquired its national nuclear force 20 years ago. It has provided for and will maintain it at the minimum level necessary to make any power understand that France's capacity to respond is greater than the stake our country represents. This policy is understood and approved by all the French people and by all the political forces in the majority and in the opposition. The effort therefore continues and will be pursued so we can remain at this level; the decision to build a seventh nuclear submarine, an end-of-the-century generation submarine, and the determination to perfect our nuclear arsenal have been accepted without much opposition. Contrary to what is happening in other countries in Europe, no one in France thinks that strengthening defense could draw an attack on our soil. And no one would understand that this policy might be thought disturbing to the countries of Eastern Europe.

Our independence does not imply isolation. Our future is linked to that of our neighbors. European construction is a precondition of our future. That process of construction is being pursued with peoples who must remain free in their thinking and in their policies. They must not be affected by outside threats. They must feel protected and secure. But they are not thus protected by us. Adequate to guarantee our vital interests, our nuclear arms are not now intended—nor will they be in the future—to insure the protection of the entire European zone of the Atlantic Alliance. Nor may they be used to this end, since we retain exclusive control over them. The guarantee of European territories that do not have nuclear weapons therefore can come only from the integrated command of NATO, that is to say, in fact, the U.S. For this reason, maintaining the American nuclear deterrent and continually modernizing it insofar as this is necessary are in our view essential.

Allies and yet independent, sole masters of our deterrent force yet standing solidly with the U.S., with our neighbors and with our European partner—what do we advocate in the present situation?

(1) In the first place, the importance of the U.S.'s world responsibilities does not permit it to adopt a posture of minimal deterrence that would protect only American territory. Such a posture would also reduce the function of deterrence and thereby render highly dangerous the undisputed imbalance in the European part of the alliance that does not have nuclear arms capable of reaching the Soviet Union.

(2) You should give your allies and your adversaries the assurance that you will not resign yourself to this lesser role. This is why proposals for a nuclear freeze, however well-intentioned they may be, seem to us dangerous for they could appear to many to be a first step toward withdrawal.

(3) With even greater reason we find the insistence sometimes voiced in the U.S. on a commitment to on-first-use of nuclear weapons to be profoundly destructive to the ties of solidarity in defense, and thus to your own security. Certainly, given your position, one can understand your concern not to make everything depend on a premature and massive use of nuclear arms. But, as Mr. Mitterrand said on Jan. 20 before the Bundestag, "The nuclear weapon, the instrument of deterrence, whether one likes it or deplores it, remains the guarantee of peace." This important truth is entirely understood in France. It is understood in Europe much more than you think.

(4) The credibility of deterrence could be affected by the nature of Soviet overarmament. So the balance must be reestablished. Deployment of medium-range missiles should be sought at the lowest possible level. Zero level would be ideal. Is it still attainable? If the Geneva negotiations on Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) fail, we believe that NATO will have no other recourse than to go ahead with the decision taken in 1979 to modernize U.S. nuclear forces in Europe.

(5) Counting the French and British nuclear forces in the negotiations would permit the Soviets to justify keeping 162 SS-20s (or 486 warheads) targeted on Europe before any American arms were allowed. The fallacy of this reasoning is evident.

THE UNITY OF THE ALLIES

Who, moreover, could believe or even suggest that the French force is a threat to the security of the Soviet Union? Let's not forget that in addition to the SS-20s, 9,000 nuclear warheads carried on strategic rockets and bombers can reach French territory. The Soviet claim to include our forces in the count has no strategic foundation.

In acceding to the Soviet request, the U.S. would be giving up the notion of restoring the continuity of deterrence that was broken by the introduction of the SS-20s. This task, as we have seen, cannot in any way be accomplished by the French and British forces. In yielding, the U.S. would leave the Federal Republic of Germany and the other nonnuclear states of Europe without adequate protection. In point of fact, for our European partners, the inclusion of third-party forces in the Geneva calculations would be a disastrous piece of deception.

Lastly, the U.S. would be putting itself in a weak position for demanding a balance, for it would be acknowledging the acceptability of having a quantity of missiles lower than that of the Soviets by a number at least equal to that of the French and British missiles.

Too often the Soviets consider themselves a threatened country, encircled by hostile states. This justifies in their eyes their determination to obtain a greater degree of security than other states.

Establishing trustful and cooperative relations between the West and the Soviet Union, which my government wishes to see and to which it is ready to contribute, depends on the Soviet Union being brought around to a more normal and less excessive vision of its own security needs.

Such a readjustment is possible. It can take place only through the unity of the Allies, through their common determination and first and foremost through the determination of the United States.●

MAKING DISASTER ASSISTANCE EQUITABLE

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to repeal the credit elsewhere test for use in determining who is eligible for low-interest Federal disaster loans. My bill also would place a cap on the level of interest that could be charged for these loans.

The modest savings achieved through charging higher interest rates on Federal disaster aid do not, in my opinion, justify the suffering they inflict on disaster victims and the delay they cause in recovery.

Recent events in Connecticut prove my point.

A CASE STUDY

In June of 1982, the State of Connecticut suffered the worst floods in nearly a century. The disaster took the lives of 10 residents and caused an estimated $289 million in damages. Dozens of bridges, homes, and businesses were washed away by water from bursting dams and heavy rains. Because of the storm's severity, the President declared the State a major disaster area.

What ensued after the disaster declaration is a case study on why Federal disaster assistance laws should be changed.

There was a general impression following the declaration that the Federal Government would be awarding low-interest loans to anyone who qualified for disaster assistance. What most eligible residents did not know was that the current administration, as part of its 1981 budget cuts, had changed the law to incorporate a "credit elsewhere test." In other words, low-interest loans are no longer awarded to those individuals or businesses who can obtain credit elsewhere.

Many businessowners and homeowners were outraged to learn that they were ineligible for low-interest Federal loans because they had maintained good credit standing. Instead of loans at 8 percent, they were offered Federal assistance at the prime rate of 16 percent. Many of these residents felt cheated by promises of Federal assistance and punished by having remained creditworthy.

At Senator CHRIS DODD's and my request, the General Accounting Office conducted a study that in part examined the effectiveness of the credit elsewhere test. Of the 1,103 loan applications approved by the Small Business Administration, 34 percent—329 home loans and 39 business loans—were at the high rate. Because of this higher rate, the GAO estimated that the test would save $224,000 during the first year. This savings represents less than 2 percent of the total amount loaned to businesses and individuals in Connecticut.

The savings to the Federal Government are further reduced after taking into account the fact that interest payments may be deducted from Federal income tax. In addition, the GAO calculated that it took the SBA staff an additional 368 hours to process the 1,100 applications using the credit elsewhere test.

I do not believe that these projected savings justify the credit elsewhere test. My bill would repeal the test and require that the interest rate charged for disaster loans be set at one-half of the market rate of Government securities, plus 1 percent for administrative costs. A cap would be placed at 8 percent for both home and business loans.

This legislation would prevent the problems we experienced in Connecticut from occurring in other States and provide more equitable assistance to all victims of natural disasters. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.●

THEY MAY BE RIGHT

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, contrary to claims by its opponents, the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 has led to payment of more, not less, taxes by Americans in the highest tax brackets. If there was ever any serious doubt about the fairness of the President's 25-percent cut in tax rates for every single taxpayer, there should be none now. By the same token, the recent tax revenue figures confirm that the tax cuts can help solve the problem of budget deficits, as reduced tax rates encourage upper bracket taxpayers to invest in productive enterprises, not tax shelters.

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to the recent article analyzing the fiscal 1982 revenue statistics, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Forbes Magazine, Feb. 14, 1983]

FACT AND COMMENT II—THEY MAY BE RIGHT

(By M. S. Forbes, Jr., Deputy Editor-in-Chief)

Two years ago supply-side economists assured us that cuts in income tax rates would pay for themselves. Collections from the highest brackets would go up at once, and revenues from the other brackets would increase within 24 months. These economists cited the Mellon tax reductions of the 1920's and the Kennedy cuts of the early 1960's; in both cases revenues increased and the proportion paid by the top brackets rose substantially.

Events seem to have proven the supply-siders wrong.

Or have they?

People who must make estimated income tax payments each quarter to the IRS are generally in the higher brackets. David Stockman's Budget Office estimated that collections from this category of taxpayers would fall from $77 billion in fiscal 1981 to about $72 billion in 1982. The Reagan tax-cut bill of 1981 had just been passed, and the top tax rate was being slashed from 70 percent to 50 percent.

The fiscal 1982 results are in. The take from this category was $85 billion, 10 percent more than the year before. The proportion of U.S. income tax payments from this group was 29 percent, up from 27 percent.

If the tax reductions enacted in 1981 had been made effective at once (only the maximum rate was brought down in one step), instead of being staggered over 2½ years, David Stockman's revenues would have been beefier. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher put in smaller, but immediate, income tax reductions in 1979, and Britain's income tax revenues, despite a recession more painful than our own, went up, confounding treasury officials.

Too bad the Administration has forgotten that, if you let people keep a little more of each additional dollar they earn, everyone, including the tax collector, comes out ahead.●

GOVERNMENT REFORM LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since the birth of our Nation, the success or our democracy has depended on the ability of the Federal Government to respond to the needs of its people. Unfortunately, as the Nation's population has grown, so has the size and bureacracy of its Government. We must never lose sight of the kind of government envisioned by our forefathers—one operated by its citizenry and attuned to their needs. In an effort to promote those goals, I am introducing legislation aimed at making the Government more responsive.

The first measure will guarantee the public's right to know how its money is being spent. By closing a loophole in the Freedom of Information Act, this legislation would require public disclosure by recipients of Federal grants as well as Federal agencies. The American people provide the funds to run our Government, and I believe they are entitled to a full accounting of how those funds are spent.

Two additional bills I am introducing would allow a one-House veto of rules and regulations established by Federal agencies. They would mandate 4 weeks' notice before holding hearings on new regulations and a 60-day comment period on proposed rule. Increasingly, Congress has passed legislation which delegates broad regulatory powers to the Federal agencies responsible for administering the laws. This, of course, leads to government by executive decision rather than by representative assembly. My proposal would mean an increased opportunity for many Americans to organize effective responses to the seeming flood of Federal regulations.

Finally, I am also introducing legislation requiring the Federal Government to make public annual consolidated financial statements using the accrual method of accounting. Currently, the Federal Government has no precise idea how it stands financially because it does not compile consolidated financial statements. This bill would establish an accurate annual accounting of our financial situation and allow us to intelligently establish funding priorities.

We need to continue to improve our Government and work together to solve its problems. I urge my congressional colleagues to join me in supporting these legislative proposals in the 98th Congress so that the Government can operate more effectively and continue to respond to the people it serves.●

FEDERAL BUDGET AND ITS DEFICITS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the current topical discussion of the Federal budget and its deficits has led to whispers about tax increases. Tax indexing—the linking of income tax rate brackets and the personal exemption to the cost of living—is being targeted for repeal. I introduced the first tax indexation bill in the House of Representatives on May 13, 1974—H.R. 14738, the Cost of Living Adjustment Act, and every year since then I have reintroduced the measure. In 1981 indexing was part of our economic recovery plan. Its enactment is critical to the overall success of the President's program.

Tax-indexing provisions constitute genuine and fundamental reform of our Tax Code. They are the only enduring parts of the Internal Revenue Code that provide the greatest benefit to the taxpayer. Repealing the provisions would reimpose the hidden tax of inflation on us all, but would be felt most by those with incomes under $10,000. No other legislative battle is more important to the taxpayer right now than preserving the indexing provisions of current law.

Martin Feldstein's excellent article on the subject appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 1, 1983. I include it in the RECORD at this point in the hopes that it will shed light on this very crucial matter. I commend the article to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 1, 1983]

WHY TAX INDEXING MUST NOT BE REPEALED

(By Martin Feldstein)

The most important legislative battle this year will be the attempt to repeal the indexing of the personal income tax that is now scheduled to begin in 1985. Although tax indexing may seem at first to be a rather technical tax matter, it actually holds the key to controlling the future growth of government spending and to preventing a resurgence of spiraling inflation. the long-term success or failure of Ronald Reagan's economic program is likely to hinge more on retaining tax indexing than on any other piece of legislation.

In practice, an indexed tax system prevents inflation from pushing individuals into higher tax brackets and increasing the share of income taken in taxes. This is achieved by increasing each of the bracket points by the rate of inflation during the previous year. For example, in 1984 the 18% tax bracket will include income between $16,000 and $20,200. If consumer prices rise by 5% in the year ending Oct. 1, 1984, the 18% tax bracket for 1985 would be adjusted to the range from $16,800 to $21,210. Indexing would also raise the personal exemption from $1,000 to $1,050.

The repeal of indexing would mean that bracket creep would raise taxes higher and higher, permitting Congress to finance ever greater amounts of government spending without having to vote explicitly for any increase in tax rates. The repeal of indexing would permit Congress to reduce the budget deficit over time without any cuts in government spending by just waiting while tax receipts grow and grow.

TAXES WOULD BE HIGHER

Even with inflation declining gradually over the next few years as the administration forecasts, the repeal of indexation would raise tax revenue by $17 billion in 1986, $30 billion in 1987, $44 billion in 1988 and ever higher amounts in later years. A $44 billion tax increase in 1988 would mean that the repeal of indexing had raised taxes by more than 10%. And after a decade of inflation at just 4% a year, taxes without indexing would be 25% higher than if indexing is retained.

Of course, a higher rate of inflation would mean more bracket creep and thus a bigger tax increase each year. If inflation averaged 6.5% for the next five years, the extra tax revenue in 1988 would be about $80 billion instead of $44 billion. And a replay of the inflation experience of the Carter years—with inflation rising from 6.5% in 1985 to 13.5% in 1988—would raise tax receipts by about $120 billion more in 1988 if the tax system is not indexed.

The repeal of indexing would thus give Congress a strong incentive to pursue inflationary policies. With indexing gone, spiraling inflation would generate a surge of tax revenues that could finance greater government spending while permitting Congress the political luxury of voting occasional "tax cuts" that actually failed to offset inflation but provided a framework for further income redistribution.

Many financial investors and others would interpret the repeal of indexing as an indication that inflation would soon be on the rise. This change in the expected rate of inflation would raise interest rates, especially long-term interest rates on bonds and mortgages. Higher interest rates could threaten the recovery in housing and other interest-sensitive sectors and possibly bring the incipient recovery in the economy as a whole to a premature end.

Those who want to repeal indexing frequently wrap themselves in the cloak of fiscal responsibility and argue that "with the large budget deficits that we now face, we cannot afford an indexed tax system." What they should say is that the large budget deficits in future years mean that we must either cut spending or raise taxes or both. The administration's budget calls for a balanced package of spending cuts and revenue increases, including a standby tax equal to 1% of GNP that will go into effect in October 1985 unless very rapid economic growth between now and then has reduced the deficit to less than 2.5% of GNP.

If tax revenue must be raised, the repeal of indexing isn't a satisfactory substitute for an explicit tax increase. Because the repeal of indexing is a hidden way of increasing taxes, it removes the pressure to choose between spending cuts and more taxes. And unlike voting an explicit tax increase, repealing indexing doesn't provide a fixed amount of additional tax revenue but starts a money machine that will squeeze more and more money from taxpayers in the years ahead. The repeal of indexing is politically tempting to many in Congress because it increases revenue without explicitly increasing taxes. But it is the very opposite of responsible budgeting.

A common alternative rationale for repealing indexing is given by those who mistakenly believe that the combination of indexed benefits and indexed taxes inevitably produces budget deficits because "indexing raises benefits but reduces taxes." This argument is wrong because it misrepresents what indexing is all about. The indexing of benefits means that benefits just keep pace with inflation. The indexing of tax rates means that tax receipts don't rise faster than inflation through bracket creep. With complete indexing, inflation doesn't alter the real value of either benefits or taxes and therefore doesn't increase or decrease the real value of the deficit.

There are finally those who claim that they don't want to repeal indexing but just to postpone it for a year or two to help shrink the budget deficit. In reality, postponing indexing would have relatively little effect on future budget deficits. Slipping the starting date for indexing to 1986 would only raise an extra $12 billion in 1988. It is hard to avoid the suspicion that those who advocate postponement believe that if indexing is postponed once, it will be postponed again and again until it is eventually repealed. It is critically important to start indexing on schedule in 1985 because once the American taxpayers experience indexing it will be here to stay.

If indexing were repealed, the resulting tax increases would be relatively greatest for the lowest income taxpayers. It is the lowest income taxpayer who benefits most from the indexing of the $1,000 personal exemption and the $3,400 zero bracket amount. In addition, since the tax brackets are narrower at lower incomes, bracket creep is more severe. Eliminating indexing would cause the 1985 tax liability of those with incomes under $10,000 to rise by more than 9% while the tax liability of those with incomes over $100,000 would rise by less than 2%.

The liberals who want to repeal indexing are unconcerned about this increase in the tax burden on low-income taxpayers. They know that the vast increase in tax revenue that would result from de-indexing would permit Congress to vote further tax cuts for these lower income groups that would more than offset the effect of bracket creep on their tax liabilities. Tax reform would thus be deflected from a proper concern about incentives and simplification and would be focused instead on annual debates about egalitarian redistribution.

NO NATURAL CONSTITUENCY

The current congressional discussion about the repeal of indexing is counterproductive in several ways. By raising the possibility that indexing might be repealed, it increases the risk of high inflation in future years and thereby keeps current long-term interest rates higher than they should be. By focusing attention on the indexing issue, Congress avoids facing the difficult decisions about the control of spending and about the explicit tax changes that must eventually be made as part of this year's budget process.

Unfortunately, despite the critical importance of the indexing issue, it doesn't generate much pressure on Congress from individuals or from representative groups. While proposed policies that would affect a segment of the population often induce intensive lobbying activity, a major subject like indexing that influences the entire economy doesn't have a natural constituency. There is therefore the danger that Congress won't recognize how important indexing is to the public both now and in the future.

President Reagan strongly supports indexing as a central feature of his tax program. He has said clearly that he will veto any legislation that would repeal indexing or postpone its starting date. The president believes that an unindexed tax system is fundamentally dishonest. The repeal of indexing would eliminate political accountability and encourage wasteful government spending. It would make greater inflation an aid to politicians and an extra burden to taxpayers. It would initiate a continuous battle over the distribution of the tax burden.

The indexing of the personal income tax is the most fundamental and far-reaching aspect of Ronald Reagan's tax program. It must not be repealed.●

TRIBUTE TO J. DUDLEY DIGGES

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I recently learned of the death of one of the highly respected residents of Maryland. J. Dudley Digges, who died on February 25 at his home in La Plata at the age of 71, was, from 1969 to 1982, a prominent judge on the highest tribunal in the State of Maryland, the court of appeals.

Judge Digges' tenure on the appellate court was marked by compassion, dedication and intelligence. His job confronted him with many challenges and he rose to all of them.

Before beginning his term on the appellate court, he served for 20 years as a judge of the seventh judicial circuit, which includes Charles County, Calvert County, Prince Georges County and my home county, St. Marys.

It was this region's fascinating mixture of rural and urban populations that provided Judge Digges with the diverse experience which made him unique among the judges of the court of appeals. As a result of his extensive experience as a trial judge and his vast knowledge of constitutional law, Judge Digges won the immediate and unanimous respect of the other judges on the court of appeals.

His leadership qualities which we all admired so much were best illustrated in his firm handling of the Spiro Agnew case. Digges is most widely remembered for writing the opinion disbarring the former Vice President and Governor of Maryland after Agnew pleaded no contest to charges of income tax evasion.

Judge Marvin Smith, another judge of Maryland's Court of Appeals and one of Judge Digges' very close friends, described Judge Digges to me as "one of the most solidly grounded members of the legal profession in Maryland."

"He was good at anything he did. It was always done thoroughly and promptly," Judge Smith said, recalling his friend's reputation on the appellate court. "Everybody recognized that this was a guy of outstanding ability."

Judge Digges, a former president of the State bar association, played a leading role in changing and improving the organization of the association. He helped turn the bar association from a small legal-social group into the well-organized system for sanctions that it represents today.

Judge Robert Murphy, chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals, called Judge Digges "a man of the greatest intellectual depth." In recognition of Judge Digges' accomplishments and contributions, Maryland Gov. Harry Hughes ordered that the flags on the State house and the court of appeals in Annapolis be flown at half staff.

Judge Digges was a lifelong resident of La Plata. He graduated from La Plata High School, St. John's College in Annapolis and the University of Maryland Law School. In 1936, he set up a private practice in Upper Marlboro with former U.S. Representative Lansdale G. Sasscer. During World War II, he served in the Army Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Judge Digges retired from Maryland's highest court early last year at the mandatory retirement age of 70 after participating in some of the most important legal decisions in Maryland history.

After he retired, he was appointed by Governor Hughes to head the Maryland Heritage Committee, which is organizing next year's observance of the 350th anniversary of the founding of Maryland. He was also chairman of the Court of Appeals Rules Committee and a former president of the Southern Maryland Society.

Judge Digges received honorary doctorates of law from the University of Maryland and St. Mary's College of Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have known Dudley Digges. I ask you to join me in paying tribute to a man who made invaluable contributions to the Maryland legal system and everyone who is a part of that system. Judge Digges set an example that other appellate judges will be proud to follow.

I know I speak for all Marylanders in extending my sympathy to Judge Digges' sister, Mrs. Calvin Harrington Jr. of Cambridge, Md., and his two brothers, W. Mitchell Diggs Jr., and Edward S. Diggs, both of La Plata.

The principles which guided Judge Digges in life will continue to characterize Maryland's legal system, a perpetual monument to this great man.●

A COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTION TO ONE NATO PROBLEM

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, last April, I was privileged to attend a ceremony in Bonn, Germany, at which the U.S. Ambassador, Arthur Burns, and the German Foreign Minister, Hans-Dieter Genscher, signed a historic document—the United States-German Agreement on Wartime Host Nation Support (WHNS). Under the terms of this agreement, the United States reaffirms its commitment to a 10-division D-Day force in NATO's central region; in return, Germany is committed to providing essential goods and services to U.S. forces in wartime from the German civilian sector and to creating a 93,000-man force of Bundeswehr reservists, dedicated to the support of U.S. forces fighting in Germany.

By this means, one of NATO's most difficult problems can be resolved.

By 1978, most military analysts had come to recognize that the rapid Warsaw Pact buildup dictated increases in NATO's conventional forces in the central region. Without these increases, NATO could not achieve the minimum force levels essential to a successful conventional defense; without them, it was clear, the only remaining means for defending NATO would be nuclear—either tactical or strategic systems, or both.

Faced with this situation, in 1978, the NATO heads of state agreed to the long-term defense program (LTDP). Under its provisions, the U.S. was, and is, committed to providing a 10-division D-Day force, an increase of 3 divisions over our previous commitment. Our commitment for tactical aircraft on D-Day was increased commensurately. That augmentation of our early-deploying force represents our share of the total NATO conventional buildup.

Honoring that increased commitment—particularly its ground forces component—confronted the United States with a serious dilemma. To reinforce NATO with three additional divisions within the same period of time as previously required, we had to: first, increase our strategic airlift, or second, increase our forward stationed active forces, or third, plan to commit our forces to combat without necessary support. All of these alternatives are undesirable; increasing our airlift capability is terribly expensive; increasing our peacetime overseas strength is neither politically nor economically practicable; going without essential support—openly forgoing the ability to engage successfully in sustained combat—drastically curtails the deterrent effects of our NATO commitment and forces us to resort to a defense based on nuclear weapons when deterrents fail us.

In 1980, seeking a way out of this dilemma, the United States proposed to its NATO allies a transatlantic bargain, under which we would increase our early-deploying combat forces, without essential support, provided the allies made that support available to us. Our allies responded favorably to that offer.

Since we have entered into WHNS agreements with the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg under which each of those powers guarantees to provide from its civil sector, essential goods and services to U.S. forces in wartime. These four agreements relieve us from the need to deploy some 50,000 U.S. military personnel to NATO in times of tension or crisis.

Because of Germany's unique geographic situation—the NATO-Pact boundary is along the German frontier and many of our initial support requirements are likely to lie in combat areas—the United States-German WHNS Agreement was different in some respects from the other agreements. Like the others, this agreement called for the Germans to furnish us with goods and services from their civil sector. But it went far beyond the normal arrangement by incorporating a unique provision under which the German Government agreed to create an organized military force of some 93,000 Bundeswehr reservists, dedicated to the support of U.S. ground and air forces in wartime. In combination, these actions to which the Germans have committed themselves will obviate our need to deploy more than 150,000 U.S. support troops to NATO in times of crisis and tension.

Through these several agreements, the United States has been enabled, without increasing our previous strategic lift capabilities, to deliver sustainable conventional forces in the numbers to which our Nation has committed itself to NATO.

As is usual, under the terms of these agreements, all goods and services from the civil sector are provided on a reimbursable basis. Since they are to be furnished only in wartime, this form of support entails no peacetime costs.

But the German Bundeswehr Reserve units do have peacetime costs—capital outlays for equipment and facilities; recurring costs for salaries, maintenance, and training. Since the Germans are providing a service—the support of U.S. forces—to meet what, in accordance with NATO practice, is a U.S. national responsibility, we would normally be expected to bear all of the costs for the 93,000 reservists. But the United States-German WHNS Agreement departs from the norm by having Germany share these costs with us. Under the provisions of our agreement, the Germans will bear approximately 50 percent of the capital costs and about 60 percent of the recurring costs.

Pursuant to our agreement, the German Government already has assigned personnel to this program and has set aside nearly $18 million to pay its share of the 1983 costs for implementation. We anticipate that the German contribution will be doubled in 1984, as more units come into being.

The Germans have furnished all facilities needed for scheduled 1983 activations; the United States will provide facilities for activations in 1984. NATO infrastructure funding will be requested for any future activations for which suitable facilities are not available from existing assets.

The continuing resolution authority (CRA) does not include funds for the U.S. share of implementation costs during 1983. Indeed, the report of the conferees directs the Department of Defense not to proceed with the WHNS program.

I would like to comment upon the arguments against funding this program, which were advanced by Members of Congress during last year's debates on the budget and the CRA. Some Members who oppose this program have also expressed their belief that our NATO allies must be required to assume a larger share of the defense burden than they have done until now. Ironically, the WHNS program is one measure that would cause the Germans to do more than heretofore.

Some Members have argued that we should not provide equipment for German reserve unit until all U.S. reserve units have been fully equipped. This argument is doubly flawed. First and more importantly, the German reserve units will be available to support U.S. units within 2 to 3 days after both countries determine that support is needed. U.S. reserve units cannot be mobilized and deployed to Europe in time to provide the needed support, even if sufficient strategic airlift were available. We are not dealing with equivalent alternatives here, only the German reservist are able to meet the support requirements of our combat forces. Second, since the equipment to be procured by the United States includes only essential items which cannot be mobilized from the German civilian sector, it constitutes a very small part of the equipment involved in the total program; the effect upon our own reserve components or applying it to this program is almost negligible.

The CRA conferees indicated that this WHNS program should be treated as a part of the foreign military aid budget. That would be most inappropriate, for under the United States-German agreement, we will retain title to all equipment which we procure for use by Bundeswehr reservists in support of U.S. forces in Europe. The United States could not retain title to this equipment if it were transferred through a foreign military sales program. But beyond that technical problem, I am troubled by the notion, implicit in the conference report, that this is foreign aid. It is not the Germans whom we aid by this program—it is the United States. We are not dealing with foreign aid here; instead we seek to provide our own soldiers and airmen with the support they must have to survive and succeed in combat.

Our failure to fund this program runs counter to our efforts to further the military revitalization and political cohesion of NATO. There is general agreement here that both we and our allies need to do much more to strengthen NATO. We do not advance that policy by forcing, through lack of appropriations, unilateral withdrawal by the United States from an agreement which has been carefully tailored to strengthen deterrence and improve NATO's conventional defense capability.

The President's fiscal year 1984 budget request includes $41 million to pay the U.S. share of costs associated with implementing the WHNS program in that year. I understand that the Department of Defense intends, in a supplemental appropriations request for fiscal year 1983, to seek authority to begin implementing this vital program now.

I urge your support for the wartime host nation support program which will enable the United States to fulfill a critical international obligation, and also, far more important to all Americans, to provide the means for sustaining our forward deployed and reinforcing troops in the event of a NATO war.●

CHILD-CARE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1983

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Child-Care Assistance Act of 1983. This measure is a companion to S. 4, which has been introduced in the Senate by my good friend Senator ALAN CRANSTON.

The number of working families faced with a lack of adequate child-care facilities is rapidly growing. Single parents and working mothers, especially those with low incomes, are finding it increasingly difficult to insure that their children are properly supervised. Since 1977, the estimated numbers of working mothers of children under 18 and working mothers of children under age 6 have increased by almost 20 percent—from 50.7 percent to 59 percent and from 40.9 percent to 50 percent, respectively. In just the last 2 years, the number of children under the age of 6 whose mothers are in the work force has risen from 7.5 million to 8.5 million—an increase of more than 13 percent.

Moreover, demographic data indicate that these increases will continue. It has been projected that by the year 1990, there will be 11.5 million children under the age of 6 and 17.2 million children between the ages of 6 and 13 whose mothers will be working. That represents an increase of almost 7 million children from the current 22 million children under age 13 with mothers in the work force.

The data also indicate a wide disparity between the number of children with working mothers and the number of available child-care slots. The Department of Health and Human Services, in reports issued in 1980 and 1981, indicated that there were some 900,000 center-based and 5.2 million family-based day-care places available. That is roughly 6 million places for 22 million children under the age of 13.

Obviously, the problem is multifold. There is a severe lack of centers available and those that are open tend to be filled. In addition, many families are unable to afford these services. As a result, many school age and even preschool age children are left at home for several hours a day without supervision. This is accompanied by an alarming increase in school vandalism, juvenile alcoholism, and a variety of other disruptive and criminal activities. As for younger children, studies have shown that the years from birth to age 6 are crucial in a child's development. Children should be afforded the most positive environment possible to enhance their personal and social progress in all areas. Making qualified and accessible child-care services available to all families will obviously be of immediate benefit to these children. But such a system would also have a huge impact on our country as a whole, in terms of insuring well-adjusted and productive members of our society. When the costs of leaving these children alone is compared to the benefits of providing proper supervision, I think we can all agree that it is a price we can well afford to pay.

Equally serious is the case of a family that does not have access to day care services, but chooses not to leave their children alone and unsupervised. This can encompass a number of situations: Either both parents must work to insure the economic stability of the family, or it is a single-parent household, but whatever the case they do not intend to leave their children unsupervised for the length of time employment would demand. An increased availability of affordable child-care centers will give these parents an opportunity both to seek employment and to work full time. Certainly, this can only strengthen the family unit, as well as reduce public assistance costs.

That is the purpose of this measure—to promote the availability and diversity of quality child-care services for all children and families who need such services. My bill would provide assistance to the States to expend the existing supply of child-care services, improve the quality of and coordination among child-care programs, and generally foster increased coordination of programs at the local, State, and Federal levels. Grants would be available to States, under the terms specified in this act, to carry out these activities and to make additional resources available to help families find and meet the costs of child care. The bill is also designed to provide mechanisms to facilitate an assessment of the extent of the need for child-care services throughout the Nation, both an initial assessment within the next few years and continuing assessments periodically thereafter.

Additionally, and fundamentally, this bill is aimed at strengthening the functions of families by seeking to assure that parents are not forced by lack of available programs or financial resources to place a child in an undesirable care facility or arrangement. It is in the national interest that we implement such a policy. I urge my colleagues to study the situation and my proposal, and to join with me in support of such action.●

RIGHT DIRECTION IN EL SALVADOR

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following correspondence expressing the views and recommendations of the American Chamber of Commerce of El Salvador:

EL SALVADOR 1983: IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

"Human rights", "land reforms", "military oppression", "oligarchies", "military advisors", "Vietnamization", "extreme left", "extreme right", "dialogue", etc., are some of the emotional terms that partisan internal politics and pressure groups have manipulated to confuse the American people and Congress so that the reality about El Salvador has been lost. The real issue at stake is whether the U.S. will, for obvious national interest, develop a position of commitment that will insure the future of democracy and the private enterprise system in El Salvador; or will the U.S. position and policy permit another Nicaragua to occur and thereby progressively lose the entire Caribbean Basin and Mexico to Castroism.

The American Chamber of Commerce of El Salvador urges that this commitment be evidenced by increased economic and military assistance to El Salvador to save the economy and to counteract the international communist attack. Failure to support El Salvador would again demonstrate that the U.S. is incapable of defending the principles of democracy against a determined and programed international communist aggression.

We also urge Congress to embrace the investment and trade package of the CBI as a program designed to eliminate the regional economic environment which has stymied political, social and economic progress.

In dealing with the question of El Salvador it is essential to recall March 28, 1982 when we witnessed one of the most incredible voter turnouts ever in the history of democratic elections. This election was even more astonishing since the people had to expose themselves to the threat of loss of life in order to exercise their right as defined in Article 21 of the United Nations Human Rights charter, which states: "The will of the people is the base of the authority of public power."

In March 1982 the Frente Democrático Revolucionario (FDR), which has always used violence and terror as a means to obtain power or promote change, created the hostile political and security environment which they then used as an excuse for not participating in the elections. The FDR's decision to stay with the GUNS and not the BALLOTS confirmed their disregard for the Human Rights of those that did decide to participate and vote.

The election result is the testimony of over 80 percent of the Salvadorean voters who spoke to the world with one clear message: We do not support the FDR movement. The U.S. cannot ignore this fact and have a reasonable policy toward El Salvador or, for that matter, towards any other developing democracy of the world. The U.S. must identify with this one event over any other to establish the cornerstone of its commitment to El Salvador.

The above facts must be kept in mind when analyzing the pressure by some elements in the United States to force the people of El Salvador into a dialogue with the FDR to reach a political solution. This position under the present realities must be discarded for it is in direct contradiction to the voice and spirit of the March 28 elections, and could give the FDR a role in the government which they have been unwilling to earn through the democratic process. Those arguing "dialogue" still have not recognized nor accepted the FDR for what it represents.

In our presentation to the Congress last year before the elections we said:

"The principal misunderstanding concerns the opinion surrounding the make-up and strength of the FDR. The basic controversy about the FDR regarding their strength or weakness is a matter of opinion. The opinion that because of their terrorist activities the FDR represents some major group of Salvadorean is accepted by certain sectors out of hand, while the true majority of Salvadoreans, the church, the government, the unions, the military and the private sector, which support elections and reject the FDR, are conveniently ignored. The FDR, as documented, is an umbrella political front for the international sponsored marxist-leninist terrorist groups. They have intelligently incorporated renegades from the social and Chistrian Democrats to give it appeal within the western world. They have not, by fact or history, won any popular internal support for their cause. They portray support by trying to capitalize on and usurp the popular movement of the late 70's, which sought change in the "old system", but did not seek communism as the "new system". Any support they had within that popular movement disintegrated. When the extreme left leadership made public its marxist-leninist ideology and the social reforms were implemented by the government. As social outcasts, not only for their ideology but also for their violence, they retreated to the hills and resorted to hit and run terrorism, while being idolized as Robin Hoods by the media."

This analysis has not changed and within the country the FDR is still viewed as a band of traitors to the principles of democracy and private initiative. Reasons for their continued existence can be summarized into six major points:

1. Continued arms and logistic support from the international communists with the help of Nicaragua as a bridge from Cuba.

2. Ability to draft youths (mostly under 18), drifters and common criminals who do not necessarily support their cause but join for the obvious adventurism, theft, etc., associated with outlaw bands, and those forced to cooperate through terror.

3. Ability to con and use mistaken idealists who believe they will have a voice in some future government, but who will be obviously discarded as the Nicaraguan example clearly shows.

4. Ability to continue to receive support and recognition from interest groups and political leaders which only view the faults of the present government and do not look at the final objective of the FDR which is clearly communism for El Salvador.

5. The publicity they receive when they destroy the economy by means of violence, making them look powerful and numerous.

6. The use of well-orchestrated propaganda machine available to them within the U.S., to create misinformation throughout the world.

The fourth point is of particular importance for the people of the U.S. to help correct. It is most ironical and contradictory that some human rights activists, certain religious groups and political leaders provide propaganda and political support to the FDR by charging the abuses committed by a few undisciplined elements to the entire government and military, which are publicly committed to the correction of their faults and to democracy. While not ignoring this fact, the daily destruction of public and private property caused by the FDR clearly affects all Salvadoreans' livelihood, their right to work, to move freely about their country, and to enjoy such basic necessities as electricity, water, medicines, education and food. By ignoring the above violations committed by the FDR, makes these religious, human rights and political groups collaborators in providing justification for treason instead of helping develop the necessary democratic solution.

The unmistakable conclusion from the analysis of the March 28 results and the nature of the FDR is that the U.S. Government must support the existing legally and democratically elected representatives of the people of El Salvador and encourage the further development of their democratic process.

The U.S. and its congress must make a clear and public rejection of the FDR principles as antidemocratic and anti-U.S. The U.S. must insist that the FDR reject terrorism and seek acceptance through the democratic process. With these political steps taken then it is very feasible to expect the Salvadoreans to be able to participate in a true dialogue for the conditional surrender of the FDR, providing guarantees of life and future participation in the society. The conditional surrender of the FDR must be urged to bring to an end the unnecessary death and suffering they are imposing on the Salvadorean people.

The focus on land reform as a condition for continued U.S. aid to El Salvador must be carefully put into context not only for El Salvador's case but for the signal we are sending to our other Latin American friends. The land reform, the nationalization of the banking system, and the state control of the sales and marketing of El Salvador's major and traditional exports were in the late 1970's political steps to defuse an explosive social condition. The blueprints for these reforms were based upon a set of circumstances that existed at that time but which with the evolution of the past few years, including the successful implementation of the key purposes of the reforms and especially the demonstration of March 28 elections, do not continue and now have placed the U.S. ironically in defense of a highly socialist program not compatible with U.S. principles. The Salvadorean government continues to consolidate the reform program. The real threat to its progress is from the Marxist-Leninists through their open and declared war on the national economy and their continued undermining of the security and well-being of the rural communities. In spite of the "Scared Cow" image imposed on the reforms, U.S. policy makers must reassess them in the context of reality in El Salvador of 1983 and not El Salvador of 1978 when they were supported by the Carter Administration. Within the land reform movement, if anything is necessary at this moment, it is to guarantee the people of El Salvador the basic human right of ownership of private property and to do so *without reversing* the rights of ownership to the new land reform beneficiaries. Flexibility is required to give the reforms the opportunity they need to become adaptable, realistic and productive under the present set of circumstances.

A reform rarely emphasized, but yet the most important, is the democratic pluralism being developed within El Salvador. This has been one of the principal goals of American Foreign policy towards El Salvador, and while it has demonstrated growing pain, its existence is evidence of political progress.

Economically, El Salvador can not support all the task before it alone. History shows that El Salvador has never been an aid burden on the people of the United States. Aid, even now, is considered by the people of this country as short term help. El Salvador's record as the most productive country in the region with the least natural resources will be reconfirmed once peace is established and the CBI is implemented. But very serious and long lasting problems at a much higher price in lives, immigration problems and aid will face the U.S. in the neighboring countries if this specific economy, a benchmark for the hemisphere, is allowed to collapse. The aid given to El Salvador, even though limited, in the last couple of years has accomplished a great deal. The economy daily being damaged by the FDR is still providing jobs and the private enterprise system has demonstrated endurance. Political pluralism, a freely legally elected government and widespread social awareness all have emerged to alleviate the anarchy and turmoil which plagued El Salvador before a U.S. began providing assistance. Much more assistance is needed to improve the economy, to discourage the marxist-leninist and to bring the needed social development through jobs, until the benefits derived from the CBI trade package can materialize.

When summarizing about El Salvador, one should remember the worlds of Oliver Wendell Holmes: "The great thing in this world is not so much where we are, but in what direction we are moving."

El Salvador is moving in the right direction and progress depends on our ability to support it in stopping those who have declared themselves against our values. Our political, economical and military support will insure that El Salvador's developing and fragile democracy will strengthen, bring the economic and social progress that these people are willing to work for. If our support is stopped or even short of their needs, then El Salvador will fall into Castro's hands. Then what cost will that bring to the U.S.A. in near future and what will our "bottom line" look like before the world?

THE PEOPLE'S PARADISE

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

• Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, some form of socialism/communism is dominant in many nations and every continent. The idea of socialism is especially attractive to intellectuals who are able to maintain a comfortable distance from actual socialist practices.

Though socialism is a god that fails continuously, and causes more human suffering and tragedy than any idea or practice in history, there are those who stubbornly cling to its high-minded idealism. They religously close up their eyes to the reality that the socialist promise of instant utopia brings only the tyranny of a real dystopia.

It is for them that the following glimpse of reality is provided.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 20, 1983]

ERASING A PEOPLE'S HISTORY

(By Albert Wass)

Bulldozers roar and old brick houses crumble under the pounding of the giant wreckers in the outskirts of the ancient Hungarian city of Kolozsvár in Transylvania—now a part of Communist Romania. Six-century-old hand-carved stone portals proudly showing the name of the builder and the year the house was built fall into dust. Dictator Ceausescu's regime does not tolerate historic landmarks. The Hungarian past must go.

In 1382 the commander of Kolozsvára, the Fort of Kolozs, a wise man by the name of András Pethó, moved 32 Hungarian families from his Maros valley estate to rich bottom land next to the fort to raise vegetables, poultry and hogs. He gave them about 1,000 acres of land and built a village which was named in the 15th century by German merchants "Hoch-stadt" (High Town), changed to suit the Hungarian tongue into Hóstát.

Over the centuries, the hard-working people of the settlement fed the growing town with vegetables, fruits, milk, and poultry. As Kolozsvár became the cultural and administrative center of Eastern Hungary, they established their own landmarks there and engraved their deeds into history. After six centuries of honest and frugal labor, the new and intolerant regime of Romanian dictator Ceausescu decided to remove them from the face of the earth as an affronting landmark of Transylvania's Hungarian past.

Though their lands were taken by the state in 1946, the sturdy farmers held on to their way of life, turning their small back yards into intensively cultivated gardens. Nevertheless, the heavy hand of the rulers fell upon them anyhow.

There was no place for Hungarians in Romania, and no place for independent workers under the communist system. Block by block, the famous old Hostat was demolished to yield space for apartment houses built for the thousands of "first class" citizens, Romanians, moved into the newly acquired province from the East with the purpose of changing the Hungarian character of this ancient city.

The people of Hostat were loaded into trucks, like cattle, and dumped somewhere in old-romania, where language as well as culture was foreign to them. Those who tried to resist were beaten and sent to forced labor camps. In their new environments, the Hungarians were strangers and destitute. Old-age pensions were refused under the pretext that they were not laborers but "capitalists" who owned their own land. Many died of hunger and cold. Others took their own lives as an escape.

In the first week of December 1982, a full 600 years after their forefathers established themselves on the land with the purpose of feeding the city of Kolozsvar—known today as Clug—the last 16 families of once-prosperous Hostat were dragged out of their homes, loaded into trucks and driven away.

According to an eyewitness, there was an old man among them named Sandor Bognar, who begged Romanian police sergeant to allow him one last favor. In his yard stood an old stone monument with the inscription:

"Here Stood King Mathias The Just And Swapped Jokes With The Humble Owner Of This Home Ambrus Bognar, Anno Domini 1468."

The old man wanted to take that old stone with him, wherever he had to go.

The sergeant rudely refused his request and kicked him in the groin. The old man fell, but got up and reached for an axe. He was shot to death, his body thrown in the truck midst his horrified family and driven away. But not too far, just some 15 miles to the top of the Felek ridge. There the truck stopped and the Bognar family was ordered off into knee-deep snow. They were left there with the old man's body, in the middle of nowhere, to die.

Officially nobody seems to know what happened to them. But the rumor is that some good people from one of the nearby villages took them in and hid them from the police. But this is only hearsay, of course. Nevertheless, the fact is that in one of the abandoned old cemeteries up there on the slope of the Felek there is a new grave with a strange stone laid flat over it.

On the top it says "Here Rests Old Sandor." Nothing more. But on the bottom, hidden from sight, there is supposed to be more. Something about a king who swapped jokes with simple peasants, back in the olden days, when socialism was not yet invented.●

REPEAL WITHHOLDING TAX ON INTEREST NOT DIVIDENDS

HON. C. ROBIN BRITT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BILL HEFNER and I are introducing legislation that would repeal the withholding of taxes on interest by banking institutions but would not repeal the existing law providing for withholding of taxes on dividends. After careful study, I have concluded that the interest withholding provision creates an undue burden, especially on the small saver and the elderly. Additionally, it creates an administrative nightmare for banks, savings and loans, and credit unions.

Much of the initial revenue from the withholding measure comes from the Government's use of taxpayers' money—roughly one-half in fiscal year 1984. This is especially unfair to those who will receive refunds at the end of the year. Although there are exemption provisions to cure this problem, filing an exemption is an unfamiliar, complicated, and uncertain process and many, especially the elderly, will not pursue this procedure.

At the same time, given the size of the Federal deficits, we must be hesitant to adopt measures that reduce revenues. For this reason, the bill introduced today, unlike other bills to repeal the withholding provisions enacted by the last Congress, would not repeal the withholding of taxes on dividends. Dividend withholding poses fewer inequities. Dividend withholding is much easier to administer and that provision has much less impact on the elderly and those with limited income. Preserving the dividend withholding provision would save the Federal Government roughly $8 billion between 1983 and 1987. Dividend withholding accounted for roughly 40 percent of the revenues projected from the combined withholding on interest and dividends.

Efforts to repeal both interest and dividend withholding are gaining momentum in Congress. The bill we have introduced today strikes a new balance between fairness and preservation of revenues. It is a more fiscally responsible measure.●

SUPPORT OF THE CONSUMER DEBTOR BANKRUPTCY AMEND- MENTS ACT OF 1983

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, the Honorable MIKE SYNAR, and others, in introducing the Consumer Debtor Bankruptcy Amendments Act of 1983. This legislation, which is important to working people in this country who depend on unsecured credit at reasonable rates, would amend certain provisions of the Federal Bankruptcy Code which have had the unintended effect of making it more difficult for the average consumer to find and afford consumer loans. This is badly needed legislation that will benefit both consumers and creditors.

Mr. Speaker, since their inception, our Nation's bankruptcy laws have signaled a compassion for honest debtors who, often for reasons beyond their control, are unable to meet their debts. At times, the loss of employment or other unexpected misfortunes can make the repayment of consumer loans impossible for the most well-intentioned borrower, and a discharge in straight bankruptcy under chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code has traditionally provided such a borrower an opportunity for a fresh start. This fresh-start concept has been one of the hall-marks of our bankruptcy system, and it has worked well for over a century, allowing individuals to reorder their lives when faced with a burden of debt which they could not repay.

In 1978, the Congress considered and approved a series of beneficial changes to the Bankruptcy Code designed, in large part, to strengthen and refine the basic protections offered to consumer debtors. Many of these changes were specifically designed to increase the protections available to individuals who, due to no fault of their own, could not afford to meet all of their debts and needed a fresh start. Most of these changes were, and still are, needed. But I also believe that in several instances the Congress may have created unintended incentives for individuals to invoke the protections of straight bankruptcy where other options may be available.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that most debtors who seek a discharge of their financial obligations under chapter 7 have little prospect of paying any reasonable portion of their debts. A consumer debtor's continuing obligation to support himself and his family frequently exhausts his available income, and the debtor will often not have sufficient current or future discretionary income left after satisfying these basic living expenses. No purpose is served by continuing to burden such debtors with legal obligations they simply cannot satisfy. On the other hand, there are a substantial percentage of debtors who are not financially incapacitated at the time of filing bankruptcy, and for whom a discharge in bankruptcy constitutes a headstart rather than a fresh start. It is the increasing chapter 7 filings of these debtors that are causing problems for the credit industry and, indirectly, problems for unsecured debtors who are already finding it more difficult to secure consumer credit.

This problem is particularly acute for the young, and minority, and low-income borrowers who may not enjoy the advantages of owning their own home or other collateral necessary to secure a consumer loan. As losses from unnecessary bankruptcies—estimated by some to be between $1.5 and $1.6 billion annually—cause lenders to tighten eligibility standards, renters and others without substantial collateral will find it is increasingly difficult to obtain credit at reasonable rates. Clearly, this was not the intent of the 1978 reforms.

These concerns, Mr. Speaker, were extensively documented in hearings last year before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law, and I know that they are shared by a number of my colleagues. The Consumer Debtor Bankruptcy Amendments Act builds upon that record as well as the recommendations of the National Bankruptcy Commission by incorporating a series of reforms intended to correct the problems which I have described, while preserving the integrity and purpose of the Federal bankruptcy system. The legislation also builds upon and improves on last year's consumer bankruptcy reform bill, H.R. 4786, which, among its provisions, contained the so-called future-income-threshold test.

Under the terms of the future-income-test provisions, a creditor and others in a bankruptcy proceeding were permitted to raise the issue of whether, given his likely future income, a consumer debtor was properly seeking relief under chapter 7's straight bankruptcy provisions or whether resort to the payment rearrangement provisions of chapter 13 was more appropriate. Although these provisions were intended only as a means of preventing abuses of chapter 7 procedures, some feared that the future-income test would afford creditors an opportunity to harass consumer debtors. It was argued that it would have allowed creditors to determine whether in fact a debtor could discharge his debts and get a fresh start. The consumer debtor bankruptcy legislation eliminates these future-income provisions so that there can be no question regarding potential creditor abuse. Under the bill being introduced today, only the bankruptcy judge would be able to move to abstain from or dismiss a chapter 7 proceeding, where to permit it to continue would constitute an abuse of the Bankruptcy Code. Creditor involvement in that process is eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, the consumer debtor bankruptcy bill makes a number of other needed reforms to our bankruptcy laws. It would enhance the Congress ability to oversee the bankruptcy system by providing for the collection of important statistical information; it would create standards for court confirmation of repayment plans; and it would eliminate costly and unnecessary bankruptcy procedures. In addition, the legislation would address the many pressing problems faced by our farmers during grain-elevator-bankruptcy proceedings.

I am pleased to join my colleagues, the Honorable MIKE SYNAR, BARNEY FRANK, GILLIS LONG, BUTLER DERRICK, DICK GEPHARDT, VIC FAZIO, BILL McCOLLUM, TRENT LOTT, HAL DAUB, HAL SAWYER, and BILL EMERSON, in introducing this legislation. This is an important bill that is badly needed by both creditors and consumer debtors. I hope it will be given swift and favorable consideration in the Congress.●

SELECTION OF BISHOP JOSEPH F. MAGUIRE OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., AS RECIPIENT OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY AWARD BY THE ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE COMMITTEE OF HOLYOKE, MASS.

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I come before my colleagues today to share my thoughts on the recent selection of Bishop Joseph F. Maguire of the diocese of Springfield as the 1983 recipient of the John F. Kennedy Award by the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee of Holyoke. The coveted award is presented each year to an American of Irish descent "whose life and career have made an indelible and noble impact upon society."

Bishop Maguire was installed as prelate of Springfield on November 4, 1977 as leader of a diocese that includes most of my First Congressional District. He is a nationally recognized spiritual leader and holds a number of prestigious positions in the church. They include national spiritual adviser of the Holy Name Society and trustee of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C.

The admiration and respect that I have for Bishop Maguire was instilled in me when I first read the address he gave on the day of his installation. He said, "We must root out from our hearts injustice, prejudice, and discrimination." He has proven over the past 5½ years as bishop of Springfield, that he practices what he preaches. All of us should learn from his words of wisdom and from his living witness of kindness, understanding and inspiration.

It is evident that his spirituality is an inborn instinct, for by nature, he is a very humble man with a great sensitivity to people in need. He is delighted to be called to visit the sick and he was eager to assist in the establishment of the soup kitchens in Springfield and Holyoke.

Bishop Maguire is a gentle man and relishes the opportunity to be with children. In church, he often pauses on his way to the altar to pat a child on the head or to pay a compliment to the child. He is a very friendly man with an attractive personality and gets along easily with strangers because of his warm smile and natural, homey attitude. His lifelong involvement with sports, both as participant and observer, epitomizes much; he enjoys playing as much as winning; he thrills at the process regardless of the outcome. As a fan, he cheers for an underdog and is jubilant in another's victory. Whoever wins, the game is important because of the people he meets there.

All who know him rejoice at this honor given to Bishop Maguire. The conferring of the John F. Kennedy Award says publicly what so many feel—it is good to give praise to this man of God who is a man of the people.●

MBFR: THE WESTERN PROPOSAL

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, hardly a day passes in which the Soviet Union fails to charge the United States with foot-dragging in the arms control arena. Such unfounded allegations are often picked up by Western journalists without critical commentary. This leaves many American readers with the impression that the Soviet position is accurate. I believe we must set the record straight on this crucial subject.

As all of you know, in 1973, the United States was instrumental in initiating the ongoing Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions talks (MBFR) in central Europe. These talks involve the 12 members of NATO and 7 Warsaw Pact countries.

The nations of the West rightly believe that the seemingly endless buildup by the East of a wide variety of arms in central Europe must be addressed and, hopefully, reduced. The West's goal is to attempt to reduce tensions with the Soviets and its allies through a reduction in ground forces and the establishment of manpower parity at lower levels.

The key issue which has to be addressed is the significant Eastern superiority in ground forces. This imbalance has been a major destabilizing factor in the military situation between East and West for a number of years. The elimination of this imbalance would reduce the risk of war in Europe.

Lest we forget, it was the Warsaw Pact, not NATO, which initially upset the balance of forces in central Europe. Over the years, the pact deployed 57 divisions and a total of about 960,000 ground force personnel. This level dwarfs NATO's 25 divisions and 800,000 men. The buildup gives the East a superiority of 160,000 men which the Warsaw Pact claims is rough parity in manpower.

Since 1973, the West has presented many proposals to the Warsaw Pact. As of this date, no troop cuts have been made. On June 10, 1982, the President announced a new NATO initiative to seek common collective ceilings in the reductions area. The latest Western proposal calls for a single comprehensive agreement. Under that agreement, all direct participants, with major military formations in central Europe, would assume contractual obligations to undertake ground force reductions. These cuts in strength levels would continue to a common ceiling on each side of about 700,000 ground personnel and 900,000 ground and air force personnel combined. Reductions would be accomplished in four fully verifiable stages within 7 years. A detailed program of verification and inspection was appropriately included as a prerequisite to an agreement of this nature.

One of the critical points of disagreement between the parties is the large discrepancy between the two sides' figures on Eastern manpower. A difference in manpower can turn the tide in a conflict. Another factor is that Warsaw Pact divisions are equipped with more tanks and artillery than comparable Western units.

Quite properly, the West has insisted on a resolution of this troop data problem as the basis for an agreement on the size of reductions needed to reach parity. NATO has full confidence in Western force figures and continues to insist that an agreement be based on agreed data. It is widely known that the initial troop strength data submitted by the Warsaw Pact was contrived to understate the Warsaw Pact's actual troop levels. Although the West has offered several detailed proposals to resolve the discrepancy, the East has refused to budge.

The second area of difficulty is that the West believes that reductions be accompanied by thorough inspections and monitoring. These would help insure verification of, and future compliance with, the agreements. The Warsaw Pact has difficulties with many aspects of the verification process.

Considering the lack of good faith which the Pact has displayed on the troop strength levels, and the East's reluctance to accept the concept of permanent onsite inspection measures, I can understand why the West's efforts to bring about troop reductions have been unsuccessful. Let those who question NATO's intentions take a look at the record and at the facts.

It is the Soviets and their allies who should be charged with foot-dragging over arms control. Most importantly, when the Soviets have a military advantage, as they do in conventional troop and arms strength in central Europe, they are apt to prolong that advantage. That is why they have indeed frozen MBFR negotiations for more than a decade and why they prefer a freeze on strategic weapons today. They are the ones who have launched a new round of nuclear weapons deployments. They are the ones whose basic philosophy preaches world revolution and Communist domination, and they are the ones who made a mockery of the Helsinki accords.

I am certain that many of my colleagues in Congress will join me in saying that the Kremlin has little respect for agreements of any kind. Let the negotiator beware.●

LEADER OF YWCA

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Gay Dickerson, executive director of the YWCA of White Plains and Central Westchester County, N.Y., on the occasion of her retirement.

Gay has made an immeasurable contribution to the work of the YWCA since becoming executive director in 1966. She presided over the Y's movement from a small house with a membership in the hundred's to a modern facility with a membership in the thousand's. In addition, the Y achieved broader representation throughout the county.

During Ms. Dickerson's tenure, the YWCA developed many valuable programs to aid various groups in need of special services. Handicapped people are able to lead full lives with the Y's swimming and social programs. Senior citizens find vital social contact in the summer weekend program. An outreach program helps disadvantaged young women, and a residence facility built in the early 1970's provides needed housing for 168 young women. Finally, to provide help urgently needed by today's women in the job market, the Y sponsors a VISTA counseling service, free of charge for those unable to pay.

Despite the financial crises which plague nonprofit organizations, especially in this time of recession, the YWCA has remained solvent, due in large part to the able leadership of Gay Dickerson. Ms. Dickerson's dedication to the vital work of the YWCA enabled the organization to carry out its programs smoothly and effectively, providing enormous benefits to the community. While her leadership will be sorely missed, the people of Westchester can rest assured that, thanks to Ms. Dickerson, the YWCA has a stable and secure future.●

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD'S DEBT PROBLEM

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

• Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, many of us are concerned about the pending proposal by the administration to increase the resources of the International Monetary Fund. In the course of my study of this most important issue, I have found several informative newspaper articles and columns, which I have inserted into the RECORD recently.

Today I would like to recommend to my colleagues and the American people an article written by Treasury Secretary Donald Regan, which addresses the major criticisms of the proposal. I believe that each of us would do well to carefully consider both his concise explanation of the international financial system and his persuasive answers to the specific questions that we receive from our constituents.

I appreciate President Reagan's concerted effort to bring this message to all of us, and I again recommend to all Secretary Regan's February 8, 1983, article in the Wall Street Journal, which follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD'S DEBT PROBLEM

(By Donald T. Regan)

International negotiations for an increase in the resources of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are nearing completion and final decisions are expected at the Feb. 10-11 IMF Interim Committee meeting in Washington. The administration will soon send a request to Congress providing for the American share of that increase.

Why is it so important that those resources be increased? The answer lies in the importance to the U.S. economy of a sound world economy and financial system. The answer also lies in the central role of the IMF in resolving current economic problems.

The major strains in the international financial system which emerged in 1982 had their roots in the rising inflationary pressures in the late 1960s, the twin oil shocks of the 1970s, and policy responses that attempted to avoid adjustment to new economic realities. Many governments sought to maintain real incomes and employment in uncompetitive industries by subsidies rather than pursue policies to counter inflationary pressures and reallocate resources to reflect new competitive conditions. The results of these policies were higher inflation, slower real economic growth, and large balance of payments deficits and external financial requirements.

'WRENCHING DIFFICULTIES'

The bulk of the external financing was provided through private markets—largely commercial banks—and was heavily concentrated on the developing countries. During 1982, however, financial markets began to recognize that the inflationary environment of the 1970s was changing and that inflation expectations were undergoing a dramatic shift. Therefore, levels of debt which had previously been considered manageable are now viewed as high in real terms and large in the face of weak export prices and slow world economic growth.

The nature of these difficulties has been known for some time. In addressing the annual meeting of the World Bank and the IMF a year and a half ago, I said that, "The United States is deeply aware of the wrenching difficulties facing many of the countries . . ., and we are conscious of our responsibilities for shaping and supporting the efforts of the Fund and the World Bank."

But with our own country just beginning to come out of a serious recession, there is a very natural tendency to feel that "other nations' problems are other nations' problems." It is tempting to conclude: The countries with the big debts and the banks got themselves into this mess; let them get themselves out.

For the sake of discussion, what would happen if the U.S. did, in fact, adopt a "hand-off" attitude toward the international debt problems?

The American economy functions within an increasingly interdependent world economy. Exports of goods and services as a share of U.S. gross national product doubled between 1970 and 1979, accounting for about 12% of GNP. At present, roughly 20% of all goods produced in the U.S. and 40% of our agricultural production go into export. We no longer live—if we ever did—in a world where adversity in the economy of a foreign country will not impact on the United States.

This year, if lenders were to pull back sharply in the absence of any interest or action on the part of the major industrial countries, new lending could begin to dry up. Trade would consequently have to be reduced to match the new lower level of external financing. For the United States, growth would be about one percentage point less than we're expecting, and our trade deficit would grow very rapidly due to the loss of $12 billion or so in exports to the developing world. Lost jobs in vital export sectors would compound our recovery efforts.

And what if the debtor nations cannot service their debts? If interest payments to U.S. banks are more than 90 days late, the banks stop accruing them on their books, they suffer reduced profits and bear the costs of continued funding of the loan. Provisions may have to be made for loss, and as loans are actually written off, the capital of the bank is reduced. In that case the creditors banks' capital/asset ratios would shrink. American banks would then have to take measures to restore their capital/asset ratios. Banks would be forced to make fewer loans to all borrowers, domestic and foreign. Auto loans in Cincinnati, housing loans in Dallas, capital expansion loans in California—all would be affected.

And this phenomenon wouldn't be limited to us. Banks in Europe, Japan and elsewhere would be forced to curtail their own domestic lending.

The real goal here is to assure that those nations with large external debts adjust without resort to draconian measures that would create chaos for them and financial instability for everyone else.

Helping nations make that essential adjustment is part of the role of the IMF. The IMF was founded to promote a sound financial framework for the world economy and is at the center of international efforts to deal with current economic and financial problems. The resources of the IMF are available to provide temporary balance of payments financing in support of the efforts of members to restore their external positions to a sustainable basis. The economic policy conditions associated with use of IMF resources are designed to ensure that a country establishes the basis for sustainable domestic economic growth as well as a sustainable external payments position.

The IMF is indeed a fund—a revolving fund to which each member is obligated to provide its currency to the IMF to finance drawings by other countries facing balance of payments needs; each country in turn has a right to draw upon the IMF in case of balance of payments need. The U.S. subscription fo IMF resources has been used many times over the years. In turn the United States is the second largest user of the entire membership! The U.S. drew upon IMF resources 18 times in the 1960s, six times in the 1970s, most recently in 1978, for a total of about $6.5 billion.

The re-emegence of large balance of payments financing needs and growing debt problems has led to a sharp resurgence in requests for IMF financing and it is clear that the IMF's liquidity position will be under serious strain in the near future.

Based on a U.S. initiative, agreement has been reached in principle by the major industrialized nations to establish a contingency borrowing arrangement which could be used to deal with threats to the stability of the system. The existing General Arrangement to Borrow (GAB) in the IMF is being increased to about $19 billion. In addition we are also negotiating an increase in IMF quotas in the range of 40% to 50% which would bring the total quotas up to about $93 billion to $100 billion. The U.S. share of the increase, for both the GAB and quotas, would be $7.5 billion to $8.0 billion.

I have already had some discussions with members of Congress about the coming request for congressional authorization. Several serious and legitimate concerns have been raised.

First, we are asked: Why are we "bailing out the banks"? Didn't they make all those foreign loans with their eyes open? While it makes a snappy headline to say that the fund wants more money to "bail out the banks," the facts are otherwise. The IMF provides assistance to nations which have balance of payments difficulties. It doesn't loan to banks—big or small. It lends to nations—only. But by lending to nations, the IMF serves as a catalyst for continued private lending. In the past few years, for each $1 in IMF financing, the banks have provided roughly $4 in net new financing, Hardly a bailout.

SOUND WORLD ECONOMY NEEDED

The second concern often heard is: Why is the administration urging such a large expenditure of money when it is pushing so hard for a curtailment of domestic spending?

When the U.S. increases its commitment to the IMF, a "line of credit" is established which the fund may draw upon, if needed, in conjunction with commitments provided by other nations. As our line of credit is used, the U.S. receives a corresponding increase in liquid international monetary reserve assets which earn interest. Consequently, our increase in "quotas" doesn't affect budget outlays or the budget deficit, although transfers to and from the U.S. and the IMF affect Treasury borrowing requirements.

Finally, some have asked if we aren't throwing good money after bad unless the borrowing nations have economic growth which will provide the wherewithall to repay.

It is essential that the debtor nations move into a period of economic growth. But the soundness and prosperity of each of the national economies is inextricably linked. It isn't possible to get growth at home unless we have a sound world economy. We are supporting a system of interim funding during a period of transition where nations move away from a "borrowing binge" and onto a firm foundation of sound economic policy and stable growth. That is a difficult process. But the world economy simply must go through it.

It is crucially important to the debtor nations and to our economic interests—to U.S. economic activity, jobs, production and investment—that these problems be dealt with in a constructive and orderly way, and the United States cannot escape playing a leading role in that effort. An effective strategy is in place, and welcome progress is being made. But the strategy will not succeed unattended. The IMF is a central element of the solution, and it is essential that we and others act to assure that it has adequate resources to perform that central role.●

AMERICANISM ESSAY WINNERS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the two prize-winning essays written by two students at Sabal Palm Elementary School in North Miami Beach, Fla.

The grand prize winner is Elaine Goldenberg of the sixth grade, and the runnerup is Gary Seligman, a fifth grader. This annual contest is important in getting our young people to reflect on what our great country has to offer, and I am pleased to have provided two flags to Sabal Palm Elementary School to be presented to the essay contest winners.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Elaine and Gary on their excellent essays.

Their prize-winning entries, written as letters to the President, follow:

SABAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
North Miami Beach, Fla.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I love my country. I guess one reason I love it is because I was born here, and have lived here all my life. Everybody has a certain amount of patriotism.

There are other very good reasons, of course. America is, and always has been, a model democracy that the rest of the world follows. The initiative and ingenuity of its people have made our lives better. This country has courage and foresight.

America is the great melting pot. Many people from other countries have come here, forsaking their homeland for the promise of America whose streets are "paved with gold." Here they can be the person they want to be.

We have our faults, everyone does, but I wouldn't live anywhere else.

Sincerely yours,

ELAINE GOLDENBERG,
Grade 6, Mrs. Sherg's class.

SABAL PALM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
North Miami Beach, Fla.,
February 2, 1983.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I love my country because I can do things I couldn't do in other countries, like speak out against our government, give my views and opinions, and various other things.

Through the 206-year history of our country, we have fought wars, passed laws, and established organizations to protect our freedom.

Freedom and equality are what this country thrives on. They are also essentials in every person's life—America is one of only a few countries where your rights demand your freedom to do and say what you think is right.

Probably in the near future we will have to fight for our freedom, but if we band together and carry out our duties as good citizens, we will not need to fear!

Sincerely,

GARY SELIGMAN,
Grade 5, Mr. Monday's class.●

THE NEW AMERICAN GOLD COINS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, when it delivered its report to the Congress, the U.S. Gold Commission recommended that Congress enact legislation to resume the minting of gold coins, which ended in 1933. The Commission wrote:

> We favor Treasury issue of gold bullion coins of specified weights, and without dollar denomination or legal tender status, to be manufactured from its existing stock of gold and to be sold at a small mark-up over the market value of the gold content, and recommend that the coins shall be exempt from capital gains taxes and that the coins shall be exempt from sales taxes.

I have introduced the "American Eagle Gold Coin Act of 1983," H.R. 1663, which provides for the minting of two coins bearing the same design, but each containing a different weight of gold: One ounce and one-half ounce.

The coins would be denominated by weight only, just as the first American gold coins were. The first U.S. gold coin, the $5 half eagle, bore no dollar denomination from 1795 to 1806. The early $10 eagles carried no dollar denominations until 1838. The new American Gold Eagles would wisely continue this same practice.

The design of the new American Eagle would be the figure of "Walking Liberty" from the 1908 St. Gaudens' double eagle on the obverse, and on the reverse, the heraldic eagle of the Great Seal of the United States.

As official coins of the United States, the new American Eagles would not be sold as the gold medallions minted under the American Arts Medallions Act are, but exchanged for other official currencies of the United States through the banking system. Just as with Federal Reserve notes and the present clad coinage, there would be no tax imposed on the exchange of such coins. The new gold coins would be acceptable in the settlement of private debts, just like any other official money, but unlike other moneys, the coins would not be acceptable in payment of any Federal taxes, duties, or dues.

The coins could be minted from the Treasury's own stock of gold, up to a maximum of 10 million ounces, and any owner of gold bullion or foreign gold coins would be able to deliver them to a mint of the United States and receive in exchange an equal weight of American Eagles.

Under Article I, section 8 of the Constitution, the Congress is given power "to coin money." The meaning of this phrase is clear, but Congress has been ignoring it for the past 70 years, ever since it delegated power to the Federal Reserve System to print money and create credit ex nihilo. For those 70 years we have had the worst depression, inflations, unemployment, recessions, bankruptcy, and interest rates in our history. Nothing we suffered with an imperfect gold standard during the 19th century can compare to the damage our economy has sustained under the management of the Federal Reserve.

The authors of the Constitution wrote article 1, section 8 precisely for the purpose of outlawing the type of monetary system we now have.

When the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution in the summer of 1787, they had fresh in their minds the debacle of the paper money printed and issued by the Continental Congress during the Revolutionary War. The paper notes, "Continentals" as they were called, eventually fell to virtually zero percent of their original value because they were not redeemable in either silver or gold. They were "greenbacks," and were the first of three major experiments with "greenbacks" that this Nation has conducted. The Continental greenback failed miserably, giving rise to the popular phrase "not worth a Continental."

Consequently, when the Constitutional Convention met in 1787, the opposition to paper money was strong. George Mason, a delegate from Virginia, stated that he had a "mortal hatred to paper money." Delegate Oliver Ellsworth from Connecticut thought the Convention "a favorable moment to shut and bar the door against paper money." James Wilson, a delegate from Pennsylvania, argued that "It will have a more salutary influence on the credit of the United

States to remove the possibility of paper money." Delegate Pierce Butler from South Carolina pointed out that paper was not a legal tender in any country of Europe and that it ought not be made one in the United States. Mr. John Langdon of New Hampshire said that he would rather reject the whole Constitution than allow the Federal Government the power to issue paper money. On the final vote on the issue, nine States opposed granting the Federal Government power to issue paper money, and only two favored granting such power.

The framers of the Constitution made their intention clear by the use of the word "coin" rather than the word "print," or the phrase "emit bills of credit." Thomas M. Cooley's "Principles of Constitutional Law" elaborates on this point:

To coin money is to stamp pieces of metal for use as a medium of exchange in commerce according to fixed standards of value.

In his explanation of the constitutional provisions on money, James Madison, in Federalist No. 44, referred to the

Pestilent effects of paper money on the necessary confidence between man and man, on the necessary confidence in the public councils, on the industry and morals of the people, and on the character of republican government.

His intention, and the intention of the other Founders, was to avoid precisely the sort of paper money system that has prevailed for the past 10 years.

This intention was well understood throughout the 19th century, and was denied only when the Supreme Court found it expedient to do so. For example, Daniel Webster wrote:

If we understand, by currency, the legal money of the country, and that which constitutes a lawful tender for debts, and is the statute measure of value, then undoubtedly, nothing is included but gold and silver. Most unquestionably, *there is no legal tender, and there can be no legal tender in this country under the authority of this government or any other, but gold and silver,* either the coinage of our mints or foreign coins at rates regulated by Congress. *This is a constitutional principles, perfectly plain and of the very highest importance.* The states are expressly prohibited from making anything but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts, and although no such expressed prohibition is appplied to Congress, yet as Congress has no power granted to it in this respect but to coin money and to regulate the value of foreign coins, *it clearly has no power to substitute paper or anything else* for coin as a tender in payment of debts in a discharge of contracts. . .

The legal tender, therefore, the constitutional standard of value, is established and cannot be overthrown. *To overthrow it would shake the whole system.* (Emphasis added.)

In 1832, the Select Committee on Coins of the House of Representatives reported to the Congress that:

The enlightened founders of our Constitution obviously contemplated that our currency should be composed of gold and silver coin . . . . The obvious intent and meaning of these special grants and restrictions [in the Constitution] was to secure permanently to the people of the United States a gold or silver currency, and to delegate to Congress every necessary authority to accomplish or perpetuate that beneficial institution.

The select committee states its conclusion that:

The losses and deprivation inflicted by experiments with paper currency, especially during the Revolution; the knowledge that similar attempts in other countries . . . were equally delusive, unsuccessful, and injurious; had likely produced the conviction [in the minds of the framers of the Constitution] that gold and silver alone could be relied upon as safe and effective money.

Twelve years later, in 1844, the House Committee of Ways and Means concluded that:

The framers of the Constitution intended to avoid the paper money system. Especially did they intend to prevent Government paper from circulating as money, as had been practiced during the Revolutionary War. The mischiefs of the various expedients that had been made were fresh in the public mind, and were said to have disgusted the respectable part of America . . . The framers [of the Constitution] . . . designed to prevent the adoption of the paper system under any pretext or for any purpose whatsoever; and if it had not been supposed that such object was effectively secured, in all probability the rejection of the Constitution might have followed.

Later in the century, Justice Stephen Field presciently wrote in the case *Julliard* against *Greenman* (1884):

There have been times within the memory of all of us when the legal tender notes of the United States were not exchangeable for more than half of the nominal value. The possibility of such depreciation will always attend paper money. This inborn infirmity, no mere legislative declaration can cure. If Congress has the power to make the [paper] notes legal tender and to pass as money or its equivalent why should not a sufficient amount be issued to pay the bonds of the United States as they mature? Why pay interest on the millions of dollars of bonds now due when Congress can in one day make the money to pay the principal; and why should there be any restraint upon unlimited appropriations by the government for all imaginary schemes of public improvement if the printing press can furnish the money that is needed for them?

Justice Field foresaw exactly what would happen in the 20th century when the Federal Government has used the printing press—and the computer—as the means of financing all sorts of "imaginary schemes of public improvement."

Under the Constitution, Congress has power to coin money, not print money substitutes. Such money is to be gold and silver coin, nothing else. It is significant that this power of coining money is mentioned in the same sentence in the Constitution as the power to "fix the standards of weights and measures," for the framers regarded money as a weight of metal and a measure of value. Roger Sherman, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, wrote that:

If what is used as a medium of exchange is fluctuation in its value, it is no better than unjust weights and measures . . . which are condemned by the Laws of God and man . . .

For decades now, but especially for the past 10 years, we have had a medium of exchange, the Federal Reserve note, which is "fluctuating in its value" and therefore "no better than unjust weights and measures * * * which are condemned by the Laws of God and man." With the issuance of new gold coins by the Treasury, the Federal Reserve's monopoly on money will be challenged. H.R. 1663 represents a major step toward the eventual replacement of our present irredeemable paper money system with a gold based system.

NO JUSTIFICATION FOR NATURAL GAS DEREGULATION

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

• Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration is trying to add billions of dollars to consumers' home heating bills, and I say their efforts should be rejected firmly and strongly by Congress.

The natural gas deregulation plan sent to Capitol Hill this week would mean the following:

First. The home heating bill of every natural gas consumer would take a strong jump upward; probably stronger than the extra $13 to $20 billion the Northeast-Midwest Coalition estimates homeowners had to pay this winter because of back-door deregulation attempts;

Second. More businesses will be strapped by high energy costs, a factor that is forcing many industries in the Northeast and Midwest to shut down, and that resulted in a coalition estimate in some 300,000 jobs lost this winter;

Third. A major drag will be added to economic recovery; high energy prices helped produce this recession, now that prices are beginning to moderate and some recovery is in evidence, it is no time to head in the opposite direction; and

Fourth. At the very time when we have near record high unemployment throughout the country, this plan would take extra money out of the pocket of unemployed families. At my office hours, I meet each week with individuals who must make a choice between eating or heating the house. That whole situation is unacceptable, and would be made more so with this deregulation.

The 1978 legislation was carefully crafted to preserve a balance between the need to increase prices to lessen a natural gas shortage, plus protection for the consumer. Where changes are now necessary in the law, let us make them in the same spirit. I am not saying the law cannot be improved to benefit all parties, I am saying that deregulation will not benefit all groups, and that is not the way to go.

In Pennsylvania, in 1981, some 26,035 consumers had their natural gas service terminated because of an inability to pay their bills; from 1978 to 1981, the average statewide residential natural gas bill rose from $264 to $600; thus while a typical Pennsylvanian's income rose only 30 percent in the last 4 years, the cost of his natural gas bill was rising 127 percent. And all those figures were before the increase of this winter.

To raise prices drastically higher by deregulation in the face of those numbers is sheer folly. Deregulation deserves to be rejected. The consumer and the unemployed deserve to be protected. The public deserves the protection that only Congress can provide by rejecting natural gas deregulation. Rejection of this plan is a goal I will be working for very strongly.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that, because of a long-scheduled speaking engagement in my district, I was unavoidably absent during two rollcall votes concerning the Emergency Mathematics and Science Education Act. Had I been present, I would have voted for House Resolution 109, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1310, and I would have voted against the amendment offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER striking the national teaching scholarship program.●

UNITED STATES LOSING GROUND IN COMPUTER EDUCATION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as addressed in H.R. 1310, the Emergency Math and Science Education Act, it is imperative that the Federal Government make a firm commitment to support math and science education. By failing to graduate enough students with advanced computer capabilities, the United States may lose its world lead in computer technology. The following Wall Street Journal article, January 14, 1983, illustrates how the Federal Government must act promptly to bring our schools into the so-called Information Age.

The article follows:

UNIVERSITIES IN UNITED STATES ARE LOSING GROUND IN COMPUTER EDUCATION

(By Carolyn Phillips)

URBANA, ILL.—It hadn't seemed like an impossible dream. After two years at Eastern Illinos University in Charleston, David Gerdes decided to transfer to the University of Illinois here to study computer engineering. He had the science and math courses that the University of Illinois requires for admission. He had good grades from Eastern—almost a B average. He has A's in all his computer-programming classes.

But with qualifications considerably better than average, 20-year-old Mr. Gerdes can't get into computer engineering at Illinois. There isn't room.

Even though overall enrollment is dwindling; U.S. colleges and universities can't accommodate the hordes who want computer education. Good students are denied admission as many schools cap enrollments at levels that already strain teaching staffs and overtax facilities. In fact, some educators say that to guarantee quality instruction, they would have to reduce current enrollments in computer courses by 25%. Meanwhile, employers lament that only 50,000 graduates were available last year to fill more than 115,000 computer-related jobs.

"This country could blow what is a terrific lead in computer technology by failing to graduate enough people with the capability to maintain it," warns Robert G. Gillespie, the vice provost for computing at the University of Washington in Seattle. But without money to augment inadequate facilities and increase staff sizes and salaries, recession-whipped schools will continue to produce insufficient numbers of computer-trained graduates and will fail to effectively introduce the computer as a learning tool in nonquantitative disciplines.

AWKWARD CHOICES

The conditions force would-be students of computer sciences or computer engineering to make some awkward choices. Mr. Gerdes, for instance, is enrolled in the college of arts and sciences at Illinois and is trying to raise his 3.9 grade-point average to 4.2, the current cutoff on the five-point scale for the admission of transfer students into the engineering program. James N. Snyder, the head of computer science at Illinois, calls 4.2 "ridiculously high" as an entrance requirement. The required grade for general admission to Illinois is 3.25.

Mr. Gerdes's chances for admission to engineering at Illinois "are probably diminishing instead of increasing," says Gary R. Engelgau, the director of admissions and records. By the time Mr. Gerdes attains a 4.2, if he ever does, the cutoff point could be pushed higher, as thousands more students continue to compete for the limited number of places. "You have to be a genius to get in," says Mr. Gerdes.

Life on the inside makes other demands—including patience. During peak periods, as at many institutions, students wait hours to use a computer terminal for sometimes just a few minutes. They also stand in long lines to talk to a professor or a teaching assistant about computer assignments. One of the biggest computer-education headaches is that classes fill up so fast students can't always get into the courses they need to graduate; as a result, a traditional four-year term often takes an extra term or two for some students to complete.

Teaching overcrowded classes is no more fun than taking them. "Clearly, the ideal situation would be for me to have two students come to my office and have tea or sherry and talk things over," says C. L. Liu, a professor of computer science at Illinois. Instead of tea for two, Mr. Liu has 200 to teach. He does concede, however, that such a large group isn't necessarily a bad thing. "I think I am able to have some dialogue with large classes. I prepare better for them. I psych up a lot more, and I'm more animated."

WATERED-DOWN EDUCATION

Mark Ardis, an assistant professor at Illinois, taught 18 students in a software-engineering course the first time the class was offered a few semesters ago. The second time the course was offered, 42 students took it. Mr. Ardis recently saw registration figures for the third offering of the class—126 students signed up. "There isn't much change in my presentation of material, whether I'm talking to 10 or 120," Mr. Ardis says. "What changes is the work done by the students. With a smaller group, I assign work I will look at and take an active role in grading. But with so many students, I will now give out assignments that only graduate teaching assistants will see." He adds: "I think you water down the education when enrollment goes up."

The Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology thinks so, too; it granted 31 percent fewer six-year accreditations this school year than last to academic programs in engineering. The board looks at a number of factors—faculty, laboratory facilities, financing and others—in determining whether a program is accredited for six years, three years or not at all.

The University of Illinois has maintained accreditation for its engineering programs. "But we do see a deterioration in quality in a general sense," says Edward Ernst, the school's associate head of electrical engineering. "Faculty overload is the big problem. But we also aren't able to keep up with the equipment we need for general instruction in engineering, especially in the computer areas. It's a matter of having twice the number of students with no additional resources."

Throughout the country, educators marvel at how quickly student use of computer facilities expands to fill available capacity. "It's like the Santa Monica Freeway—expected to handle traffic for 20 years and overrun in one," says Joel Moses, the head of electrical engineering and computer science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Robert Knight, the manager of Stanford University's LOTS (low-overhead time-sharing) computer facility, says, "You'd probably be hard pressed to find a school that is keeping up with student demand for computing capacity. To meet that demand you'd have to spend extraordinary sums of money."

Extraordinary sums of money are being spent on university computer use—$1.3 billion a year, from the most recent estimates. "But more than half of that is for administrative purposes, not instruction or research," says Mr. Gillespie at the University of Washington. The amount spent on academic computer work translates into about $20 per student per year, only one-third the

$60 per student that was recommended in a 1967 report by the president's Science Advisory Council.

Even at the best schools, under-investment in computers for instruction results in penny-pinching compromise. At Stanford, Mr. Knight says, "We're probably a little bit behind the times in terms of whiz-bang hardware," because the computer facility there just bought a second machine identical to the model it bought in 1976. Sticking with the same machines meant the facility could use the same software and staff—two areas where costs are much higher than hardware costs. Although the purchase doubled the capacity of Stanford's LOTS facility, Stanford's vice provost Gerald Lieberman says student use increased accordingly. Mr. Lieberman projects LOTS will have to double capacity again—adding two more machines—in three years, if not sooner.

Most schools tolerate a certain degree of antiquation in the machines they use in general computer-center facilities, citing capacity as the more important concern. (Specific academic departments may buy more modern machines for exclusive research or academic use.) But many schools question whether the limited capabilities of yesteryear's computers are adequate, even for instruction. "We have to give students a sense of what the field is like today, not what it was like 10 years ago," says Kenneth W. Kennedy Jr., professor mathematical sciences at Rice University in Houston.

Providing sheer capacity (enough terminals, enough computer power) constitutes challenge enough for computer-center staffs as they serve the needs of traditional student users—business, science and engineering majors for whom the computer is often the subject of study. But many blanch at the thought of having to provide adequate facilities for all other students, too—students in literature, theater, history, religion, sociology and other disciplines who could use the computer, not for manipulating numbers, but for processing information. Educators see that as the next crest, an innovation in education termed a revolution by some. "But unless something changes drastically, the nation's best universities won't take part in this revolution," says Douglas Van Houweling, the vice provost for computing and planning at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh.

Still, the most pressing problem in computer education is not machine obsolescence or lack of capacity or under-use of computers in nontraditional areas. The toughest problem remains the computer manpower shortage. Because of the short supply, industry offers high salaries that entice students with two-year, four-year or master's degrees into the workplace. So few students continue for the doctoral degree that the pool of people qualified to teach computer courses is drying up.

An American Association of Engineering Societies survey shows that computer-science and computer-engineering departments report a 17 percent vacancy rate—at a time when the 9 percent vacancy of engineering-faculty positions is considered a crisis. Jack Geils, a project director at the association, says that almost two-thirds of the vacancies in the computer-related departments date from a year ago or longer. Mr. Ernst of the University of Illinois adds: "More money alone to hire more faculty in computer science wouldn't help. We can't find anybody."

SALARY DISPARITY

Only about 250 people a year complete doctoral degrees in computer sciences, and that number has been decreasing 6 percent to 8 percent annually, says John Hamblen, a University of Missouri professor on leave to the National Bureau of Standards. In the competition for those graduates, universities lose the salary bid. "A person with a two-year degree can get a programming job for $20,000 to $22,000 a year in industry," estimates Andrew Molnar, a project director at the National Science Foundation. "A person with an eight-year Ph.D. might make $20,000 to $21,000 a year as an assistant professor."

The drawing card that universities once had—an ambiance conducive to scholarly thinking and research—is deteriorating in computer disciplines. Illinois assistant professor Mark Ardis says, "It's hard to stay at a university when there are offers from industry at two or three times your salary and better research equipment, too. And besides teaching and trying to do research here, I advise about 85 students. For the first few weeks of the semester, there is a student outside my door every minute of the day. No one gives tenure for advising students." Mr. Kennedy at Rice warns, "You can't let faculty get buried or they will leave."

Aware that it has been eating its own seed corn, industry has moved to remedy part of the manpower problem in colleges and universities. The American Electronics Association and some of its members—most notably Hewlett-Packard Co. of Palo Alto, Calif.—have developed a fellowship program designed not only to increase the number of doctoral students in computer sciences and electrical engineering but also to encourage the students to take teaching jobs after graduation. (The program waives part of the cost of a doctorate if the graduate takes a university faculty position after receiving a degree and waives the whole cost if the position is held more than three years.)

"We know if we don't make an investment in the development of engineers, then we won't have an industry, at least not one that's competitive internationally," says Patricia Hill Hubbard, president of the American Electronics Association's Electronics Education Foundation. She adds: "We also know that we're already late. We should have been doing this five or six years age."

FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

A number of companies—Xerox, Standard Oil of Indiana, Control Data and others—have introduced fellowship programs, faculty research programs, equipment grants and other means of helping higher education train high-technology workers. Many schools are watching closely a joint venture between International Business Machines Co. and Carnegie-Mellon that will result in each student and staff member at the institution having a computer work station.

Colleges and universities are also beginning to see the necessity of increased support of computer education from within. "They see that a good computing facility is similar to a library. It's something without which a university can't exist," says John G. Kemeny, a professor of mathematics and former president at Dartmouth College in Hanover, N.H. The University of California system attacked the faculty-salary problem directly by raising engineering, business- and management-faculty salaries across the board: 20% for assistant professors, 10% for associate professors and 5% for full professors.

In time, predicts John Hamblen of Missouri, the manpower shortage will work itself out—to a certain extent. he believes that as industry is saturated with two-year-degree holders—as is happening now—more students will go on for the four-year degree. He worries, however, that the process won't correct the doctorate shortage for a long while.

But Mr. Gillespie at the University of Washington questions whether colleges and universities, even with industry help and the factor of time will effectively absorb changes the computer is bringing to education, without some sort of national agenda. "The computer affects the foundations of American education in a way that means we should reexamine how we provide that education." Mr. Gillespie says. "We're floundering right now because there's a need for the federal government to provide resources and information policies. That lack of direction on a national level has us standing at the edge of a cliff."●

LEGISLATION TO GIVE FEDERAL RETIREES A CHANCE TO ELECT OR CHANGE SURVIVOR BENEFITS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, I introduced legislation to give a second chance to Federal retirees who did not elect survivor benefits at the time of their retirement. I also sponsored a bill to give Federal retirees, who elected survivor benefits, a 1-year opportunity to modify their election. The response that our office received to both of these bills was very positive. I am, therefore, today reintroducing comprehensive new legislation which provides for both of these changes.

Under current law, a Federal employee must make his survivor benefit decision at the time of retirement, or if not married at that time, must decide if he or she wants survivor benefits within 1-year from the date of a marriage that occurs after retirement. My legislation would give those Federal retirees, who did not elect survivor benefits, a year from the date of the bill's enactment or date of retirement to elect a survivor benefit. This bill provides for the repayment of the necessary funds to the Federal Government.

Our office has also received correspondence from many retirees who elected survivor benefits in accordance with current law, but whose financial situation has changed. These retirees are no longer satisfied with the survivor benefit decisions that in most cases were made many years ago, and they are now very worried about the security of their loved ones. My bill would give these Federal retirees a single 1 year opportunity to increase, but not to revoke or lower, their survivor benefits.

In order to guarantee that Federal employees and retirees would be informed of these changes, the bill stipulates that the Office of Personnel Management would have to notify all affected employees and retirees of these changes.

During this time of increasing financial pressure on our Federal retirees, passage of this legislation would, with little cost to cur Government, give us an opportunity to help our deserving retirees. There is widespread interest in and support for this legislation among our Federal retirees, and I am hopeful that Congress will consider and pass this legislation during the 98th Congress.●

THE DEMOCRATS LEARN A NEW LANGUAGE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the Democratic Party is taking language lessons and learning—however falteringly—to speak the political language of Ronald Reagan. That, at least, seems to be the substance of a report in the Christian Science Monitor. We have prominent Democrats saying things like:

If you don't make the pie bigger, nobody's going to have a piece . . . we can't go back to the Great Society approach . . . we've got to grow ourselves out of unemployment . . . we (the Democrats) made too many bargains with interest groups . . .

It sounds almost like one of candidate Ronald Reagan's campaign speeches back in 1980. Republicans had better beware. The Democrats may at last have awakened to the fact that their kind of politics and economics needs what one prominent Democrat calls the Reagan rhetoric.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Return of Old Democratic Wisdom—in Modified Form" from the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, February 22, 1983.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 22, 1983]

RETURN OF OLD DEMOCRATIC WISDOM—IN MODIFIED FORM—NEW AGENDA: CREATE JOBS, CONTROL BENEFITS SPENDING, SPUR INVESTMENT

(By Julia Malone)

WASHINGTON.—If a favorite tie or dress goes out of style, hold on to it, the saying goes. Eventually the fashion will come back.

And so it appears with the Democratic Party, which only two years ago was wringing its hands over a disastrous loss of both the White House and the Senate. Democratic ideas, many of which dated from the New Deal, suddenly looked dowdy.

But already Democrats have pulled their old ideas out of the closet again. The party made a comeback during last fall's election with its most traditional themes, social security and jobs. Now it's claiming a victory in persuading President Reagan, the man who trounced them in 1980, to back a federal jobs bill that has a decidedly Democratic look.

In more than a dozen interviews with House and Senate members and officials of two "think tanks" formed to revitalize the party, Democrats conveyed a new mood of self-confidence.

At President Reagan's midterm, many Democrats on Capitol Hill are still reexamining their party's basic tenets and trying to devise new solutions to the nation's economic problems. But for others, the past two years of recession have served mainly to prove that Democrats were right in the first place.

"In 1981 the feeling was one of despair, a feeling that we really had to change everything around," says Rep. James M. Shannon of Massachusetts. "That's past."

The "search for new ideas" in the party has been oversold, he adds. "It's been approached as if it's a treasure hunt where you say, 'Eureka! Here it is.' That's not going to happen."

"We wasted an awful lot of time waiting for lightning to strike," says Sen. Christopher J. Dodd of Connecticut of the idea search. He argues that Democratic ideas are more successful today, but not because Democrats have changed. "The hard facts of life have settled in at the White House," he says. "So Democratic ideas are beginning to emerge draped in Reagan rhetoric."

The freshman Connecticut senator sees one benefit from the two years of questioning the party's values. "Maybe if we hadn't gone through that, maybe we would not have come to realize that some of those principles are good," he says. "Finally we realize that government must play a role in the economic life and social fabric of the nation."

But the experience of the last two years has not left Democrats where it found them. An effort to redefine the party is still under way. "It has started to catch on," says a Democratic staffer. "It's not going to dominate the party in the next two years. But it's where the party is going."

The new direction is away from the "politics of redistribution" of the wealth, established by President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society, and toward investment in economic growth and opportunity, says the staffer. He echoes a sizeable minority on Capitol Hill.

That movement will soon be overshadowed by Democratic candidates for president, who will be dominating the political arena by next summer. But it will have some effect even in presidential politics, since one candidate, Colorado Sen. Gary Hart, has been among the congressional Democrats seeking a new direction for the party.

"There's a new agenda for Democrats," holds Ted Van Dyk, president of the Center for National Policy, one of the think tanks set up in 1981 to invigorate the party. He lists as top priority control of the federal government benefits, including social security, as well as "stable" military growth, a tax policy "that stimulates growth and investment" in the private sector, and better government-labor-business cooperation.

As an adviser to Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey, Mr. Van Dyk witnessed the birth of the Great Society, which once dominated the Democratic agenda. "It used to be based on an ever-growing American pile, LBJ's 'endless cornucopia,'" he says. "All you had to do is have a good idea and there would be enough money to pay for it."

"LBJ candidly told us, "We'll make small beginnings, but nobody will ever turn these [federal benefit programs] back,'" recalls Van Dyk.

"We found we made too many bargains with interest groups," he says. Now that the cornucopia has been depleted, he suggests that Democrats want to control the growth of entitlements, such as social security and medical payments, which go to the middle- and upper-income persons as well as to the poor.

"I think there is a consensus," he says. "It takes the Democrats to address entitlements, as it took Nixon to go to China."

Summing up the past decade of party differences, Rep. Paul Simon of Illinois, author of "The Once and Future Democrats," concedes the need for change. "There was a tendency for Republicans to say, 'We've got to work on making the pie bigger." And for Democrats to say, 'We've got to distribute the pieces of pie equitably.'"

"The Republicans forgot the equitable side," he says, so that even though General Motors Corporation won tax incentives, the company didn't expand, because "if there's no demand for cars, GM doesn't do that."

As for the Democrats, "We have paid a great deal of attention to equity, but we forgot that if you don't talk about making the pie bigger, ultimately nobody is going to have a piece of that pie."

One of the chief proponents of making the economic "pie" grow, Rep. Timothy E. Wirth of Colorado, maintains he sees a "fundamental change among new [Democratic] members" of Congress. Mr. Wirth, a leader of the group nicknamed the "Atari Democrats" (after the manufacturer of computer games), is trying to push the party to look ahead and develop new industry with new technologies.

The Colorado lawmaker led a task force on economic policy for the Democratic caucus in the House that issued a set of proposals last year for long-term economic reforms.

With continuing high unemployment, Wirth concedes, the focus is now on the immediate problems. "When you're in the midst of a very deep recession, what do you do?" He says. "You focus on the people who are hungry, who are running out of employment benefits, or whose health-care benefits are gone. That's just fundamentally Democratic that those things have to be done."

But Wirth moves quickly to the long-range view. "On the second level, we've got to grow ourselves out of unemployment." He cites the need for new jobs for young workers entering the market, adding, "In the meantime, we need to try and get focused on retraining for displaced workers, recognizing first that great numbers of them are just not going to go back to their jobs."

He sees hope in new technologies, which he says go beyond electronics to include better ways to burn coal, new ways to make ceramics, and biotechnology.

"Even in a time of recession . . . there are investments we have to make for ourselves and the future of our country," he says. "We can't sit still." He says he hopes to convince the House Budget Committee, of which he is a member, to add federal money for research, for equipment for university laboratories, and for paying more to develop science, math, and engineering university faculty.

Such ideas have brought some criticism, especially from labor unions. "There's a tension between the pro-efficiency and [pro-] productivity" Democrats and those who are "pro-equity," says Rep. Barney Frank of Massachusetts. Several Democrats say they worry that the new "efficiency" Democrats might be ignoring the traditional allies of the party in urban centers, including the elderly, minorities, and labor.

"People are always threatened by change," says Wirth, although he concedes, "We may be a little too far out front."

"I think what Tim [Wirth] is trying to do is provide some intellectual direction," says Rep. Vic Fazio of California, a new Democrat on the House Budget Committee. "In the long run, we're going to have to have new industry. We have to give the country hope that we have alternatives to providing for these people with public funds."

Newly elected Democrat Sen. Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey goes even further. "Unless there is some kind of new initiative, Democrats run the risk of not being able to capture the roses in '84 because there are obvious signs of recovery," he says. "So unless there are some new ideas and new initiatives, it's possible there will be a change in sentiment in favor of the President."

A self-made millionaire and son of immigrant parents, Senator Lautenberg built up a huge computer business before going into politics. He has been arguing for years that Democrats need more of a business perspective.

Despite his electronics background, he says he disagrees that "high technology is the salvation for all of our economic sins." His argument is that no matter what the industry, "Unless you have a profitable business environment, we're not going to have the jobs."

Sen. Max Baucus of Montana sounds a similar theme. "Democrats realize that if we're going to solve our economic difficulties, we can't go back to the Great Society approach," he says, noting that members of his party are spending "more time listening to the problems of businessmen."

One of those listeners, Sen. George J. Mitchell of Maine, says he has been visiting manufacturers in his state who tell him low demand for products keeps them from growing. "I think our plans should be growth-oriented," he says.

So far, there are many proposals, but no actual Democratic plan, and some say there never will be, at least until the party is united under a Democratic president. But after the rethinking of the past two years, Sen. David Pryor of Arkansas says the party has emerged "tougher, leaner," and more "fiscally responsible."

"It made us assess ourselves so that we do not repeat our past mistakes," he says.●

REMEMBERING YURI ORLOV

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, in 1975, the Government of the U.S.S.R. agreed to the Helsinki Final Act, which committed the signatories to abide by human rights standards. Yuri Orlov, a Soviet research physicist, created the first "Helsinki Watch" group, to monitor his government's compliance with the Helsinki accords. On February 10, 1977, Yuri Orlov was arrested and sentenced to a 7-year sentence.

To commemorate the sixth anniversary of Yuri Orlov's arrest, John B. Oakes wrote the enclosed editorial which appeared in the New York Times. Mr. Oakes is a member of the U.S. Helsinki Watch, a group of concerned American citizens who monitor compliance with the Helsinki accords and support Helsinki monitors in Eastern Europe.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the editorial to my colleagues in the Congress, and urge you to contact the Embassy of the U.S.S.R. on Yuri Orlov's behalf. In the words of Mr. Oakes:

* * * the Soviet Union must somehow realize that, much as it would like to forget him, he and his colleagues are not forgotten by the civilized world.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1983]

ORLOV'S CRIME

(By John B. Oakes)

(John B. Oakes, a member of the U.S. Citizens' Committee To Monitor the Helsinki Accords (Helsinki Watch), is the former Senior Editor of the New York Times.)

The letter is not out of Kafka's imagination, or Arthur Koestler's. It was written in Moscow on Jan. 8, 1983. It comes from Orlov's wife.

"Yura's situation is terrible," it begins. "Yura is completely deprived of correspondence rights. The last two letters from him were dated Oct. 18.

"At the beginning of December, I sent an inquiry [to the Perm labor camp administration]: 'Inform me of the reason for the absence of letters from my husband Orlov for the month of November.' Answer: 'The quota of letters for the month of November has been entirely used up.' I wrote again: 'The letters have not been received by me. Inform me as to what address the letters for November were sent.' Answer: 'The administration does not give out information concerning the questions submitted.' I wrote again. 'Why have there been no letters for December?' No answer. I discovered an anonymous letter in my mailbox: 'Your husband is located in Perm Prison' [as distinct from the labor camp].

"Something is going on, but what? I get a feeling of terrible, terrible defenselessness—you can't do anything to help a person who is perishing, who is being annihilated, not allowed to write, deprived of his visits, kept in cold and hunger. The uncertainty is just torture.

"He was forced to perform unbearably hard labor: knitting metal netting by hand. This work is usually done on automatic machines. They have prepared reprisals against him in spite of his health. The criminal Tarasenko, who has already murdered two people, has threatened Orlov that he would cut off his nose and ears.

"If there is yet another prison sentence, Yuri will never get out of there. This year will be the most difficult and decisive. The regime is taking a path of increased brutality. I am at my wit's end; I don't know what to do."

Who is Orlov? What was his crime?

On Feb. 10, 1977, a half-dozen uniformed agents burst into a Moscow apartment and placed a brilliant 52-year-old research physicist named Yuri F. Orlov under arrest.

Since then, Orlov has never been free: 15 months in a Moscow jail awaiting trial; then in a "strict regime" labor camp on the border of Siberia, where he is now nearing the end of his seven-year term, nearly half of it in special-punishment cells where the routine is even harsher than in the camp. Due for release next year (unless, as now seems likely, his sentence is prolonged), he still is condemned to an additional five years in internal exile.

Orlov's alleged crime? "Anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

Orlov's real crime? Belief in the word of his own Government and the courage to act upon that belief.

When Leonid I. Brezhnev, Gerald R. Ford and the top leaders of 33 other governments signed the Helsinki Final Act on Aug. 1, 1975, they pledged "respect" for human rights. Each signatory guaranteed to its citizens the freedom to monitor its own (and others') compliance with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki accords. What other meaning could the document have in confirming "the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties" in "the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms"—spelled out as covering "freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief" and expansion of freedom of movement, contacts and information?

From the moment that he organized in Moscow the world's first Helsinki Watch group (the predecessor of others in Eastern and Western Europe and the United States), Orlov was a doomed man. In the nine months between its formation and his arrest, the Moscow Watch committee, of which he was chairman, issued 19 detailed reports on human rights violations in the Soviet Union. Orlov was tried—not for making false allegations but for circulating true ones.

Orlov is not alone. Some 50 of the 75 Helsinki Watch members throughout the Soviet Union are now in jail or exile. The Moscow committee, reduced to three old and ill individuals, is inactive. Virtually the entire Ukrainian contingent is in prison.

The 35 nations that signed the Helsinki accords are now meeting in Madrid, in a protracted review session that has been going on spasmodically for the past two years. The Soviet Union refuses to recognize that its persecution of the Helsinki Watch monitors is not only a repudiation of its word but a rejection of the entire Helsinki process, which it insists it wants to continue and expand.

Today, on the sixth anniversary of Orlov's arrest, the Soviet Union must somehow realize that, much as it would like to forget him, he and his colleagues are not forgotten by the civilized world.●

REPEAL TAX WITHHOLDING PROVISIONS ON INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, rarely has any subject generated such a large volume of mail now flooding Capitol Hill as the campaign to repeal the tax withholding provisions on interest and dividends. Our people are outraged that the Government should deprive them of the use of the little bit of interest they earn on small savings accounts, and they are demanding that Congress correct what they believe to be a gross inequity.

Since it is the small saver who is primarily burdened with the loss of income and administrative expenses which financial institutions will pass on to them, my colleague, ROBIN BRITT and I are introducing legislation which will repeal the withholding provisions that apply to interest from savings deposits.

Under this legislation, the withholding of taxes from dividends would go into effect as scheduled in July of 1983. Some 40 percent of the revenues expected to be gained under the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act will accrue from dividends. Therefore, we can achieve fiscal responsibility by adding approximately $8 billion to the Treasury between 1983 and 1987 and still give the small saver a break.

The elderly are particularly distraught about this withholding issue. This is understandable, and even though they are exempt under TEFRA, they are overwhelmed with the burden and complexity of filling out the forms and the process by which they receive the exemption.

By repealing the withholding provisions on interest earned on savings, we can send a signal to the small saver that the Federal Government still encourages savings and that people will not be penalized for doing so. By retaining the withholding on dividends and with the provisions in TEFRA for tighter reporting requirements, the Treasury can capture most of the lost revenue that would be gained through the combined withholding on interest and dividends.

I commend the bill to my colleagues for consideration.●

A GROWING CONSENSUS: IT IS TIME TO NEGOTIATE IN EL SALVADOR

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried an excellent lead editorial urging talks in El Salvador. The Post said:

> The doubters fear the bottom is dropping out. They urge an effort to save the American investment by promoting negotiations, talks, "dialogue." They are right. . . . President Reagan pledged, in his recent American Legion speech, "to explore all possibilities for reconciliation and peace in Central America." It is a tall order, and he has yet to deliver on it.

The Post is hardly alone in calling for a political settlement in El Salvador through means including negotiations. Most of our country's major newspapers—including the Christian Science Monitor, the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times, and the Miami Herald—have endorsed a political route to a settlement in El Salvador in recent editorials.

These and other editorials reflect a growing domestic and international consensus. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, I have had occasion to meet with and hear testimony from a great many of our country's Latin America experts, and they are virtually unanimous that a political settlement is the only way out for us in El Salvador. In the same capacity, I have also traveled frequently and widely throughout the region, and it is unquestionably the opinion of our democratic friends there that we should be seeking a political settlement of the war.

No one is arguing that we should pull out, or cut and run, or whatever the administration's current rhetoric accuses us of wanting. What they do argue is that our strategy for involvement is fundamentally flawed. Our friends in Latin America want us to work constructively for a stable, democratic El Salvador, an outcome that cannot be achieved with our current policy. They do not want us to go down with a rapidly sinking ship.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a sampling of recent editorials on this subject:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1983]

MORE AID FOR EL SALVADOR?

More aid for El Salvador, as the Reagan administration requests? Of course. It is an $80-million-a-year war—that's the amount sent last year and sought next year. This year, the foreign aid bill collapsed, leaving El Salvador short $60 million. Not to pony it up would probably finish off the government. Is that what the Congress wants or is ready to take the responsibility for?

The trouble is that the administration and its critics are drawing divergent conclusions from the condition that has launched this latest argument, the sagging of the Salvadoran war effort. The administration would bull through its program of financing the war (while sending more advisers), trying to edge forward reforms and human rights, and cosponsoring the local government's plan to draw the opposition into its electoral scheme. The doubters fear the bottom is dropping out. They urge an effort to save the American investment by promoting negotiations, talks, "dialogue."

They are right. The administration equates talks with letting the guerrillas "shoot their way into power." But a little perspective is in order. The generals who are now on top shot their way in. Granted, at American prodding they have devolved uncertain power on a body elected since. If full power had actually been taken by the body elected a year ago, the administration would have had fits, since a feudal party won. The point of government-guerrilla talks, their State Department advocates say, is not to distribute power arbitrarily but to shape democratic political processes. It's certainly risky. Increasingly, it looks like the only alternative.

Secretary of State George Shultz's attitude is puzzling. He was questioned in the Senate on the calls for dialogue emanating from Salvador's acting archbishop and from Pope John Paul II, whose visit to Salvador next Sunday is eagerly anticipated by partisans of reconciliation. Mr. Shultz replied with a reference to "churchmen who want to see Soviet influence in El Salvador improved." Separately, he was asked if the United States would actively oppose government-guerrilla negotiations even if the Salvadoran government were interested. "I wouldn't think it would be a good idea," the secretary said.

President Reagan pledged, in his recent American Legion speech, "to explore all possibilities for reconciliation and peace in Central America." It is a tall order, and he has yet to deliver on it.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1983]

THE WAR IN EL SALVADOR

The military news in El Salvador is the guerrillas' capture and holding for two days of Berlin, population 35,000, a city in an interior province remote from their strongholds near the Honduran border. Most American observers have reacted cautiously, aware perhaps of the exaggerated response to the communists' Tet offensive in Vietnam. Still, Berlin was a serious embarrassment to the government. The guerrillas, relying on ambushes, sabotage and intimidation, do not seem to be near a country-wide military victory. Nor is there evidence that they have developed a mass following. But their pressure is constant and perhaps growing, and neither in San Salvador nor in Washington are the authorities certain what to do.

Some of the Salvadoran government's problems are familiar: Nicaragua continues to augment the guerrillas locally obtained arms. The Reagan administration has not gotten from Congress all the military aid it has sought. Other problems arise directly within El Salvador.

The Salvadoran armed forces had a year, 1982, to use their new American aid and training to turn the corner, and did not. They have been slow to adopt the aggressive, small-unit patrols their American advisers feel are best suited to routing guerrillas. The Americans favor reform, but now say the armed forces have been "distracted" by politics (pushing land reform) and political infighting. Others note that Salvadoran commanders, uncertain of their troops, have preferred the safer tactic of large-unit sweeps, and that the government has been spread thin by having to defend economic targets.

Some officers have political associations on the feudal right. One of them, much admired by the Americans for his military record, Col. Sigfredo Ochoa, last month challenged the reform-minded chief of staff in what Georgetown University's Robert Leiken aptly calls an episode pitting "the Americans' darling against their right-hand man."

There is a sense of a new turning point. The Americans nervously ask for "a more dynamic approach" by the Salvadorans and the transfer of American advisers from training to brigade-level operations. Mr. Leiken suggests that anti-communist military groups in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and the Nicaraguan opposition may join and launch their own combined regional offensive.

No doubt there is room for military improvement. But steps that give greater sway to the military foes of domestic reform, and that threaten to bring outsiders more directly into the struggle, are self-defeating. A time of frustration is the right moment to renew a search for a political solution on the middle ground.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 17, 1983]

WHEN TO STOP IN EL SALVADOR

Once again the US Congress is being asked to increase military and economic aid for El Salvador. The administration would also like to increase the number of American military advisers there charged with trying to improve the performance of the Salvadoran Army. Lawmakers are properly concerned that the US military effort in El Salvador is not succeeding and that the only way out of the dilemma lies in a negotiated settlement.

Not only Democrats are worried. "We need to find some framework for talks with the guerrillas," says Republican Senator Nancy Kassebaum. "We've always said a political solution is the only viable solution, but we're being pushed into a military solution."

To the American people, too, the scenario in that tiny Central American country is uncomfortably reminiscent of Vietnam: Leftist guerrillas try to overthrow an authoritarian government. The US steps in to provide aid and advisers. The army begins to improve but still has not learned how to cope with guerrilla hit-and-run tactics. The guerrillas grow bolder. The US says the army needs more time and training—and American help.

Where does the cycle stop? It seems that the situation to be faced up to is that the war is stalemated. Some 18,000 Salvadoran soldiers are still unable to put down 4,000 guerrillas. Earlier this month 500 guerrillas carried out their boldest operation to date, briefly seizing Berlin, a town of 35,000 people. They were forced to retreat once the army arrived, but they scored a propaganda victory. Efforts continue to get the Salvadorean troops to use small, crack patrols instead of launching massive attacks, in the face of which the guerrillas simply fade into the countryside. But the Salvadoran military is said to be bitterly divided and lacking in leadership drive.

Meantime, it has come to light that during the guerrilla retreat from Berlin American advisers were on helicopters controlling the army operation; one of the Green Berets was hit by gunfire. There are rules barring US advisers from engaging in combat operations. The incident may be an isolated one, as the administration claims. But legislators cannot be blamed for drawing parallels to Vietnam.

Then there is the difficult issue of human rights. The administration has certified some progress, including a decline in the number of deaths by "political violence" and plans for a presidential election next year. Yet the record leaves much to be desired.

Despite these concerns, no one would suggest that Congress cut off American aid altogether. Certainly the United States wishes to continue pushing military, political, and economic reforms in El Salvador, however difficult it is to do so in the midst of a civil war. Yet it is a question whether additional aid—an extra $35 million—will appreciably alter the situation or simply pave the way for more and more increases. Holding the aid budget at its present level might keep the pressure on the Salvadoran government to make faster changes in military strategy and improve its handling of human rights questions.

More fundamentally, if the judgment of Congress is that the war is in effect at an impasse, the time has come to press for the nonmilitary solution that is Washington's nominal goal. Even some high-level voices within the US State Department are urging this course; Spain, Venezuela, and others have been approached as possible mediators. President Reagan remains opposed to negotiations before the guerrillas agree to lay down their arms, but the risk is that the longer negotiations are delayed the worse the situation might become for the government side.

It is hard to fault the advice of those who say the sides in the three-year-old civil war should be encouraged to sit down and talk.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 27, 1983]

PROGRESS IN EL SALVADOR?

There is no surprise in the Reagan Administration's decision to continue military aid to El Salvador after certifying to Congress last week that the government there is making progress in protecting human rights.

President Reagan said two months ago on his trip to Latin America that the certification would be forthcoming. In the last two years, the White House has given little credence to criticism of Administration policy in El Salvador. Reagan appears determined to stand firm against what he sees as Soviet-inspired aggression in Central America.

Congress attached the certification provision to the legislation authorizing military aid to El Salvador two years ago. The President must report every six months that El Salvador's civilian-military government is curbing abuses of the civilian population by its security forces and pushing badly needed social changes in El Salvador—including a U.S.-backed land-reform program.

That law is up for renewal in October, and some members of Congress want tougher certification provisions. They believe that a more liberal 98th Congress would agree to amendments under which Congress could override a White House decision to continue military aid to a government that Congress found unacceptable. On a recent visit to Central America, Rep. Stephen J. Solarz (D-N.Y.) suggested that a new law could be written tying future aid to El Salvador's willingness to open peace talks with the leftist guerrillas who have been fighting to overthrow the government since 1979.

We think that it is wrong for Congress to put broad limits on a President's authority to conduct foreign policy. But leaders in El Salvador cannot avoid taking Solarz' idea seriously. Unless there is real movement toward peace, there may be no stopping the Solarz proposal—or something like it.

While there has been some progress in El Salvador in the last two years, it may have been too little, coming too late. The political and military situation in that small, strife-torn nation may have deteriorated to the point that no real progress can be made until the fighting stops. That is why we have argued for negotiations between the Salvadoran government and the rebel forces of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front, and why we still believe that bargaining is the best way out of the stalemate.

The liberation front is a broad coalition that ranges from moderate civilians to Marxist guerrillas. Serious negotiations could, at the very least, draw the moderate elements of the front away from their armed allies and into a coalition with the current government. They might even persuade the guerrillas to give up their war against the government, which neither side is now able to win.

The ultra-right in El Salvador refuses even to consider negotiations. Some of its most radical members doubt the need for social reforms, and have contemplated rejecting U.S. aid in order to finish the civil war as quickly and brutally as they see fit. The recent political dispute between a key military commander and Defense Minister Jose Guillermo Garcia was, for the Reagan Administration, an embarrassing illustration of how divided and erratic its Salvadoran allies can be.

There have been other, less publicized, indications that things are not going well in El Salvador.

Battlefield reports indicate that the civil war is a standoff. Rebel forces can coordinate action over wide areas and disrupt El Salvador's infrastructure and fragile economy almost at will. Security-force casualties are much higher than is normally acceptable in a guerrilla war, and the Salvadoran army has begun to forcibly recruit young men to meet its manpower needs.

Even more troubling from a U.S. view was the recent decision by the rightist-dominated Constituent Assembly to remove moderate judges handling the trials of security-force members accused of murdering six U.S. citizens in El Salvador and to replace them with right-wing jurists.

Government decisions like those continue to cast doubt on the Reagan Administration's assertions that progress is being made in El Salvador. The Administration must demand more of the Salvadoran government, not only for the sake of peace and stability in Latin America but also to forestall another sortie by Congress into foreign policy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1983]

THE UNWAGED WAR IN SALVADOR

Although the news is of real war, and shrewdly timed guerrilla thrusts, what should mainly concern Americans in El Salvador is the unwaged war: a political campaign to end this inconclusive struggle.

Grabbing a provincial city for three days was a psychological boost for an outnumbered guerrilla army; the Reagan Administration concedes as much. But this was no Civil War Gettysburg. The town of Berlin was promptly retaken, confirming again that the leftist insurgents are still challengers, not conquerors.

The offensive's real damage was political. Presumably it impressed, or at least intimidated, new sectors of the Salvadoran population and produced a new impulse to flee. And you could almost sense a new doubt spreading in Washington, which has been betting all along that an American-aided army, even if it cannot win, could at hold out indefinitely against the guerrilla challenge. After Berlin, these calculations are less certain.

The offensive was cunningly timed to coincide with the Reagan Administration's ritual certification to Congress of what nobody really believes: that Salvador's Government is "making progress" on political and economic reforms, and taking steps to punish the killers of civilians, including six Americans. Obviously chastened, State Department officials even conceded that America's policy signals to Salvador have been, at best, confused.

Few Americans want to see El Salvador turn into a Marxist tyranny; on that, surely, there is no confusion. Nor is there a clamor for saintliness by a troubled regime caught up in a savage civil war that is itself rooted in a half-century of oppression.

But a troubled partner is one thing, a barbarous one something else. The mixed signals sent to El Salvador arise from the failure to draw this distinction. And more than morality is at stake; the barbarity has been as damaging to the Government's cause as any guerrilla strike.

What is nonetheless striking in El Salvador is that so many remain willing to fight for a decent, elective government. If the guerrillas can win only psychological victories, it is in part because they have not earned the massive popular support they claim.

What should also be remembered, however, is that the opposition is not monolithic or wholly Leninist. There are democrats on both sides of the barricades. Somehow bringing them together ought always to be the central purpose of the United States' patronage.

Merely denying victory to the insurgents and counting on military stalemate is half a policy. Offering the opposition a genuine share of political power is the card that no one seems to be playing.

It should be played precisely because neither side can be sure of winning, because the insurgents must fear wider American intervention, because the Government should fear American weariness and because Venezuela and Mexico, among others, stand ready to help negotiate a way out. Fighting the military battle makes no sense without a plausible political strategy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1983]

IF WAR'S HELL, WHAT'S THE ALTERNATIVE?

Though he meant to sound tough and steady, Secretary of State Shultz sounded testy in telling Congress why he opposed negotiations to end El Salvador's civil war. He accused the guerrillas of "creating hell," trying to "shoot their way" into power and causing the violence. Buzzwords aside, that's a pretty good definition of a civil war.

No one faction has a monopoly on making life hell in El Salvador. It wasn't guerrillas who killed four American churchwomen and two American labor officials; the accused wore our side's army uniforms, and none have been punished. And for the most part, it isn't guerrillas who routinely drag civilians from their homes to be tortured or killed.

The insurgents hope to shoot their way into power and they should be resisted, not only with force but also with demonstrations that there are more humane alternatives. Similar insurgents succeeded in nearby Nicaragua when a cruel and corrupt regime fell of its own dead weight. It ought to be the aim of American diplomacy to prevent that happening in El Salvador, if still possible. The signs there now point to a battlefield standoff, which might provide some openings for a brokered peace that restores order and protects pluralism.

Just that idea was reported to be percolating in the State Department, but Mr. Shultz denies it. He denies it so vehemently that more than the merits of one or another proposal seem to disturb him. Surely he does not mean there's no conceivable way to transform the battle into political competition.

In Nicaragua, alas, the United States never got around to talking seriously with the leftist Sandinists until the last moments before their military victory. In return for support to their newborn regime, it exacted promises of early elections and a free press, which gave some small space to a democratic opposition to their authoritarian junta. Nicaragua today is certainly no advertisement for trusting leftists; but America's diehard support of the Somoza dictatorship was no precedent for siding with regimes of terror.

Given the military standoff in El Salvador, and the presence of democrats as well as authoritarians on both sides of the barricades, there may still be room to bargain. Of course the State Department should be thinking about negotiations among the Salvadoran factions; that is its job.

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 25, 1983]

CHECK ON SALVADOR

As expected, the Reagan Administration certified to Congress the other day that "progress" is being made on several fronts in El Salvador. Continued U.S. military aid to El Salvador hinges upon that certification, which the law requires semi-annually, and which the Reagan Administration issues routinely.

Among the areas in which some undefined "progress" is required are improved government success in controlling the Salvadoran military and in protecting human rights. Congress surely will find much to debate about contentions of progress in El Salvador.

Was the recent rebellion by a regional Salvadoran army commander, Lt. Col. Sigifredo Ochoa Perez, "progress," for example? That episode showed that even the Salvadoran military is split between rival rightists and centrists. Is that "progress"?

Last fall a Salvadoran judge dismissed charges against a Salvadoran soldier accused of the Jan. 3, 1981, machine-gun murder of two American land-reform experts and a Salvadoran union leader. Even U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador Deane Hinton, a Reagan Administration appointee, flatly said the soldier was "the guy who ordered the murder." Mr. Hinton should know; it was his investigators, not Salvadorans, who accumulated the evidence.

Was dismissing those charges "progress?" Has there been any real progress since late October, when Mr. Hinton threatened to cut off U.S. aid if real, as opposed to mere cosmetic, progress were not made soon? Has real progress been made since Nov. 1, when he pronounced that nation's legal system "rotten?" Is there progress even yet on the battlefront, after the largest leftist offensive in two years?

Rep. Stephen J. Solarz, a Brooklyn Democrat, suggests giving Congress the power to veto Administration certifications of progress in El Salvador. That makes sense. It would put pressure on the Administration to be honest, and thus encourage it to push for real progress there.

Mr. Solarz also suggests that future U.S. military aid to El Salvador should be made conditional upon the willingness of El Salvador's government to enter negotiations with the left without preconditions. This idea has considerable merit as well.

Such a step would give leverage to moderate Salvadoran leaders in their continuing power struggle with extreme rightists, Mr. Solarz believes. Evidence supports his view. Rightist efforts to repeal forward steps, such as land reform, have been blunted by fear that U.S. military aid would be lost. Making such aid conditional upon willingness to negotiate would provide a similar incentive to negotiate.

The leftists frequently have stated their willingness to negotiate. After a new moderate coalition gained a narrow majority in El Salvador's Constituent Assembly last November, a spokesman for the moderates hinted willingness to seek a dialog with the left aimed at ending the three-year-old civil war. If U.S. aid were conditioned upon pursuing the idea, the moderates would be strengthened in that direction. Not to do so is to yield to the extreme right.

Negotiations are nothing to fear; both sides must agree before any result is produced. Negotiations are desirable not because the armed left is virtuous or represents a majority. They are desirable because the armed left exists; because it continues to destroy the nation; because it does hold some legitimate grievances; and because negotiations are the best hope for peace.

As it reflects upon the "progress" to date in El Salvador, Congress should weigh Mr. Solarz's suggestions carefully.●

SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT'S "SUCCESS DAY" 1983

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1983, the Santa Ana Unified School District, the Santa Ana Educators Association, and South Coast Plaza Village will be cosponsoring their third annual "Success Day." The purpose of this event is to encourage students in the district onto greater achievement. Former students and community leaders will participate in the festivities, and their message is clear: We made it, and with determination, hard work, and academic achievement, so can current students.

Mr. Speaker, success has many definitions, and for each of us, it has a unique meaning. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines success as "the achievement of something desired, planned, or attempted; the gaining of fame or prosperity." Ralph Waldo Emerson said: "There is no way to success in our art but to take off your coat, grind paint, and work like a digger on the railroad, all day and every day." Christopher Morley wrote that "there is only one success—to be able to spend your life—in your own way." My favorite expression of success is "to laugh often and love much; to win the respect of intelligent persons and the affection of children; to earn the approbation of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends; to appreciate beauty; to find the best in others; to give of one's self; to leave the world a bit better, whether by a healthy child, a garden patch, or a redeemed social condition; to have played and laughed with enthusiasm and sang with exultation; to know even one life has breathed easier because you have lived—this is to have succeeded."

Mr. Speaker, the future of the United States depends upon the investment we make in the education of our youth. Each student has the potential to contribute to that future. Just as Santa Ana's more famous graduates—actress Diane Keaton, professional football player Isaac Curtis, and space-lab astronaut Gerald Carr—have succeeded in their chosen fields, so can today's Santa Ana students define and achieve success.

As the former mayor of Santa Ana and now its Representative in Congress, I am well aware of the potential for growth that exists in this community's youth. I join with my fellow colleagues in the House to salute the efforts of the organizing committee, the parents, the teachers, and the administrators in seeking excellence for our students.

Mr. Speaker, let each of us remember that success is individually determined. As Santa Ana's "Success Day" begins, let us renew our commitment to the fundamental values present throughout American history. Values that have enabled our country to reach its position of greatness among nations.●

VOTE ON AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to other official duties I was not present to vote on H.R. 999, the legislation approved by the House on Monday to establish an American Conservation Corps to provide conservation jobs for unemployed youth on public and Indian lands. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

I was pleased to see the bill pass with wide bipartisan support. Unemployment among our teenagers is at the highest rates ever recorded, and some action is desperately needed by this summer. All the projects in the bill, from conservation of forests, fish and wildlife to energy conservation, are worthwhile and deserving of our support. It is my hope that the Senate will quickly agree to these provisions so we can begin to put our young people to work.●

WISCONSIN AUTHOR CHUCK STODDARD RAISES THE RIGHT QUESTIONS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in determining the paths that a country must follow, it is more important to ask the right questions than it is to provide the right answers. Unless the right questions are asked, the right answers are never forthcoming.

A recent book, written by a Wisconsin constitutent, Charles H. Stoddard and published by Macmillan, titled "Looking Forward: Planning America's Future," does raise the right questions. It also provides some fresh ideas that can contribute to the national debate over the future direction of our domestic and international policies.

Chuck Stoddard's book is neither a blueprint nor ideologically slanted. It tackles tough social and political problems with ingenuity and imagination. Whether or not one agrees or disagrees with Chuck Stoddard's answers, the process of arriving at the right answers is advanced immeasurably by his very thoughtful book.

Stoddard's work reflects a wide background of experience in administrative assignments, including President Kennedy's Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Chairman of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board, as well as staff service on State and Federal legislative committees.

Testimony to the quality of the author's study is evident in the following excerpts from reviews of his book:

"'Looking Forward' is an exciting and challenging volume writen by a true idealist and humanitarian. . . . If humanity adopted only a tiny fraction of the beautiful ideas in this volume, the next century would be a time filled with hope and confidence."—Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Former member of the House of Representatives, Massachusetts.

"To act, one needs understanding of change. Stoddard's intelligence, experience, and courage gives us the best blueprint yet on understanding and acting to create a positive future."—Huey D. Johnson, Secretary for Resources, State of California.

"Stoddard has produced a blueprint for the new political and economic institutions that will be needed to help us live with what we have. A tired two-party system needs some new ideas. 'Looking Forward' provides plenty."—Former Congressman Henry S. Reuss.

"Thoughtful, timely, practical—with optimistic hope for better tomorrows."—Frederick Wallick, Editor, UAW Washington Report.

"The progressive ethic of Charles Stoddard's 'Conserver Society' is needed nowhere more urgently than in food and agriculture . . . he embraces the human resources of the farmers and their families in the same caring concern that he shows for the land and water and natural things."—Robert G. Lewis, former chief economist of the National Farmers Union.

"'Looking Forward' provides focus for the renewed environmental movement that will emerge from the defensive battles of today. Students desiring responsible roles in that environmental offensive should read Stoddard—a thoughtful writer with long experience in public service."—Henry P. Caulfield, Professor of Political Science, Colorado State University.●

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which designates English as the official language of the United States.

I share the view of many Americans that English must remain our only national language, and that the Federal Government should not encourage the use of others. I firmly believe that the linguistic minority groups in our Nation must learn English if they are to become fully integrated into American society. It is time for the Federal Government to stop sending conflicting signals to the non-English-speaking people in America. The United States has, for example, laws which on the one hand require a bilingual ballot for those who do not read English, and naturalization laws, on the other hand, which state that a person must "read, write and speak English in ordinary usage" to become a U.S. citizen.

This resolution, identical to House Joint Resolution 442 introduced in the 97th Congress by the Honorable Robert Dornan, will stop the use of the bilingual ballot, will allow the instruction in English in non-English languages for the purpose of making students proficient in English, and will end the use of foreign languages in subject-matter instruction.

It is important to note that this resolution does not seek to discourage the use of any language for religious or ceremonial purposes, for domestic use, or for the preservation of ancestral cultures, nor does the bill affect the teaching of foreign languages to American students.

The text of the bill is as follows:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid as a part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. The English language shall be the official language of the United States.

SEC. 2. Neither the United States nor any State shall require, by law, ordinance, regulation, order, decree, program, or policy, the use in the United States of any language other than English.

SEC. 3. This article shall not prohibit any law, ordinance, regulation, order, decree, program, or policy requiring educational instruction in a language other than English for the purpose of making students who use a language other than English proficient in English.

SEC. 4. The Congress and the States may enforce this article by appropriate legislation.●

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES EXAMINES ADMINISTRATION FISCAL YEAR 1984 AND IMPACT ON OLDER AMERICANS ACT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 and again on March 1, I conducted hearings of the Subcommittee on Human Services to examine the largely negative impact of the Reagan administration's fiscal year 1984 budget on the programs and services under the Older Americans Act.

The February 23 hearing focused on all titles of the act except for title IV, while the March 1 hearing focused exclusively on the title IV program which provides funds for research training and demonstration programs.

As a result of these hearings I today call for a full restoration of the $56 million funds which are proposed to be cut as part of the fiscal year 1984 budget request of the President. I take particular exception to a proposed $32 million cut in the vital congregate and home delivered meals programs also known as title III C of the act. I am also strongly opposed to the 77 percent cut proposed for research and training under the act which must be restored if we are to maintain our commitment to our senior citizens.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to submit my opening statements at each of the two hearings and hope my colleagues will join in opposing these unwarranted cuts in such a worthwhile program.

The statements follow:

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT AND THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 1984 BUDGET REQUEST

I am pleased to convene this first hearing for 1983 of the Subcommittee on Human Services. Our topic today is the administration's fiscal year 1984 budget proposal and its impact on the programs and services provided by the Older Americans Act.

I approach this subject with a profound personal interest. There are few Members of the House who have worked harder or longer than I on behalf of the Older Americans Act, on this Committee or on the Education and Labor Committee, which has direct legislative responsibility for the act. On the basis of this experience, I am deeply concerned about the administration's budget and what it will mean to the future of the act.

I consider what has been proposed to be an unwarranted attack on the Older Americans Act and the millions of senior citizens who benefit—oft-times daily—from the services provided under the act.

I am opposed to the administration budget on two specific grounds. First, I am opposed to the overall reduction of some $56 million recommended in the budget which includes a $32 million slash in the vitally important nutrition programs. The second is the substantive legislative changes which accompany the budget proposal. The transfer of title V from the Department of Labor to the Administration on Aging is of special concern to us. The other legislative change being offered—even though rejected by Congress in the past—would transfer the U.S. Department of Agriculture Commodity Food Program into the Administration of Aging. We would like these issues to be addressed as well as other aspects of this proposal.

I consider these and any other legislative changes which may be part of this budget to be inappropriate proposals 1 year before scheduled reauthorization by Congress. There are few Federal programs which are monitored more carefully than the Older Americans Act. This committee alone has conducted several dozen hearings on the act in our 6-year history. The standing committees in both the House and Senate have done likewise over the years. This means that when legislative changes are made during reauthorization—they have had the benefit of review by Congress as well as by the aging network as well as the seniors receiving services and employment under the act.

As a result of this regular review, the reauthorizations of the Older Americans Act which have occurred during its 16-year history have been successful and have produced positive results. The administration budget seeks to usurp this traditional role of Congress and I stand totally opposed to any legislative alteration of the act before reauthorization.

It is my hope that Assistant Secretary Hardy can shed some light and dispel some of the confusion surrounding the administration's budget. In particular, has a bill been drafted reflecting the legislative changes which are being advocated? If not, why not? I have some specific questions which I hope will be addressed.

"Why—after President Reagan in December of last year signed into law a bill increasing funds for the nutrition programs—is the administration proposing to slash funds by some $32 million in these same programs for the fiscal year which begins in October? One of the reasons given is that certain management improvements should make up the difference. Does this include any form of 'means testing' or 'sliding scale fees' for participants—something which would violate existing prohibitions in the act?

"With respect to the title V employment program—it was last September when Congress overwhelmingly voted to override the Presidential veto of the supplemental appropriations bill. One of the main reasons for this action was the $27 million in funds for title V which the administration wanted to abolish. Now, just 6 months later, the administration is again proposing radical changes for this program—including terminating funds for the eight national aging organizations which currently administer three quarters of the program. Why are these changes being proposed?"

I am also concerned that separate funding for a variety of services under title III-B of the act might not be continued under this budget. It is essential that we continue to move toward the goal of increased coordination of the various services and programs within the act. Title III-B has been the glue which has held the programs together at the State and local level—and the services provided with III-B funds are those services deemed by State and area agencies on aging to be most needed for their seniors. Congress in 1981 specifically moved away from mandating services under III-B and increased local discretion. The administration's position regarding title III-B needs to be clarified to insure that the intent of the 1981 amendments will continue to be carried out.

I would also hope that the administration will be able to provide a justification for their proposed cut of some $2 million in funds needed to operate the 57 State agencies on aging in this Nation.

I view this hearing as vital to the future of the Older Americans Act. I will maintain my position that 1983 is not the year to reauthorize the Older Americans Act—it is scheduled by law for 1984 and that should not be changed. Therefore, any efforts to accomplish a "backdoor reauthorization" should be rejected by Congress. A budget proposal should concentrate on funding levels—not massive program changes. The funding levels provided for the Older Americans Act does not even constitute the equivalent of a "freeze." A $56 million reduction below last year's levels is much more drastic a reduction than a freeze would represent.

We have invited representatives from all major aging organizations which are involved on a day to day basis with the programs and services under the Older Americans Act. This includes representatives from all eight national contractors of title V. We want to learn their assessment of the budget proposal and what impact it will have on their ability to provide services. I look forward to all the testimonies this afternoon.

TITLE IV—OLDER AMERICANS ACT AND THE BUDGET CUTS

The Subcommittee on Human Services convenes its second hearing in less than 1 week to examine the administration's fiscal year 1984 budget and its impact on programs and services funded by the Older Americans Act.

Our sole focus today is on title IV of the act which provides funds for research, training, and a variety of discretionary programs and projects. The fiscal year 1984 budget request for title IV would reduce funds from the current $22.1 million to $5 million. I contend that a 77 percent cut will cripple this important program and will have a corresponding adverse effect on the rest of the Older Americans Act. I pledge today to work with others on this committee and elsewhere in Congress to get these funds restored at least to fiscal year 1983 levels.

We have invited the Commissioner on Aging, Dr. Lennie-Marie Tolliver, to present the administration's rationale for these latest radical cuts for title IV which has already been cut by some 60 percent in the past 2 years. The administration has offered as one justification their contention that the Older Americans Act is a service program not a research and training program. I challenge the premise that title IV and the rest of the Older Americans Act are two separate entities. The essential missions of title IV are to conduct research aimed at improving services; to train persons who can better serve the elderly; and to fund projects to demonstrate newer and better methods of providing services. This to me establishes title IV as a vital—as compared to a missing—link in the Older Americans Act.

Consider the fact that both the congregate and national home delivered meals programs which today are title III C1 and 2 of the Older Americans Act were outgrowths of demonstration projects funded by title IV. Consider the fact that more than 220 colleges and universities in this Nation have received funds from title IV, have developed training programs, and have produced professionals in the field of aging. Consider that in an AoA-commissioned survey of some 1,000 students who received degrees in gerontology from schools receiving title IV—82 percent of those employed went to work in programs helping senior citizens.

My point here is that title IV is being victimized unfairly by the budget cutting zealots of this administration. It represents misguided economics when one considers the actual and potential return of the investment from title IV dollars. One cannot overlook the demographics of our society. The 65 and over population is growing at a rate of 1400 persons per day. The growth rate is fastest among those 75 and over. We need to be developing and implementing new policies in response to our rapidly aging population. Title IV is one of the few Federal programs which can provide the funds to conduct the necessary research, training and demonstrations to help us develop a better national aging policy.

Common sense—and elementary mathematics both conclude that it is impossible to maintain programs and services provided under a $22 million budget with a $5 million budget. The question becomes—who gets reduced—who gets terminated—what worthwhile area will suffer. These are questions we want to have answered today.

The reductions and eliminations will have to come from critically important areas. Let me read some examples of projects which were funded with title IV funds as recently as fiscal year 1982 which could be reduced or eliminated:

Health promotion with the elderly;

Increasing effectiveness of services to minority elderly;

Training for volunteerism with the elderly;

Clinical training in aging and mental health;

Home care;

Congregate housing: how to make it work;

Developing an index of elder abuse;

Rural day care; and

Legal services—ombudsman services.

I would be naive to say that title IV is not without its flaws. I have addressed them in various times during my 14 years in Congress—I have developed amendments to better target certain title IV funds in areas such as mental health. I remain convinced that some previous recipients of title IV funds may have contributed to the demise of the program by failing to properly disseminate the products of their research. However, it is one thing to "fine tune" a program to make it better—it is something entirely different to perform radical surgery on a program without regard to whether or not it survives. I contend that a cut of the magnitude proposed in the administration's budget is more the latter than the former.

As I indicated in last week's hearing—1983 is not the year to reauthorize the Older Americans Act. It is scheduled by law for 1984. I stand prepared to work with the administration to develop meaningful amendments to enhance the act. I do not stand entrenched on title IV. There are changes which can and should be made—there is a need for improved accountability and better dissemination. However, I am opposed to reauthorizing as part of this budget process whether it be through legislative changes or by cutting a budget by 77 percent and expecting the program to survive.

The witnesses we have today represent some of the most distinguished people in the field of aging—all of whom have direct and first-hand knowledge of the value of title IV. I look forward to hearing all of the witnesses today and hope that we can maintain our commitment to the elderly of this Nation.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 65th anniversary of Estonian independence.

Estonia retains its rich cultural background and heritage, despite its suffering under the yoke of Soviet oppression. Each day, Estonians are denied their basic freedoms, are kept from using their native language, and from identifying their distinct ethnic roots. The Estonian language has only secondary status in the Republic's schools, and youngsters there are being taught to discard their heritage and adopt the identity of the "new Soviet man."

Estonian Independence Day is not commemorated with the celebrations that we enjoy. We Americans acknowledge the diversity of our heritage but rejoice in our common nationhood. We are encouraged to retain and be proud of our roots. The Soviets are trying to make Estonia culturally homogeneous.

Estonia has been occupied since 1940. This and other Baltic nations cannot praise their freedoms. Estonians are being denied their fundamental right of self-determination and live under foreign rule.

The Soviet Union has colonized and has tried to Russify Estonia. We must praise the strength the Estonians have displayed thus far in preserving their traditions, which are under constant attack. Their freedom of speech, religion, and press is all but nonexistent, yet they persevere. Let us express our support for the Estonians in their quest to become truly independent.●

LARKSPUR, CALIF. 75TH BIRTHDAY

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1983, Larkspur, Calif. will celebrate 75 years as an incorporated city.

Larkspur has maintained its small town character.

Its old downtown core has been deemed significant by the National Register of Historic Places and is listed on the National Register because it has retained the ambience of a typical California small town between 1900 and 1930. Its architecture has a mix of styles that convey the feeling of the past.

Growth and progress have been gentle to Larkspur. Remodeling and new construction have respected the past and retained the historic feeling of the community. In the commercial downtown area, 72 percent of the buildings, built between 1880 and 1930, still remain.

The city has maintained a natural character, expanding on both sides of the Corte Madera Creek which flows into the bay, into the redwood canyons, and up the oak-studded slopes of Mountain Tamalpais. Active citizen groups have influenced city planning to keep this natural setting and old town character. Purchase by the city of open space lands has preserved the natural backdrop of the city so that the view looking south along the main street of town is visually the same as at the turn of the century.

The town boasts one of the last ark communities existing along the creek; one of the few mobile home parks in the county; a major commercial flower grower in the heart of downtown; redwood groves, open space trails to Mountain Tamalpais, creekside bike paths as well as the Larkspur Ferry Terminal.

At 75 years of age, Larkspur is an interesting mix of people, businesses, and natural elements. Larkspur is still typical of a small California town, yet is just 12 miles north of the Golden Gate Bridge.●

COST BENEFITS FOR THE POSTAL SERVICE AND AMTRAK

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce a legislative proposal expressing the sense of this Congress that the Postal Service should conduct a study of the potential for accruing cost benefits for both the Postal Service and Amtrak, by increasing the amount of mail presently transported on Amtrak.

As you are aware, the Postal Service is projecting a deficit for the coming year. Their budget difficulties are only heightened by the budgetary policies of this administration. It seems particularly appropriate at this time to mandate the conduct of a study which could result in a tremendous savings for the Postal Service as well as additional revenues for the financially beleaguered Amtrak.

The proposed study would serve the best interests of both the Postal Service and the postal customer as it would explore ways on which the Postal Service could transport mail more efficiently, at a savings which could be passed on to the consumer. The provisions of the study include; an analysis of the volume of mail currently transported via Amtrak, an identification of the most expedient Amtrak routes for the transportation of the mails, an assessment of the equipment available for the transportation of mail and the potential for added equipment. In every category, an estimation of the cost for providing this service would be made, which, combined, would provide the Congress with a well-documented figure as to the savings likely to be realized by both the Postal Service and Amtrak.

As of late there has been mounting concern over the effects of the Postal Service's financial difficulties. Already the nonprofit mailers are suffering from the increases in their mailing rates. The consumer is apprehensive about the threat of higher postal rates and reductions in services ranging from the closing of thousands of small post offices to the cessation of Saturday delivery. I believe this proposed study is a most responsible step toward investigating the most efficient means by which these difficulties can be alleviated and the ways in which the Postal Service can better serve the public.●

TAX TREATMENT OF RETIREMENT COMMUNITIES

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a measure designed to provide residents of nonprofit residential retirement communities relief from unfair treatment under Federal tax laws. Residential retirement communities such as Westminster Village in Bloomington, Ill., provide individuals of retirement age with an opportunity for independent living, immediate access to medical care, companionship, and guaranteed lifetime residency.

The legal relationship between the retirement community and the residents is unique. Upon entrance to the community, a new resident pays what is described as a "life occupancy fee" which entitles the resident to occupy his apartment for life so long as the resident is able to live independently and without assistance. Under the terms of the agreement occupancy cannot be terminated by the community even though the resident becomes insolvent and unable to pay monthly fees. Thus while legal title to the resident's apartment remains in the community, the resident holds many of the rights and privileges of ownership.

Each resident is required to pay the real estate taxes attributable to his apartment. However, because they do not hold legal title to their apartments, the IRS has not allowed them to deduct the taxes from their income. The legislation I am introducing today will allow lifetime residents of nonprofit residential retirement communities to deduct from their income the real estate taxes paid by them attributable to the apartment they occupy.●

IRISH-AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP AWARDS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night, March 4, a dear friend of mine will be honored by the Independent Irish Society at a dinner in West Orange, N.J.

John J. Brown is presently the legislative director of the International Union of Operating Engineers, AFL-CIO here in Washington. Prior to that he served as an organizer and business representative of IUOE Local Union No. 68 and as secretary-treasurer of the New Jersey State AFL-CIO. In addition to his impressive career in the labor movement, John has built a distinguished reputation for his activities with Irish-American causes. He was the president of the Independent Irish Society from 1973-75, treasurer of the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee from 1973 until 1976, and was the general chairman of the 1976 Irish Festival held at the Garden State Arts Center.

The Independent Irish Society presents a yearly award to outstanding individuals. This year John will be one of the recipients of this award, the Irish-American citizenship award. The other award will be given to Helena Sharkey, of West Orange, who is an employee of the Essex County Clerk's Office and was the first woman ever to serve as grand marshal of the West Orange St. Patrick's Day Parade.

I am very proud of these two individuals, and offer my sincere congradulations to both of them on this special occasion.●

ROSS PEROT: COMPUTER COMMANDO

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, Nick Timmesch has recently published in the Saturday Evening Post a remarkable article about an even more remarkable individual: Ross Perot.

Ross Perot is a man of singular character, courage, and decency. Ross Perot is an American in love with his country. And of course, Ross Perot is a Texan.

I strongly recommend the article to all my colleagues.

ROSS PEROT: COMPUTER COMMANDO

(By Nick Thimmesch)

Ross Perot's name is a household word for any American who believes in initiative, hard work, traditional values and love of country. Ross Perot stuck to these basic beliefs in his pursuit of success and what he fervently and unashamedly regards as the American dream. He is no phony. Even his detractors admit Perot's patriotism and sense of purpose are real.

His convictions, and a gumption and toughness forged in his East Texas upbringing, fired him to:

Build a $500-million-a-year computer-service business out of a $1,000 investment after he became impatient in the role of IBM's star computer salesman.

Direct a commando team that penetrated deep into Khomeini's Iran early in 1979 and, in a daring operation, rescued two of Perot's executives from a prison housing 12,000 inmates and got them out of the country.

Head a citizens' committee waging war on drugs, successfully persuading the Texas legislature to pass six tough antidrug laws, thus startling many cynical political observers in the Lone Star state.

Now, as Americans fret over the persistence of a high unemployment rate (it has been rising since 1970), with some people quite anxious over the need for job creation, it is encouraging to experience the confidence of a man such as Ross Perot.

The 10.8 percent unemployment rate marking the closing weeks of 1982 is the saddest part of America's economic decline of the past decade. It caused doomsayers to cry for massive spending by the federal government to create "public" jobs, meaning more bureaucracy and, ultimately, greater frustration.

Liberal and leftist organizations demanded a return to "make-work" programs operated during the '30s depression—a revival of WPA and the Civilian Conservation Corps, to name two. Other political voices cried for protectionist trade barriers or pork-barrel programs for their special interests.

Ross Perot just shakes his head over this sort of panic. He knows the U.S. has a tough challenge to rebuild and restructure its economy, but with a conviction as strong as that which he feels for his country, he is convinced that government programs cannot be the prime remedy.

"Job creation must come from the highly productive private sector," he said in his cherry-paneled offices at Economic Data Systems, the Dallas company he founded. "When you try to create jobs in the public sector, you wind up adding to the tax burden, and this slows the economy.

"Make-work jobs weaken a country. They are to be avoided. By going big into public-sector jobs, you develop a situation where nonproductive people must be supported by productive people."

But he doesn't see the reconstruction of highways and bridges as a "make-work" program. The Reagan administration pushed Congress to raise the gasoline tax five cents a gallon so that a large-scale repair and construction project for deteriorating roads and bridges could begin. As Congress limped home for Christmas vacation last December, it was weary from the filibuster it had endured on the gas-tax bill. But it finally approved spending $5.5 billion from the additional tax for work that promises to employ 320,000 people.

"Bad highways and bridges are a drain on our economy," Perot says, "and it is vital that they are rebuilt. The gasoline tax is an indirect form of a toll road. The road user pays through this tax. I don't have a better idea for raising the money needed for this vital work, so until one comes along, I'll have to go along with it. There's not enough money in general revenue to pay for the rebuilding."

Perot believes it is a businessman's responsibility to run his company in such a way that it grows and creates new jobs. He is serious about this just as serious as he was when he decided to recruit volunteers from his own staff to help go rescue his imprisoned executives in Iran.

"A businessman has a duty to his employees, his company and his country." Perot says. "He must make that company successful, so it can add necessary jobs and broaden the nation's tax base. That's how private companies help the government cover its functions. Business and jobs build the nation's economy and create prosperity.

"It is a businessman's job to make a product that is wanted and sells in the marketplace. It must be sold aggressively. Now, all this may not sound interesting to some people who say, 'ho-hum,' but the truth is that there are no short cuts to creating jobs—no magic. It is fundamental business practice and imagination that creates jobs."

Perot's success in business, particularly the burgeoning computer field, is one of the spectacular stories of our time. In 1957, when he was 27, he became a computer salesman for IBM. He quickly blitzed the sales force and sold so many orders that IBM had to impose a yearly quota on the commissions an individual salesman could make.

Perot says that he exceeded his entire year's quota for 1962 only 19 days into that year, and that left him impatient and frustrated. So instead of sitting around thinking about golf or a larger home or a new car, Perot, on his own initiative, developed the idea of "facilities management," meaning a service the IBM could offer companies unfamiliar with setting up and operating computer systems. But IBM turned down his idea.

The decision didn't cause Perot to fall into a funk. He regards such "failures" as being like skinned knees, "painful but superficial." He quit IBM, took $1,000 from his modest savings and founded EDS, a one-man corporation.

Perot is five-foot-six, and his hair is as close-cropped as it was when he was a naval cadet at Annapolis. He can appear stern. Perot doesn't complain, explains only what he has to and doesn't flinch. Bullets could crease his eyebrows and he probably wouldn't blink.

So at age 32, he marched into the offices of executives and told them they should let him and the staff he was recruiting enter their premises, set up data-processing departments and operate them. In effect, Perot, the mighty mite of Texas, was telling these executives, most of whom were not knowledgeable in this emerging, bewildering world of high technology, "Let us take this headache away, and we'll run your data processing cheaper and more efficiently than you can."

Perot's determination and conviction won him business. By 1968, when he made his company public (and became a temporary billionaire in the process), he was employing 303 people. Today, it's 12,000, and he's still hiring.

"Capitalism works," he says, "it's better than any other system. Our company is strong and growing, and we put our financial resources into expansion.

"We mostly hire young people out of college, and their training is more and more specialized. We made it our highest priority to hire Vietnam veterans before that war was even over. We have several thousand of them now. If you go across the top of my company, you will find many Vietnam veterans, and they are among the finest executives in the computer industry."

So at a time when most executives are deep into cost-cutting measures and dreading the chore of laying off employees, Perot thinks about the new people needed to service the new business EDS is developing. In the past five years alone, EDS has increased its net income by 178 percent, its total revenue 242 percent.

EDS is no longer a spectacular new entrepreneurial success. In 20 years, it has become a mature company, and Perot was intelligent enough to realize it couldn't always be a one-man show. In 1979, he turned over much of his authority to Morton H. Meyerson, now EDS president, and oversees his company (he owns 53 percent of the stock) from the board chairman's position.

"We are in a highly competitive industry," Perot says. "We are constantly providing new computer service for our customers. We are currently developing software for the home-computer market. You know how that market is growing. That means more jobs."

The man really means it; he is not putting out rhetoric for the Tuesday luncheon of a civic club. Perot's record shows he does what he thinks is right and will take punishment for his action if need be.

Just before Christmas 1969, Perot chartered two 707s, loaded them full of Christmas dinners and went to Vietnam in hopes of serving this wonderful cargo to American prisoners of war in Hanoi. When that mission failed, he was scoffed at and made fun of.

The penalty came four months later when, in a single day, Perot lost $450 million as EDS stock plunged—an apparent reflection of a loss of confidence in the company run by the "Lone Star Santa Claus," as one headline called him.

That didn't shake him. Less than a year later, he was on Wall Street, pumping money into a brokerage firm in trouble, saving it (in a civic way, perhaps, because his rescue averted a panic).

Perot became an authentic legend because of another rescue operation, the one he directed in early 1979 in order to free his executives, held for an incredible bail of $12.5 million. He had recruited a 15-man "commando squad" from his own company and got an ex-Green Beret Colonel, Arthur "Bull" Simons, to direct the mission.

Perot used a forged passport to enter Iran and, luckily, arrived at the prison when an American State Department official was there inquiring about Perot's executives. Prison authorities thought Perot was also a U.S. official, so they let him go to the cell. The faces of his two men nearly turned sheet-white when they saw their boss.

He told them quietly that he was arranging a prison riot, that they should wait until the cell doors were open and the guards gone and then come to a car at a given location.

It all worked. The riot broke out, 12,000 prisoners ran out, and Perot's men escaped to the Turkish border. The success was due to the daring of Perot's commando team and to the rather large amounts of money Perot spread around to willing Iranians.

"De Toqueville said America is great because Americans are good," says Perot, reflecting on that success. "Patriotism is not some mindless flag-waving jingoism, as critics charge. Patriotism is doing what our people did on that mission. It is love of country.

"When the Carter administration tried to rescue the hostages and had that tragic failure, the same people who went with us to Iran came to me at 8:30 a.m. that morning and volunteered to go back if they could rescue those left in the desert. That shows the goodness of Americans—just marvelous.

"Our team was asked to consult with the federal government before that effort. But we had a strong difference of opinion with some of the military and with White House staffers. There was a lack of direction and go-go spirit at the White House. And Carter was so indecisive. In a situation like that, you put the right crew together and let them go. Let them size it up and minimize the casualties and carry out their mission. You don't treat them like robots."

Perot prefers "love of country" to the term, "patriotism." Supersalesman that he is, he is also shy and doesn't like being called a "patriot." He actually has a logic worked out about "love of country."

"It is important for people to have this feeling," he says, "so that they can continue to enjoy living in a self-governing country where people can make changes to fit the current need.

"You know, the Mormon Church requires its young people to give one year of service, and it's called a mission. Well, I endorse that, and our government should have the same requirement: Every young American should go on a mission of service to his or her country.

"At some time in your life, you should give a year or two to your country. I wouldn't call it 'conscription.' I would call it 'Service to Country.' Every 18-year-old could work on jobs like conservation projects, hospital service or helping older people. It would have to have substance and be well organized.

"That young person would come out with an understanding of service, of being less selfish and of people. Finally, that young person would have worked around government and would therefore know what it can do and what its limitations are. That youngster would not be part of a future group urging the government to do everything. When we look to government to solve all our problems, government tends to spend huge amounts of money, and then it fails. The War on Poverty is a perfect example.

"The United States can be anything it wants to be. But we must teach our children that the freedom we take for granted can be fragile. We must teach that they have obligations to their country, that the country is not a magic box to serve them.

"We now expect life to be so extraordinarily good to us that we must be paid $20 an hour for a job that you could train a monkey to do—or we think the world is being unfair. The real lesson is that, if you give a lot to the world, the world will give a lot to you.

"I was taught this at home, at school and at the Naval Academy. I was taught that there is no other country like ours in all civilization. We were painstakingly taught the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. It is no accident that Texas children, taught about their state, are proud of it and their country.

"Communist children are taught communism and to love their country. They know more about their countries than our children do about ours today. It's no contest when a Russian or a Chinaman is having a dialogue with one of us—they have the encyclopedic knowledge of their country.

"This is partly because we've been through 25 years of fads in education—new math, new alphabet, new style of reading—whatever some professor could come up with. Out of that, we produced a generation of children who can't figure, can't read, can't spell.

"I am a great believer in creativity and innovation, but these people went wild with fads and trends. And our children have shied away from hard subjects. They want political history and art history and this and that, but they don't want anything hard, and they certainly don't want engineering.

"You walk into an engineering school today and you think you are in the Orient. Those aren't Japanese-Americans in those classes—those are Japanese, and they are flooding our schools. We've got to change that; we've got to get discipline and hard courses back for our children.

"The typical Russian student has an awesome amount of math. Our future economy is based on a technology requiring more math and discipline. We do our young people a disservice by encouraging them to take the easy path."

It was Perot's concern about young people taking the path to drugs that caused him to accept in 1979 then-Governor William Clements' request to head the state's antidrug program. Perot had already spoken out many times against drugs, using church and civic meetings for his pulpit.

Once appointed, Perot mustered some 700,000 volunteers—including parents, teachers and students—to join his antidrug crusade. The state PTA led this legion. And Perot showed the world once more that he meant business.

Instead of issuing the usual committee report and platitude-laden statements, Perot had hard-hitting speeches, did a cram course on drug abuse and financed a full-blown campaign against drugs out of his own pocket.

Finally, he came up with a legislative program, vigorously solicited the legislature and warned that the "drug lobby" would fight him and the "Texas War on Drugs."

By spring 1981, Perot had persuaded the legislature to pass a series of laws to stop the sale and flow of illicit drugs in Texas. Soon after, physicians were complaining that Perot made them run the risk of criminality, and some legislators griped that Perot ran roughshod over them. Whatever, today there are no tougher antidrug laws in the U.S. than those in Texas.

Ross Perot's real first name is "Henry," and he was born the son of a cotton broker in Texarkana, Texas, June 27, 1930. He was a newspaper carrier boy, broke in horses for his father, became an Eagle Scout and president of the student council at Junior College. In 1949, he got himself an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. He served eight years in the Navy, four of those years on an aircraft carrier. Somehow, he wound up as his ship's official greeter and one day met an IBM executive who was touring the ship.

Soon thereafter, Perot decided the Navy was too slow for him, so he resigned and joined IBM in 1957. By now, he had a strong interest in philosophy and, while he was out in the daily sales grind, mused over thoughts of the great. One was Henry David Thoreau, whose declaration, "The mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation," stuck in Perot's mind as he worked the Dallas business beat for IBM.

So on his 32nd birthday, Perot left IBM and incorporated EDS. Dallas, with its large banking and insurance industry, was a prime market for the computer services he offered. Perot plunged into his new work with a fervor that could only match that of a fundamentalist preacher. He hired young men who would adhere to his dress code: dark, conservative suits, white shirts, single-color ties, no beards or mustaches were allowed. They became known as the "warrior saints" of the "Dallas Crusader."

It is ironic that Perot's business boomed because of one of the great accomplishments of President Lyndon B. Johnson's "Great Society," the Medicaid and Medicare systems. These huge federal payment programs begged for computer services, and Perot's EDS supplied them.

EDS was so highly regarded by Wall Street that, when Perot went public with his company in 1968, he immediately became worth $1.5 billion on paper. The enormous publicity that gathered round him in those years caused him to draw inward and reflect even more on the meaning of life and his beliefs in God, country, his family and himself.

The media made him a star in sometimes unflattering terms. He was variously called "America's first welfare billionaire" . . . "The commando leader of the free enterprise system" . . . "A Promethean Patriot" . . . "Texas Titan" . . . and "Right-Wing Yippie."

"I ignore any kidding about my love of country," Perot says. "My interest in this country is deep, complex and very well thought out. Simply put, we just can't take from our country, we must also give. It is easy to criticize the dirty river. It's a challenge to clean it up.

"The media likes to deal in personalities. It sells newspapers and magazines and makes television. Right now, the media is going big on dramatic stories about a single person who is out of work. But that one person's plight doesn't have anything to do with the big picture. It is human, touching and heart rending. Therefore, it produces, on television, an audience share, ratings and higher advertising rates.

"I only wish that it became good business for the entertainment industry to go patriotic. The current trend in schools and elsewhere to feel apologetic for teaching the people the values of our country might change. Maybe even television comedians, with all their influence, might show some love of country."

Ross Perot really means what he says. In the top floor office suite at EDS, there hangs an authentic Gilbert Stuart painting of George Washington. He enthusiastically tells you about it. There is a "Spirit of '76" painting by Willard—the real McCoy. There is a bronze casting of Remington's "Bronco Buster"—the genuine article. There are Norman Rockwell signed paintings; Iwo Jima miniatures; an oil painting of an American POW in a North Vietnamese prison; and a photo of released POWs with the signatures of all those thanking Perot for his help in freeing them.

Perot is the man who gave each of the 52 hostages held in Khomeini's Iran an American flag he flew all 442 days they were held captive. Perot is the man who worked as hard as anyone did to settle the dispute over the "V"-shaped memorial to the Vietnam veterans so that a proper tribute would also be presented to them along with the controversial piece of sculpture in Washington.

More important than any of this, of course, is Perot's undying love of country and his unwavering belief that Americans will eventually be able to work out their problems.

"It's immature to think that the U.S. economy is going down, as some do today," he says of the doomsayers. "This is a country where people can *change* things. We have control over our destiny. You can't beat that!"

Then he looks you straight in the eye and declares: "The love of our country is very fundamental to the success of our great country. That's what every last one of us must keep in mind."●

MERIT PAY REFORM ACT OF 1983

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to reform the current merit pay system as implemented under title 5 of the United States Code.

At present, Congress is being asked to consider many varied and far-reaching proposals which could impact on the civil service system. These are new initiatives. There are civil servants, though, who have been faced with an inequitable pay system and structure of increases since the imposition of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. These are the midlevel managers in grades 13 to 15 under merit pay. I feel it is imperative that we address the problems faced by these individuals.

Grades 13 through 15 are comprised of the Federal Government's senior managers and supervisors. These people are the backbone of the Federal Government. The success of government programs, the ability to keep government expenses down, and the implementation of important policies are among the responsibilities of this group of Federal employees who manage the work force.

Under the current merit pay system, however, these individuals receive only one-half of the comparability increase; no within grade increase; a merit pay increase, the size of which varies considerably based on the size of the "pool" of funds available, and a possible incentive award. During the first 3 years of this system, many of these managers have fallen sharply behind in pay increases compared to what their General Schedule counterparts and the employees they supervise have received. This represents an oversight and inequity which cannot be justified. In the interest of good government and in an effort to insure that the quality of government management does not deteriorate, I am submitting a 5-year experimental merit pay reform measure for supervisors and managers. The purpose of this legislation is to encourage and recognize high levels of performance, cut government costs, and increase the morale and productivity of employees affected by the merit pay system.

I believe it is important to set up this reform bill on an experimental basis. Under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the idea of merit pay was conceived and subsequently implemented. In theory, I believe the concept was good; however, in practice, it has not worked and I do not believe that it can work. In drafting this legislation, I am convinced that this is the most equitable approach we can take in promoting merit at the crucial management levels of government. If we are wrong, I believe an experiment will bear this out. The Federal managers, under my bill, will not be forever wedded to a system that does not attain the goals it is designed to achieve.

The experiment will establish a standardized five-point system ranging from unsuccessful, marginally successful, to fully successful, highly successful, and outstanding. Those who rate fully successful or better will receive full comparability increases—a benefit which is standard in the General Schedule regardless of performance level—and within grade increases. Those failing to perform at these levels would receive neither of these increases.

At the beginning of each performance appraisal period, critical elements and standards—job description responsibilities—will be established between supervisors of employees covered by this system and the employees. I feel this is a necessary first step in removing some of the aspects of the performance appraisal system which have plagued its effectiveness.

Those performing at levels above the fully successful level will qualify to receive performance awards relative to their rating in this five-point scale. Regulations governing the levels, critical elements, and standards to be used in this assessment of performance and subsequent award will be prescribed by OPM. A performance award could not exceed 20 percent of base salary.

Currently, a merit pay employee receiving the maximum incentive award of $25,000 has the opportunity for an award which is 40 percent of base pay. I believe this figure should be brought down to a more reasonable level.

An agency's funding for performance awards could not exceed 1½ percent of total base salaries in the agency for those covered under this program—this figure reflects the current practices used in regulations made by the OPM in determining appropriate levels of agencies' awards.

Quality step increases are eliminated and funds which otherwise would have been provided under current merit pay and General Schedule pay systems would be redirected into the performance award funding mentioned above.

Innovative ideas and helpful suggestions in improving government's productivity and efficiency are oftentimes generated by these top supervisors and managers. Awards programs already in existence for merit pay and General Schedule employees designed to recognize and acknowledge this type of achievement would be continued.

I want to reiterate the most important feature of this legislation and how it differs from the current merit pay and General Schedule. I believe the critical feature of this bill is its ability to withhold comparability increases and within-grade increases for employees not performing in a fully successful manner. I believe this is an important first step in insuring a quality government work force which is motivated by strong management policies and performance practices.

MERIT PAY REFORM LEGISLATION

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Title: Merit Pay Reform Experiment of 1983.

Second section, Amendments to Chapter 54 of Title 5, U.S. Code.

This section replaces the former Merit Pay System with a five year experimental performance recognition system for improving the performance of key supervisory and managerial personnel in Grades 13 through 15 of the General Schedule.

Under the former Merit Pay System, supervisory and non-supervisory management officials in Grade 13 through 15 of the General Schedule were eligible for base pay increases and cash awards based on performance. In addition, they received one-half of the annual comparability adjustment without regard to their performance. The new Merit Pay Reform system will cover only supervisors and managers with supervisory responsibility. It will continue to tie base pay increases to performance. Within grade increases and the annual comparability adjustment will be granted only for fully successful performance or better.

For less than fully successful performance, however, no within grade increases or annual comparability adjustment will be granted. Performance recognition and other incentive awards for special acts or achievements may be granted to recognize on-the-job performance or inventions, suggestions and other improvements to the Federal service. In no event, however, will agency funding for performance recognition awards exceed 1½ percent of the total base salaries of the supervisors and managers covered by this program.

At the end of the five-year period, a decision to continue or stop this experimental program will be made by Congress based on agency recommendations.

Section 5401. Sets forth the purpose of the Merit Pay Reform system. It shall provide performance-based pay recognition for high quality supervisory and managerial performance. Less than fully successful performers, however, will receive no pay increases. Within available funds, continuing training is to be provided to supervisors and managers to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of the Merit Pay Reform system.

Section 5402. Defines the coverage of the system. Any GS-13 through 15 employee who supervises at least one professional level employee will be included in the system. Office of Personnel Management classification standards for supervisors and managers will be used to provide coverage guidance instead of the current practice of using the labor relations definition of supervisor and management official codified in 5 U.S.C. 7103.

Section 5403. Establishes uniform performance rating levels for simplicity and equity. Ratings will be based on a 5-point scale ranging from unsuccessful, marginally successful to fully successful, highly successful, and outstanding.

In accordance with this 5-point scale, comparability increases and within grade increases would be granted only to those with a fully successful rating or better. For those rated below fully successful, no comparability increase or within grade increase would be provided.

At no time could such an award exceed 20 percent of basic pay. Such an award would not affect the base pay of an individual—rather it would be a lump sum payment.

Awards provided under Chapter 45 of Title 5 for inventions, helpful suggestions, achievements, and other special acts would be retained for these mid-level supervisors as well.

Funding for performance awards would not exceed 1½ percent of total base salaries of the agencies' supervisors and managers covered by this program.

Section 5404. Each year, OPM, in consultation with the agencies, shall submit a report on the operation of the experiment to the President and Congress evaluating the effectiveness of the Merit Pay Reform system.

Section 5405. This section outlines technical and conforming amendments.

Under the Merit Pay Reform experiment, supervisors of employees covered by this system will be required to discuss the critical elements and standards used to appraise the performance of covered employees prior to the start of the appraisal period.

A five-level appraisal system is established. In addition, there will be no forced ratings distribution under the experiment.

This section delegates authority to OPM to issue implementing regulations and to prescribe any reporting requirements needed to set up and operate this experiment.

At the end of the 5-year experiment, within 60 days of the issuance of OPM's final report on the project, Congress must adopt a concurrent resolution to disapprove the continuation of the program.●

MIT JOINS CHORUS FOR PEACE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow members of my alma mater, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, will present to this body an open letter signed by at least 3,228 members of the MIT community urging a halt to and reversal of the insane nuclear arms race.

This letter is important not only because it signals a broad and expanding awareness of the nuclear peril that threatens this world, but because it comes from an institution that holds a ranking position in the community of science and technology. The list of signatories is impressive and notable, and it includes a broad base of faculty, staff, and students who normally do not make concerted political statements.

Those who signed this letter urging a bilateral, mutually verifiable freeze along with a reduction of existing nuclear stockpiles, include the provost, 3 former presidents of MIT—two of whom were former presidential science advisers—4 academic deans, 15 institute professors, 4 Nobel laureates, 33 holders of endowed chairs, and, perhaps most impressive, all 11 scientists and engineers who are known to have participated in the development of the first atomic bombs at Los Alamos national laboratory 40 years ago, and who are now on the MIT faculty or professors emeriti.

The threat of a worldwide nuclear holocaust was in its embryonic stages when I graduated from MIT in 1953. It has since escalated into a terrifying reality, and never before has it been more important to ask whether we will continue down the road of nuclear escalation and possible human extermination, or whether we will say this insanity must come to a halt.

The nuclear freeze movement supported by millions of people and endorsed at the ballot box by several States last November, including my own of California, is not an effort to cripple America's defenses or expose this country to a blind and unverifiable agreement with the Soviets. As I have said to this body before, our people do not want to sacrifice our Nation's safety, but they also do not want to be incinerated so some Dr. Strangelove theorist can test his belief that nuclear war is winnable. It is not, and the list of those Americans who understand that grows daily.

Last year, the 97th Congress, by the slimmest of margins, rejected a nuclear freeze resolution that would have made great strides toward disassembling this structure of fear that holds America's future hostage. This year, the nuclear freeze resolution, which I have cosponsored, will once again come before Congress. The chorus of support for that resolution has grown louder, and now MIT has added its credible and informative voice to the chorus. I hope my colleagues will join me tomorrow in receiving the MIT letter and welcoming this mighty institution's support for peace over war.●

AMERICAN CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1983

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleagues on passing H.R. 999, the American Conservation Corps Act of 1983. The bill passed the House with a bipartisan vote of 301-97, with 187 cosponsors. This legislation will provide meaningful work and educational benefits for our Nation's young adults.

Participants in the American conservation program would receive academic credit from educational institutions whenever possible as well as training, skill certification, and placement services. This program will be one cost-effective way to offer our country's youth jobs and aid them with proper experience for future employment. Priority consideration will be afforded those individuals who are socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged.

With unemployment among youth at a record high, this bill gives them a glimmer of hope in a time of economic gloom. I thank my colleagues on the Interior Committee and especially Mr. UDALL of Arizona and Mr. SEIBERLING of Ohio for their fine efforts in passing this bill.●

THE SCIENCE ESTABLISHMENT FLUNKS

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, although I intend to vote for H.R. 1310, the Emergency Math and Science Education Act, I wanted to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD an article that appeared in the October 8, 1982, issue of the Wall Street Journal, which puts the current support for science education by the research community in proper perspective.

As a former member of the House Science and Technology Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, I am painfully familiar with the chronic neglect of science education by the research-dominated National Science Foundation. During the yearly NSF authorization process, I and my subcommittee colleagues worked to carve out a more substantial financial commitment to science education by NSF. Each year, we face the same foot-dragging and a diminishing share of the total NSF budget for science education.

As a Member of Congress with a particular interest in the Federal budget process—having prepared an alternative budget to President Reagan's in 1981 with a smaller deficit than the President's—I would like to note in supporting H.R. 1310 that the same objectives in this legislation could have been achieved without the increase in Federal spending if the university science and engineering community had cooperated within NSF to commit resources to science education prior to its cause celèbre status.

THE SCIENCE ESTABLISHMENT FLUNKS

(By Rustum Roy)

It has become fashionable—within the space of less than six months—for prominent leaders among scientists to be concerned with science education as distinct from research. On all sides we hear of the desperate straits of science education among the general American populace.

By and large, especially in relation to the developed nations, I believe that the U.S. citizenry and its leadership are indeed below the average elsewhere in a balanced understanding of science and technology and their impact on society. However, the main response of the science community to this situation is an appeal to government and to industry for more money. But nonscientist, politically astute observers detect a peculiar inconsistency in all this recently acquired concern for science education by this community.

How can it be, they reason, that the university science and engineering community should find itself in such desperate straits, when the Reagan administration has been relatively kind to science budgets? For two or three decades, science was well funded; indeed, the seeds of this problem were planted during the plush years of science's growth. Surely money is not the only problem. Is it not in the values and priorities of the scientists themselves?

Have they shown a concern for the education in science of the general public? After all, the Public Understanding of Science program was judged by the science community itself for many years to be worth one-tenth of 1% of the budget of one agency (NSF) and zero in all others. Even the Reagan elimination of the National Science Foundation's science education directorate amounted to only 6% to 7% of the total NSF budget.

If, the critics argue, the science and engineering community felt so strongly about any of these aspects of science education, they could easily have shifted resources during the many fat years of science funding to establish the levels of activity that are their new targets.

In the 15 years that the total budget for academic research was growing steeply, the *percentage* of the NSF budget allocated to all science education had dropped from near 50% to nearer 5%. For all those—in Congress and the agency—partly responsible for this change to rediscover education is indeed a turnabout. For them to make the charge that this was due to the "unimaginative" nature of NSF's science education program is ingenous, to put it mildly.

I believe there is a most instructive lesson in our history of handling science education, and unless and until we in the science establishment radically change our own values (heal ourselves), we will be unfit and unable to mount a meaningful campaign to eradicate technological illiteracy and re-integrate science into the education of all Americans.

The lesson I draw from the facts about our neglect of science education of the general population is that the vast majority of the scientists who have made policy for this nation for the last two decades—as professors, deans, presidents, chairpersons or members of National Academy committees or the National Science Board—did not have any philosophical rationale for or against "science education" for the nonscientist. Most simply didn't think about it or care.

The wholeness of the educational fabric of a technologically advanced culture, from a citizen able to appreciate and criticize technology and science, to the support of esoteric astrophysics Ph.D.s, was not manifest in the science community's reductionist world view. "More money for research" was the single goal of most scientists and science-policymakers. And when it came to money for science education, even of scientists, it was a very poor relation indeed compared to more money for research.

Therefore, it is my opinion that giving a little ($100 million) more money for science education of the general public cannot possibly do any good if it is given through this same community. Its gut-level attitudes simply cannot change that fast. Perhaps a Solomonic test would be to ask NSF, NIH and the rest, in a zero-based budget exercise, to see what percentage they would be willing to give up out of research budgets for science education. The government should then match that amount with additional money for science education within that agency. This would provide a mind-focusing exercise and a cathartic self-healing via repentance for both the science community and the nation.

To improve a very bad situation, I believe the executive or the Congress can move fast via a different program in a different agency, and one which has an excellent antecedent. I note first that it is genuinely in line with the concept of the new (or old) federalism. A new initiative on nationwide technological literacy could be modeled on former Assistant Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hollomon's invention: the State Technical Services Act (STSA).

I propose that an analogous State Science Education Act (SSEA) be enacted with two components. One will provide (on the basis of a formula incorporating the number of school students, high-school graduates, two-year technical graduates and college degrees) a grant to be matched on a three-federal-dollars to one-state-dollar basis, for state-run programs designed to eradicate technological illiteracy and upgrade science education for the non-specialist at every level.

The second part, somewhat along the lines of the STSA, would provide federal grants with an even higher matching ratio to consortia, regional associations and national groups, for programs agreed upon as being of value to any group of states.

Such programs might involve, for example, development of course content and teaching materials for print or TV. Using block-funding mechanisms, perhaps a five-person federal bureaucracy could run the whole office out of the Commerce Department. Moreover, by having 50 states run the SSEA program, we would move the action away from the research-oriented Washington bureaucracy, toward the level of government that in any case has the responsibility for much of science and general education.

Due to the shortage of science teachers nationwide, the only mechanism for rapid improvement of the national posture is through the volunteer route. The vast majority of our school districts could find in local industry, community college or university, scientists and engineers who would give up several hours a week to teach science at the local school and help in other local cable TV, newspaper or other community programs. Such volunteer contributions would count as matching money in kind, to qualify for extra state grants. Moreover, this scheme would not disturb the basic structure of the existing science teachers' employment, while permitting a gradual expansion of the personnel capable of explaining and interpreting technology in the context of society.

The bottom line comes down to this: In an era of fixed intellectual and financial resources, can the high science research community be entrusted with the science education of the American people?●

IDAHO BUSINESSMAN HONORED BY TIME MAGAZINE

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in these times of economic troubles it is heartwarming to see recognition of successful business practices combined with responsible service to the community. Idaho is proud to have a native son, Tom Smith, so honored by Time magazine's 1983 Quality Auto Dealer Award. The news announcement follows:

TIME MAGAZINE HONORS BLACKFOOT AUTO DEALER

LAS VEGAS, NV.—Time Magazine has named Tom B. Smith, president of Blackfoot Motor Supply Company, Inc., an Oldsmobile, Buick, Pontiac, GMC, AMC, Jeep and Renault dealership in Blackfoot, Idaho, as a recipient of the 1983 Time Magazine Quality Dealer Award (TMQDA). His selection was announced by Michael M. Carey, director of the TMQDA Program for Time at the National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA) Convention in Las Vegas on February 12th. Smith and the other recipients were honored at the opening business meeting of the NADA Convention which this year was attended by over 5,000 people involved in the automotive industry.

Smith, whose dealership is located at 369 W. Bridge Street in Blackfoot, is one of only 62 dealers in the entire nation nominated for the Time honor.

The TMQDA Program is sponsored by Time in cooperation with the NADA. Each year it honors outstanding new car dealers in America for "exceptional performance in their dealerships combined with distinguished community service." The recipients are chosen by a panel of judges from the University of Michigan Graduate School of Business Administration.

A native of Pocatello, Smith began his automotive career in 1945 as assistant manager of his family's dealership, Blackfoot Motor Company. The following year, upon the death of his father, he became president of the company.

Involved in automotive industry affairs, Mr. Smith was nominated for the Time award by the Idaho Automobile Dealers Association. A member of NADA, he served on the NADA 20 Group, is past president of the Blackfoot Auto Dealers Association and has served on several factory dealer councils.

Active in community affairs, Mr. Smith is past president of the Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club, a former director of the United Way, the Boy Scouts Council and a member of the Masonic Lodge, Idaho Falls Country Club and the Elks Lodge. In addition, he annually supplies a car for the Idaho State University Gold Club.

Smith and his wife, Doris, have three children and live in Blackfoot.●

THE NATURAL GAS CONSUMER REGULATORY REFORM AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD summary information about the Natural Gas Consumer Regulatory Reform Amendments of 1983, the administration's comprehensive natural gas reform legislation that I introduced with several cosponsors earlier today.

SUMMARY OF NATURAL GAS CONSUMER REGULATORY REFORM LEGISLATION

Consumer protection through elimination of automatic pass through of price increases by pipelines (PGA adjustments).

Gas price increases above inflation may not be passed through automatically by pipelines.

Process requires full public proceeding with appropriate standards.

Ceiling price for most gas becomes lesser of NGPA price or "average" new free market price ("gas cap").

Indefinite price escalators limited by "gas cap".

Free the parties to negotiate new contracts with incentives to do so at low prices.

All new and renegotiated contracts deregulated.

Either party may market-out on any contract not renegotiated by January 1, 1985.

Eliminate disincentives for use of low cost gas.

Increase competition through contract carriage at incentive rates.

Take-or-pay contracts may be reduced to 70 percent by purchaser.

Eliminate Fuel Use Act and incremental pricing.

(1) As of date of enactment, any new contract may be signed and may operate by its terms.

(2) Any contract may be renegotiated and may operate by its new terms.

(3) The volume-weighted average of the price for natural gas in all contracts under (1) and (2), for the most recent month with available data, is called the "gas cap."

(4) Pending renegotiation, prices for all gas (except Section 107) are the lower of the Natural Gas Policy Act (NGPA) price ceiling or the "gas cap."

(5) On January 1, 1985, for any contract that has not been renegotiated, either party may exercise a "market-out" (abrogate the contract). In that event, purchaser must carry gas for seller to any other purchaser at an incentive rate.

(6) All gas is decontrolled from the non-price regulations of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and the NGPA on January 1, 1985, or on renegotiation, if sooner.

(7) Section 122, which gives the President or Congress the power to reimpose controls, is repealed.

(8) Immediately repeal Fuel Use Act (forbidding some uses of natural gas) and Incremental Pricing.

(9) All buyers have equal access to offshore and interstate gas.

(10) Latest "gas cap" is considered a federally-approved rate for area rate clauses.

(11) Purchasers may reduce all "take-or-pay" contracts to 70 percent of deliverability (conservation exception for associated gas).

(12) If option is exercised, seller can resell elsewhere the amount of gas reduced. In that event, the buyer must transport the gas at an incentive rate.

(13) Option to reduce taxes expires on January 1, 1986.

(14) All escalator clauses of all types in pre-enactment contracts are limited by the "gas cap." This limitation continues until January 1, 1986.

(15) Through January 1, 1986, an interstate pipeline may not immediately pass-through purchased gas costs above its last pre-enactment level plus inflation. Any additional cost must be specifically approved by FERC after a public proceeding with appropriate standards.

(16) FERC, on application, can require a pipeline with available capacity to carry gas under contract between producer and purchaser at an incentive rate.

(17) No pipeline may take gas from its own production or from an affiliate at a rate higher than its rate of take for any less expensive gas.

(18) A ceiling is placed on the currently deregulated gas (Section 107—deep gas) until or unless the "gas cap" rises above the ceiling. Tight sands gas is capped at the maximum allowable price on the date of enactment.

Executive Summary—Analysis of Natural Gas Consumer Regulatory Reform Legislation

BACKGROUND

If the wellhead price of natural gas were not regulated, market forces would affect natural gas prices as they do all other unregulated commodities. When deliverable supplies were high, as they are today, the price would fall; when deliverable supplies were reduced, the price would increase. If the price of the principal competing fuel (oil) were to drop, the price of natural gas also would drop in order to maintain a competitive position in the marketplace.

But the domestic gas market has been distorted by existing law. The Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 (NGPA) currently is causing natural gas prices to rise despite an oversupply of deliverable gas, declining oil prices, and a low rate of inflation.

PROPOSAL

The legislative proposal provides a transition to a free market for natural gas that both protects consumers from the effects of market distortions on prices during the transition and provides strong incentives for producers and purchasers to renegotiate contracts to minimize costs. Key differences from the NGPA include the following:

Consumers are protected through a moratorium on automatic Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) increases above the level of inflation, with other increases requiring a full public proceeding by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

All new and renegotiated contracts are deregulated, with the volume-weighted average price of these new contracts becoming a cap on prices that can be charged under old regulated contracts. Pipelines may reduce take-or-pay contract volumes to 70 percent.

On January 1, 1985, either party may opt out of any old (pre-enactment) contract, and transportation of gas from producers to new buyers is guaranteed.

MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS OF THE ANALYSIS

Oil price assumptions are critical to any analysis of natural gas pricing policies because the fuels substitute for and compete with each other over a broad range of uses. This analysis uses in its reference cases those oil prices developed for the fiscal year 1984 budget. These prices are relatively flat in real terms ranging from about $31 to $32 over the 1983-90 time period. A low oil price sensitivity case was run at the $23-to-$24-per-barrel level in real terms through 1985, with growth at 1 percent in each year through 1990.

Other key assumptions include the following:

GNP growth at 1.7 percent in 1983 with a recovery peaking in 1984-85 (4.5 percent). The average annual growth rate for the rest of the decade is 3.4 percent.

Excess deliverability of natural gas in 1982 averaging about 1.4 trillion cubic feet.

Conservative estimates of the number of producer/pipeline contract renegotiations before January 1, 1985.

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS.

Under current law, prices are projected to continue on a steady upward path, reflecting both the changes in mix (depleting supplies of old, low-priced gas and additions of more expensive gas) and some subsidization of drilling for more expensive gas. As prices currently are approaching market-clearing levels, the analysis does not show a sudden price increase when partial decontrol takes effect in 1985. But just what will happen to gas prices in 1985 will be strongly influenced by oil prices.

Under a low oil price scenario, prices under current law continue to rise until after the partial deregulation in 1985, as certain contract provisions cause the price ceilings under the NGPA to continue to act as floors that rise with the rate of inflation.

The legislative proposal shows a much different pattern in the near term. Under base case price assumptions, the average price of gas shows a decrease in the first year of 10 cents to 30 cents per thousand cubic feet. This is about 20 cents to 40 cents below projected NGPA prices. Prices under the proposal remain below those under current law (NGPA), with both rising to about 10 percent above 1982 prices by 1985, assuming no PGA restrictions as a worst case. If FERC disallows some purchased gas cost increases until 1986, residential prices will not rise by the full 10 percent.

Under a low oil price scenario, residential prices should drop by about 30 cents to 60 cents in the first year, about 40 cents to 70 cents below NGPA projections, and should remain well below 1982 levels until 1985. After 1985, the difference between current law and the proposal is very small, as low prices do not offer substantial incentives or subsidies to drill for expensive gas.

In terms of economic efficiency, the legislative proposal shows sizable gains as resources flow to their most efficient uses in a competitive market rather than to the less efficient uses caused by a distorted market. Under the base case oil price assumptions, the legislative proposal provides net national economic benefits over the period that are in the range of at least $1 billion to $2 billion. Such benefits to the economy also are very sensitive to oil prices; when oil prices increase, the free market will cause low-cost gas to be produced first—unlike the current situation with its distorted incentives to produce high-cost deep gas because of its deregulated status. Using the higher oil prices expected in the analysis of 1 year ago, economic efficiency gains are in the range of $25 billion.●

WILLIAM POTOKA, "GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR"

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 the residents of a community, whose very name conjures up the picture of small-town America, will gather to honor a man who has earned the title: Ambassador of Good Will.

The community is Mount Pleasant, Pa., and the gentleman singled out for recognition by Lodge 868, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, is its mayor—William Potoka, "Citizen of the Year."

It is expected more than 250 of Mayor Potoka's friends, neighbors and Brother Elks, will convene to pay tribute to the many civic services he has performed as a member and as an elected official of the community.

Mayor Potoka's present office, one which he has held for 14 years, is merely one of several positions he has held in Mount Pleasant. He has been a school director, serving as president of the last Mount Pleasant School Board and the first of the new Mount Pleasant Area jointure.

He has been a director of the Mount Pleasant Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the Bicentennial Committee and the leader of a citizen's group that organized a "Welcome Home" celebration for a town resident who had been an Iranian hostage.

Mayor Potoka also headed a committee to restore the community's tribute to veterans, a statue of a World War I "Doughboy" destroyed in an automobile accident in 1981. He is an avid supporter of programs for the youth and the elderly and last Christmas instituted a "Reach Out and Touch Someone" program to provide food baskets for the unemployed.

He is prone to "go on the road" to extol the advantages of living and working in Mount Pleasant, appearing on the banquet circuit as a speaker and in movies and video tapes.

In the interim, he somehow finds time to be the husband of his wife for the past 41 years, Florence Testa, the father of their children and the grandfather to five of their offspring. He also continues to run the business he built from a service station to the repair and rennovation of tractor-trailer trucks.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to join the people of Mount Pleasant in honoring their "Ambassador of Good Will," Mayor William Potoka and express to him on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States our sincere admiration of his many years of dedicated service to the residents of his community.●

RICK VOORHIES

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. HAROLD ROGERS, related to this House an incident of heroism that involved a constituent of his, Mr. Roy Wesley, who was pulled from a burning truck by Mr. Rick Voorhies, who happens to be a constituent of mine. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly commend Mr. Voorhies on his courageous efforts that may well have saved a human life.

It is rare, indeed, that we hear of such human-sacrificing acts. It is only fitting, therefore, that we recognize the people involved and thank them for their concern for fellow man.

Again, on behalf of this body, I congratulate Rick Voorhies on his courage and a job well done.●

CONSUMER DEBTOR BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENTS ACT

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to curb unnecessary bankruptcies without denying bankruptcy relief to consumers who need the "fresh start" the bankruptcy system is designed to provide.

Personal bankruptcies have risen dramatically since the Bankruptcy Code became effective on October 1, 1979. Three years later bankruptcies continue to run at an annual rate of about 450,000, or 200 percent of the rate for the 12 years prior to enactment of the code. This rise is inexplicable, even when coupled with high interest rates, inflation, unemployment and increased public awareness of bankruptcy from lawyer advertising.

Economic conditions cannot account for the many debtors who have been counseled to discharge all of their debt in a straight chapter 7 bankruptcy when they might easily have completed repayment of such debts in a court supervised chapter 13 program.

Some experts believe that as much as $1 billion of the $6 billion scheduled in bankruptcy annually is unnecessarily discharged and can be paid by debtors without hardship. This $1 billion is being paid by other consumers through higher prices and limitations on credit availability.

There is a virtual consensus that help is needed. The only question is how. The legislation I am introducing today presents a firm middle ground between the two approaches already introduced in the 98th Congress: H.R. 1147 by Congressman PETER RODINO and H.R. 1169 by Congresswoman MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD. Both are good bills that address important problems facing the consumer credit industry; I believe my bill is a sound compromise that addresses these problems thoroughly while protecting the vast majority of consumer debtors who need and deserve bankruptcy relief. I am pleased that my Judiciary Committee colleagues Congressmen BARNEY FRANK, HAL SAWYER, and BILL MCCOLLUM have joined with me today as cosponsors, along with Congressmen GILLIS LONG, BUTLER DERRICK, DICK GEPHARDT, BILL GRAY, VIC FAZIO, TRENT LOTT, BILL EMERSON, and HAL DAUB.

Our legislation builds upon a hearing record formed in the 97th Congress. In 1981 a consumer bankruptcy reform bill was introduced which contained several provisions to modify the bankruptcy process. It contained a provision which would have allowed a creditor to challenge the eligibility of a consumer debtor to take chapter 7 relief based on an ability to pay test. I did not cosponsor that measure, believing another approach could curb unnecessary bankruptcies while better protecting the rights of deserving debtors.

Our legislation achieves this goal by following the suggestions of the final report of the National Bankruptcy Commission that consumer debtors seeking bankruptcy relief be counseled as to their options before selecting a chapter 7 straight bankruptcy or a chapter 13 repayment plan. I am keenly aware of the importance of credit in the daily lives of millions of consumers and believe that counseling debtors may prevent their jeopardizing their future ability to obtain credit. As the National Bankruptcy Commission, among others, has noted, debtors often find themselves in a straight bankruptcy without being aware of the repayment alternative.

Mr. Speaker, our bill also grants a court the authority, on its own motion and only on its own motion, to abstain from or dismiss a chapter 7 proceeding where to permit it to continue would constitute an abuse of the Bankruptcy Code. When this was first brought to my attention I was shocked to learn that courts cannot now stop a bankruptcy proceeding even when the judge is convinced the relief sought is unnecessary. This provision is an alternative to the highly criticized threshold test or future income test contained in other legislation. Our intention is to protect consumer debtors from routine harassment which some feared could result from the threshold test, which gave creditors a formal procedure by which to challenge chapter 7 proceedings, while at the same time helping to curb abuse of chapter 7 relief.

Our bill gives creditors no formal procedure. Rather, the court alone decides. If a creditor does seek to raise the issue at any point in the proceeding, the bankruptcy judge is under no obligation to hear or consider the creditor's motion or petition. It may be dismissed without comment or consideration and the creditor has no right to appeal. Therefore, the creditor has no means of bringing any pressure on the judge to exercise his discretion and no means of putting any pressure on the debtor not to pursue a chapter 7 straight bankruptcy. Further, creditors who do seek to harass debtors by filing superfluous motions or petitions would be subject to all the sanctions now available to a judge to deal with creditor harassment, including citations for contempt of court.

Additionally, this bill would strengthen congressional oversight of the bankruptcy system by providing for the collection of statistical data to enable the Congress to better measure the effectiveness of the Bankruptcy Code. During the 97th Congress we experienced a great deal of uncertainty over the facts of the matter during our debate. I am hopeful this data will help future Congresses insure that the Bankruptcy Code is responsive to national needs.

Other principal provisions of this bill address the problems of "loading up" by some debtors in anticipation of bankruptcy, create standards for courts to follow in confirming repayment plans, abolish the discharge hearing, and eliminate other costly and cumbersome procedures which prevent the efficient handling of bankruptcy cases. Congressman RODINO's bill addresses the "loading up" and confirmation standards problems.

And finally, our bill addresses the special and unique problems of farmers caused by the court's inability to move quickly to distribute crops to farmers who have merely stored grain in grain elevators without transferring title to the grain elevator operator. Our bill imposes a 120-day time limit on the bankruptcy judge to determine grain ownership; requires bankruptcy courts to accept valid warehouse receipts and scale tickets as proof of ownership; provides that all holders of valid warehouse receipts shall share in the distribution of assets and those not holding receipts shall share in the second tier distribution; and allows farmers to demand reclamation of crops up to 20 days after the filing of the bankruptcy petition and requires that written requests for reclamation which are denied by the court shall be secured with a lien.

The 97th Congress provided sound legislative history for many of these proposals. On March 23 and 25, 1982, hearings were held by the House Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law focusing on unnecessary discharge of debts. On April 23, 1982, hearings were held focusing on reaffirmation, discharge hearings and the desirability of a bankruptcy judge convening the meeting of the creditors. In June of 1982, further hearings were held focusing on the avoidance of liens on household goods and the dischargeability of debts incurred within 90 days before taking bankruptcy. These hearings provide the foundation for the legislation that we are introducing today.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident this bill will provide the vehicle to curb abuses of the bankruptcy system without injuring deserving debtors and denying the "fresh start" that so many need. I know that Congressman RODINO, author of H.R. 1147 and chairman of both the full Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law, shares my interest in enacting needed remedial legislation. I look forward to working with him and other members of our committee toward solving these problems.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, history illustrates for us the struggle and perseverance of those suppressed people who have sought to be free of the tyrannic and repressive rule imposed on them. Perhaps one of the best examples of such a longstanding and desired fight for freedom is in the 50 million Ukrainians, held hostage as a nation, within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Therefore, it is with a deep sense of concern and admiration for these people that I address the Congress today on the necessity of Ukrainian independence.

The fall of Russian czardom in the spring of 1917 was the starting point for the Ukrainian national revolution which saw the establishment of a Ukrainian National Republic on November 20 of that year. On January 22, 1919, all people of Ukrainian ethnicity were united into one sovereign state of the Ukraine. Pledging a commitment to live in peace and friendship with all neighbors of the Ukraine, the nation enjoyed 3 years of free existence before succumbing to the expansive and imperialist forces of the Soviet Union.

The years following Soviet annexation have been hard and harsh ones for the Ukrainian people. Through deportations, executions, collectivization, and starvation, millions of innocent men, women, and children have lost their lives as their Communist overlords have attempted to tighten their grip on the country. Today, 45 percent of the political prisoners in the Soviet Union are Ukrainians although in total, the people of the Ukraine account for only 20 percent of the total population. The people of the Ukrainian S.S.R. suffer untold hardship and national persecution, famine holocausts, suppression of Ukrainian culture, religious persecution, economic exploitation, the wanton destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches, and numerous violations of national and human rights. Most admirable and encouraging is the fact that, despite these deliberate attempts to destroy the Ukrainian people, their spirit of freedom, lust for liberty, and sense of national pride is as strong as it was 65 years ago when they declared their independence. Such fervent desires and feelings express for us today the emotions and wishes our Founding Fathers had 200 years ago. As we were helped in achieving our goals and wants, should not we recognize and help those others who thirst and long for freedom?

The attempts for independence within other Soviet bloc countries show that the artificially forged unity of the Communist bloc is vulnerable to the smoldering desires of nationalism. As a nation concerned with human rights, it should be our obligation to monitor the events and occurrences within the Ukraine so as to exert pressure on the Soviet Union while revitalizing and supporting those who have the courage to dissent. And it should be our new goal to push for and promote the principles of freedom in those countries like the Ukraine where the desire for them is there but government repression stands in their way. The determination and perseverance, the suffering, and the sacrifice of the Ukrainian people have been great; let it not be in vain.●

WOMEN'S HISTORY WEEK

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my support for House Joint Resolution 70. This resolution as introduced by my colleague, BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland, calls on President Reagan to declare the week of March 6, 1983 as "Women's History Week."

The history of our great Nation is no less the history of American women. The contributions made by American women are notable, as part of an historical record, while providing role models that are worthy of imitation.

As this great Nation of ours has experienced good times and bad times, American women because of their sacrifices and contributions deserve as much recognition as a heartfelt nation can offer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join Ms. MIKULSKI and me in requesting President Reagan to declare the week of March 6, 1983 as "Women's History Week."●

THE INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ENCOURAGE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

• Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by 21 of my colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee in introducing an important bill to permanently rectify a provision of the Internal Revenue Code that discourages research and development activities in the United States. This legislation will also bring our Tax Code into line with the international treatment of domestic research and development expenses, and will help to restore our competitive position in the international marketplace.

In 1977 the Internal Revenue Service promulgated regulation 1.861-8, under which a complex formula must be used to allocate to foreign-source income a portion of overhead and other expenses associated with research and development activities conducted in the United States. This allocation process thus precludes U.S. companies from deducting this allocated share of research and development expenses from their taxable U.S. source income. However, this procedure effectively denies any deduction for this portion of the company's research and development expenses, as no foreign country recognizes deductions against its income or other taxes for research and development activities conducted outside its national boundaries.

Regulation 1.861-8 thus imposes a substantial additional economic cost on the performance of research and development activities in the United States. The effect of this regulation is to deny U.S. corporations a full deduction against U.S. income for purely domestic research and development expenses. In other words, this regulation acts as a significant incentive for U.S. companies to shift their research and development activities to foreign countries. No matter what the tax arguments may be for this allocation methodology, we clearly should not be encouraging the exportation of our most valuable resource, research and development, in these or in any economic times.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981 we recognized the problems created for U.S. research and development by this regulation when we enacted a provision in the Economic Recovery Tax Act to impose a 2-year moratorium on the allocation requirements of section 1.861-8 of the Income Tax Regulations. This moratorium is scheduled to expire on December 31, 1983. Therefore, the time is upon us to take permanent action to resolve this problem once and for all.

The bill I have introduced will require that expenses related to research and development activities conducted in the United States be allocated to U.S. source income. Thus, there will be no question as to how deductions for research and development expenses should be treated for U.S. income tax purposes. Moreover, this legislation goes far beyond a simple extension of the existing moratorium and provides a permanent solution to this problem.

In 1981, we also required the Treasury Department to conduct a thorough study of the implications of this tax treatment of domestic research and development expenses. This study was to have been completed in February of 1982. It still has not been transmitted to Congress for our review.

It is clearly up to Congress to take action on this critical problem. We are not going to get guidance from the administration or the Treasury Department, as is indicated by the inordinate delays experienced in the development of the study that we required in the 1981 Tax Act. Last month the 1-year anniversary of the due date for this study came and went, and still we have not seen the study.

In the meantime, the U.S. companies affected by this regulation decided to take action on their own and commissioned Arthur Andersen & Co. to conduct a similar study of major research and development spenders in the United States. Among other things, this study, which was released in January of this year, found that the United States is the only Nation in the world requiring the allocation of domestic research and development expenses to foreign-source income. In fact, many other developed countries are working hard to attract and stimulate research and development activities within their borders. Moreover, U.S. company research and development investment is growing faster in foreign markets than in the United States, and many of the companies responding to the survey indicated that regulation 1.861-8 is a significant factor in their decisions to locate research and development activities abroad.

Mr. Speaker, when we export research and development, we not only export jobs; we also export our national productivity and only serve to further weaken our competitive standing in the international marketplace. If we are going to return this Nation to its status as a vital producer of goods that the world needs, then research and development must lead the way.

As if we needed proof of the importance of research and development to our national economy, Japan, our favorite example and scapegoat of late, provides a greater number of research and development incentives to industry and individuals than any other country. Where at one time "Made in Japan" was synonymous with poor quality and cheap imitations of U.S. goods, Japan now leads the world in developing and producing high-quality, innovative, high-technology products that Americans and citizens of other nations are lining up to purchase.

It is time this Government and this country recognized the important steps that must be taken to restore industrial productivity and to regain our position in the industrialized world. Enacting a permanent solution to the problem created by regulation 1.861-8 is but one of the steps that we should be taking to realize these vital goals, but it is a very important step. We must move quickly to eliminate this significant disincentive to domestic research and development activities once and for all.•

MEDAL OF HONOR PROPOSED FOR ERNEST L. WRENTMORE

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

• Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to authorize the President of the United States, in the name of Congress, to award the Medal of Honor to Ernest L. Wrentmore of Penn Valley, Calif.

Mr. Wrentmore, at the age of 13, was the youngest man to have served in the American Expeditionary Forces in France during World War I. Even at such a young age, Mr. Wrentmore exhibited great bravery and valor during his tour of duty. While serving with the Expeditionary Forces in France, he was gassed and wounded while carrying messages across a bullet-swept field to another unit of U.S. troops, thus allowing his company to advance. His commanding officer, Maj. E. C. Allworth, cited Mr. Wrentmore's entire tour of combat as "above and beyond the call of duty."

Mr. Wrentmore was awarded a battle star citation in October 1918 as well as the Purple Heart in May 1933 by the War Department for his heroic actions in World War I. He also received an appointment to study at West Point Military Academy and a recommendation for the Distinguished Service Cross by his commanding officer, Major Allworth.

Due to a fire which destroyed the headquarters of Mr. Wrentmore's company and all recommendations and paperwork regarding his tour of service, Mr. Wrentmore did not receive the proper recognition for his distinguished service. I feel that Congress should seize the opportunity to show our Nation's appreciation, no matter how belated, for the extraordinary valor and courage demonstrated by Mr. Wrentmore during World War I. Mr. Wrentmore should not be denied any longer the recognition he deserves.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Notwithstanding any provision of section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, the President of the United States is authorized to award, in the name of Congress, the Medal of Honor to Ernest L. Wrentmore, formerly a private, Company I, Sixtieth Regiment, United States Infantry, in recognition of his great courage on October 14, 1918, when he was dispatched by his company commander to carry messages across a bullet-swept field to another unit of our troops, thus permitting his company to advance.●

CHRONICLING THE GROWTH OF SEESSEL'S SUPERMARKETS

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to draw the attention of my fellow colleagues in the Congress to the outstanding accomplishments of a Memphis based, family owned grocery store chain. Today, Seessel's Supermarkets mark the beginning of 125 years of business and service to our community.

In Memphis, Seessel's has become a household word representing the highest standards in retail merchandising. Since 1858, the Seessel family has operated the type of quality, innovative business which has become the hallmark of this country's true success stories.

I would like to share with you the following article which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on February 27, 1983, chronicling the growth of Seessel's Supermarkets along with the history of the city of Memphis.

The article follows:

SEESSEL'S CELEBRATING CHAIN OF 125 YEARS

(By Emmett Maum)

What began 125 years ago as a downtown butcher shop owned by a German immigrant has evolved into a grocery store chain with seven locations. Some services have changed, others have been added, but through it all a Seessel has lead the way.

Founder Henry Seessel opened The Central Market on Main in 1858. On Wednesday his family's fifth generation will start a celebration that will last the rest of the year.

Seessel's Supermarkets, a privately owned company, is one of the oldest firms in the Mid-South. The chain has introduced several innovations in the Memphis market, said Arthur N. Seessel III, 44, company president. They include:

Selling frozen foods and generic foods.

Air-conditioning grocery stores.

Scanning at checkout counters.

Providing a playground for children whose parents were shopping at the store on Union. The playground existed in the 1950s.

Delivering groceries "in a big way." The service ended in 1962.

Being the first of larger food stores to charge groceries, and it still has credit accounts with some customers.

Its executive positions have passed through five generations and present executives hope their children will enter into the business. The president's brother, Jerry, 41, is executive vice president, and their cousin, Richard, 35, is vice president of food services. Arthur N. Seessel Jr., who retired five years ago at age 65, and his brother, Sam Seessel, who retired three years ago at 63, are cochairmen.

Sales volume has more than doubled since 1980, said the company president. During that period, Seessel's doubled the size of its store at Poplar and Perkins and opened stores at Quince and Ridgeway roads, and in Southaven.

This year Seessel's may construct its largest supermarket—a 40,000-square-foot store at Germantown Road and Farmington Road in Germantown.

If built, it will be the dominant store in a shopping center planned by Memphis-based Malone & Hyde, Inc., one of the nation's leading food distributors, said Seessel. Plans for the store were approved by the Germantown Design and Review Committee, and will be presented to the Germantown mayor and Board of Aldermen.

Because the chain is privately held, Seessel did not reveal sales and profits. "Our profit margin is in the neighborhood of 1 percent, about average for the supermarket industry," he said. Seessel's and other supermarket chains get their net income from the sales volume, rather than a big margin.

Seessel's retains the same basic attitude it had 125 years ago, he said.

"Our attitude is that we are Memphians. We like Memphis and its people and enjoy serving them. And want to continue to benefit the community and those with whom we work. We feel service, quality and good prices equal values. That creed was passed on by Seessel's predecessors, and will go to the next generation of Seessels involved in the business."

That attitude, coupled with its "family of employes," has been responsible for Seessel's continued success, Arthur N. Seessel III said. "Employes make a business. You can build the finest facilities, but without good employes the company won't succeed too well."

Seessel's philosophy is to do something constructive that will have an impact on the community, he said. It attempts to include company employes, "by far our greatest asset," said Seessel. Seessel's Supermarkets believes in business, civic and cultural contributions, he said.

Arthur N. Seessel III has a son and a daughter; Jerry Seessel, a son and two daughters, and Richard Seessel, a son. They would like to see as many of their children as possible join the firm later. Seessel's has refuted periodic rumors that it would sell out to others. Malone & Hyde, owner of Giant Foods of America and Pic-Pac Food Stores, and developer of and supplier to Big Star Stores, has been most prominently mentioned as a possible buyer.

"We buy our groceries from Malone & Hyde, an excellent firm. We think highly of J. R. Hyde III, its chairman and president. However, we have no intention of selling to Malone & Hyde or anyone else," Arthur Seessel III said.

The chain kicked off its 125th anniversary celebration last Sunday with a party for its 635 employes, half of whom are part-time workers, at the White Station High School Auditorium. The event gave employes a peek into special events that the city's oldest grocery chain has in store for its birthday.

They were told the company will bankroll an annual $5,000 four-year college scholarship for a Seessel's employe or dependent. A 10 per cent discount on grocery purchases will be given to employes working for the chain 10 years or more. Ninety employes—or 30 per cent of full-time workers—have been with Seessel's a decade or more.

Poster and memorabilia contests are scheduled in March. Theme of the poster competition for students in grades 4-6 and 7-9 will be "The Supermarket of the Future." The contest has been approved by city, county and many private schools, said Seessel. The poster contest is designed to encourage students to combine factual information with their creative concepts about the future, and to apply the ideas to an institution they know—the family supermarket. The other aim is to expose the public to children's visualization of one aspect of the future. Grand prize for each division will be an Atari video computer system.

Of the memorabilia contest, Seessel says, "Search your attic, drag out your scrapbook, as your grandmother. Seessel's wants to find interesting material related to our history of the grocery business in Memphis. We are looking for items dating from the opening of our original Main store in 1858 to the opening of our Union store in 1941."

Competition will be in four categories—advertising, documents, merchandising and grocery products and/or packaging. The grand prize for the best overall entry from any category will be a $500 gift certificate from Seessel's.

In March a multimedia advertising campaign will start, focusing on the anniversary.

The company's founder moved and changed the names of his businesses frequently. Nine years after starting his meat shop Henry Seessel opened A. Seessel and Sons, a stall in the City Market in Old Market Square. Two years later, he started A. Seessel and Sons Dry Goods. In 1872—during the decade that saw yellow fever ravage Memphis and bankrupt the city—Henry Seessel opened his second store called The Central Market.

The Memphis Appeal, a forerunner of The Commercial Appeal, chronicled that opening: "At No. 72 Jefferson, corner of Third, opposite the European Hotel, not far from the theater, and in full view of the Exposition Building, stands the new Central Market, owned by H. Seessel Sr., the great butcher of Memphis. It will be opened tomorrow (Oct. 14, 1872) with a great display of the finest beef, mutton, hog and venison in the state. The Central Market will be found very convenient to all that part of town lying between Poplar and Beale Street markets."

In 1900, The Central Market moved to 15 South Second, and the name changed to Arthur N. Seessel's Market. In 1917, it moved to 18 North Second. In that move, Arthur N. Seessel incorporated the best of Clarence Saunders' ideas into his store. Saunders' self-service Piggly Wiggly stores were forerunners of the modern supermarket. The concept's enormous popularity made Saunders a multimillionaire until he lost his fortune in a stock battle on Wall Street.

During those days, Seessel's used a horse-drawn wagon for deliveries, and in years afterward used early vintage trucks.

In 1926, Seessel's Market, including a bakery, opened at 1117 Union. The firm says it remained the only Mid-South grocery store offering a bakery department until the 1950s. Seessel's started a store at 1761 Union in 1941. A supermarket opened in 1962 at Poplar and Perkins. In 1969, Seessel's Bakery opened in Whitehaven, along with its third supermarket. A Raleigh store was established in 1972, one in Germantown in 1975, the Quince and Ridgeway store in Balmoral in 1979, and one in Southaven last year.●

IDES OF MARCH FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, in Rome the oracles warned Julius Ceasar of the Ides of March. Four weeks ago, the administration and the Department of Labor warned the House leadership and Appropriation Committee that money for unemployment benefits would be depleted by March 15, 1983, and requested an urgent supplemental. Nevertheless, instead of working expeditiously, the House leadership chose to sit on the administration's request and pursue other political goals.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Congress is poised to consider a so-called jobs bill. Several weeks ago we expected a bipartisan employment initiative but it has been retooled and now is no longer clear cut. Who suffers from the delay? The unemployed who hope for new job opportunities. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a second group of victims—the people who are depending on their unemployment benefit checks. Why? Because the House leadership held up the President's request for unemployment benefit funding so that it could later be included in the jobs bill to make this bill more palatable.

This delay was premeditated and borders on blackmail. Playing political games at the expense of the unemployed is inexcusable. I have written a letter to Chairman WHITTEN of the House Appropriations Committee requesting that supplemental unemployment appropriations be considered quickly and separately. I am sure the Senate would welcome this responsible action. Hopefully, the Ides of March will not be a woeful day for the unemployed.●

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED AND THEIR FAMILIES

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, all the jobs and emergency assistance legislation for the unemployed unfortunately seem to ignore one of the most tragic consequences of this economic depression—the brutal fact that millions of Americans are deprived of basic health care because they lose their group coverage when they lose their jobs.

Today I am introducing legislation to establish both an emergency program and a permanent program providing health insurance at affordable rates for up to 18 months after an individual loses his or her job. This bill is the House companion to S. 307 introduced by Senator DONALD RIEGLE of Michigan.

There is a desperate need for quick action in this area. At a recent hearing before the Health and Environment Subcommittee on which I serve, Congressional Budget Office Director Alice Rivlin testified that of the 12 million Americans out of work, 7.4 million had been laid off. Including dependents, this leaves some 10.7 million persons lacking health insurance coverage because of job loss. More are losing coverage every day.

This is a tragedy for both the unemployed workers and their families and the entire health care system in America.

Even though many private company health plans offer conversion options for unemployed workers, the premiums—usually about $200 a month—are out of reach for the worker who must also pay his mortgage, heat a home, and feed a family on an average $700-a-month unemployment check. These workers face two unacceptable options—either delaying and neglecting needed health care or losing their homes and life savings to huge medical bills.

There can be no more tragic a comment on us as a society than the fact that in the State with the highest unemployment, where 400,000 workers lost their health insurance, the infant mortality rate rose for the first time since World War II. Study after study shows that increased unemployment means increased deaths from heart disease, cirrhosis of the liver, and other stress-linked disorders.

Unemployment tremendously strains our health care system. Because unemployed workers postpone treatment until conditions need major, expensive attention, they turn to hospital emergency rooms for treatment. Most cannot pay for this care and the hospital must absorb the cost, adding about $30 a day to the cost for other insured patients.

The Public Health Hospital in Mobile, Ala., has recently shut its door on weekends to everyone because it can no longer afford to treat uninsured patients. Dr. Richard Thompkins of the Seattle Public Health Hospital testified before our Health Subcommittee that "economic realities soon may force us to either turn away people who desperately need our help . . . or close our doors permanently." He warned that we are moving closer to an "unequal two-tiered health care system"—one for those who can pay and another for the elderly, the poor, and the uninsured unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are a far better and more decent society than one which would tolerate such a system. My bill establishes a combined Federal, State, and private effort to provide a permanent program of up to 18 months of health insurance coverage for those who are laid off because of economic conditions in the future. In addition, this bill establishes a temporary program to provide up to a year of coverage for those currently unemployed.

This is a modest program—voluntary for the worker and requiring some financial contribution on his part. Yet it is an affordable contribution for someone collecting unemployment and would entitle the unemployed worker and his family to the Federal minimum standard for benefits which would be comparable to those offered under medicare, including comprehensive medical and hospital protection.

The permanent program consists of two parts. First, all employers must continue health insurance coverage for their unemployed workers—under existing payment ratios—for at least 6 months following an involuntary severance. In addition, the employer must participate in a State insurance pool which would provide another year of protection. In the pool, the worker would pay 20 percent of the premium cost—about $20 to $30 a month for family coverage. Workers would be eligible either for pool insurance coverage for up to 12 months after their own coverage expires or for 60 days after they become gainfully employed, whichever comes first. An employed worker would be eligible to participate in this program only if the individual were not eligible for other health insurance protection, such as spousal or paternal insurance, medicare, or medicaid.

The State insurance pools would be regulated by the States, not by the Federal Government. In order to provide additional financing during periods of sustained high unemployment, the legislation provides for Federal contributions to State pools when the national unemployment rate exceeds 7.5 percent and the State's unemployment rate is 110 percent of the national rate for the previous 6 months.

The emergency insurance program would cover those who have been laid off since June 1, 1981, and who are not eligible for the permanent program. Under this program, the Secretary of Health and Human Services would enroll all eligible individuals on an expedited basis. All individuals eligible for participation in this program would receive benefits equal to the Federal minimum medicare benefits and would pay no more than 20 percent of the premium.

As soon as an insurance pool is established within the unemployed person's State, the administration of the program would shift to the State pool. The individual would continue to pay 20 percent of the insurance premium and, unlike the long-term program, the Federal Government would contribute the remaining 80 percent. The temporary program would be completely phased out as soon as the permanent program is in place.

Mr. Speaker, I favor this approach because it creates no new major Federal programs and utilizes the existing private sector mechanisms for dealing with this critical problem. Because the permanent program is financed by a large number of active employers and employees and benefits a strictly limited population, the cost promises to be manageable.

I am pleased that we have begun to hold hearings on this problem, and am hopeful that the Congress will act quickly before there is further damage and suffering.●

PROMOTING PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF SCIENCE

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, if we are to reach to the roots of the problem of scientific and technological literacy in America, we must focus on those methods readily available which are both efficient and cost effective. One of these methods is public television programing, which is now available to well over 90 percent of the U.S. population. The public understanding of science program (PUOS) at the National Science Foundation is vital to accomplishing this goal. The language of H.R. 1310, the Emergency Mathematics and Science Education Act, establishes a renewed priority for such programs. In the past, the PUOS has been responsible for programs such as "Nova" and "3-2-1 Contact", the science series for 8- to 12-year-olds.

But while both these programs have attracted wide audiences, they have been unable to secure significant financial support through corporate underwriting. Less than one-fifth of the cost of "Nova" is financed by underwriters; thus, without funding from the PUOS, over four-fifths of the $5 million program must be financed by local public television stations. For "3-2-1 Contact," there is a similar story. Only a single underwriter was available for the first series and there is no underwriting money for the second series, now in production.

The public television station in San Jose, Calif.—KTEH—has faced exactly the same problem in its effort to produce two promising new public television programs, a weekly series "Tommorrow/Today" and 2-hour special entitled "A Quarter Century in Space," designed to air nationwide in conjunction with the 25th anniversary of the creation of NASA next fall. "Tommorrow/Today" was originally produced as a local 13 part series and carried on public television stations in 23 markets. The staff of the Institute of Electrical & Electronic Engineers (IEEE) magazine Spectrum serves as consultants and the IEEE's board has formally endorsed the program and its fundraising initiatives. Unfortunately, after an 18-month effort, the corporate underwriting necessary to produce a new series for nationwide distribution is unavailable. Yet this is exactly the kind of program which could significantly increase our understanding of new technological developments and their impact on our society. The first program of the series addressed ultrasound, medical imaging systems that substitute for X-rays; the history of microelectronics from the transistor to today's tiny silicon integrated circuits, and recombinant DNA. Other programs focused on subjects ranging from computer crime and solar cells to regulations which encourage dumping rather than recycling of hazardous chemicals.

"A Quarter Century in Space" is also being developed in conjunction with the IEEE Spectrum staff. And, like "Tomorrow/Today," it has been unable to attract corporate underwriting. Since it is timed to coincide with the NASA anniversary next fall, it will probably not be produced at all unless corporate support can be found within the next month.

The value of this kind of programing is not limited to viewers at home. Both "Nova" and "3-2-1 Contact" have been widely used in our elementary and secondary schools. With sufficient funding, WNET in New York will join KTEH to develop the instructional packages for in-school use of both programs.

With a revitalized public understanding of science program, programing like this has a renewed chance of actually getting on the air rather than simply gathering dust on the shelves as at present.●

THE DEMOCRATS' CAMPAIGN RHETORIC

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1983

● Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, already, four Democrats have declared their candidacies for President, almost 2 years before the election. With the long campaign and an endless river of rhetoric stretching out before us, we would do well to remember these words of Oliver Goldsmith: "The true use of speech is not so much to express our wants as to conceal them." Political speeches in particular must be read with care to find the gulf that divides profession from practice.

Thus, Mr. Mondale told us last week in announcing his candidacy how much he cares about the downtrodden and the unemployed. But he supports domestic content legislation, which would protect jobs of auto workers by taking away the jobs of people in shipping, trade, and other industries, including farming if it triggers a real trade war; and would also force consumers to pay higher auto prices. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that this legislation would result in a net loss of 66,000 jobs and would raise car prices by an estimated $333 per vehicle. Is that pro-jobs and pro-consumer?

He also talked about the vital importance of education. That is just great; but he refuses to support competency testing for teachers, which would go a long way toward improving the quality of instruction in the Nation's classrooms and the quality of learning.

Jimmy Carter's Vice President confidently declared, "I know how to defend this country." It must be a top-secret plan. All we know about it is that he calls for cutting defense spending, which has had to be accelerated by President Reagan largely because of the neglect of the Carter-Mondale administration. Presumably, we will be stronger and more secure with less. He says he stands behind the Camp David accords, one of President Carter's major achievements, but he denounces President Reagan's Middle East peace plan of last September, which is completely consistent with the accords.

Mr. Mondale was the Vice President of an administration that became synonymous with retreat abroad, inflation and rising taxes at home, and disarray everywhere. He ought to be the candidate of the amnesiacs * * * lest we forget.

I wish to insert in the RECORD a critique of the economic policy paper published by the House Democratic Caucus last autumn. It, too, is an interesting example of political rhetoric. I, for one, intend to make it very clear to the voters during the next 2 years which party, by deeds and not words, is the true friend of the poor, the jobless, the elderly, and of peace.

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 1, 1982]

DEMOCRATS AND THE ECONOMY: AMBITION SEARCHING FOR IDEAS

(By Spencer Warren)

Democratic candidates across the country have found a fertile source of campaign positions in a recent publication of the House Democratic Caucus: Rebuilding the Road to Opportunity: A Democratic Direction for the 1980s. It consists of task force reports on the economy and six other issues. If, as many expect, the Democrats score major gains tomorrow, the economy report in particular will likely serve as the Democratic alternative in the next Congress and as a policy catalogue for the party's presidential aspirants.

Unfortunately, the citizen searching for persuasive alternatives to Reaganomics will not find them here. Nor would he expect to, after reading Caucus Chairman Rep. Gillis W. Long's preface to the reports. Rep. Long, D-La., asked the task forces to "develop from the many philosophies and interests in our party, general consensus positions on the most important national issues." Now, it follows that policies designed to appeal to the "general consensus" will amount to little more than bland nostrums, chosen not on merit, but to avoid giving offense. And that is exactly what the Democrats deliver.

Of course, these cliches and panaceas must be dressed in garb suitable to the ambitions of a great party, one trying to shed its 1980 appearance of being shopworn and out-of-date by conveying a new image of imagination and vitality. Thus, public works spending becomes "Rebuilding the public infrastructure." More social welfare spending is "human investment." And further government interference in the marketplace is the "politics of cooperation," as opposed to the present "politics of confrontation."

The Democrates prescribe a cure for our steady economic decline in terms that paraphrase countless statements of President Reagan, Rep. Kemp and other supply-siders. Thus, "Investment is the key to future economic growth," which is the "cornerstone" of progress. The party's task is "to rekindle the entrepreneurial spirit in America, to encourage the investment and risk taking—in private industry and in the public sector." (The latter is a contradiction—there is no risk where the government has an unlimited resource in taxpayers' dollars; this is one of the Democrats' few new ideas.)

President Reagan was elected on his pledge to stimulate economic growth by reinvigorating investment in the private sector. How do the Democrats now propose to restore the economy's long term capacity to produce? Poking through their lofty phrases, one finally discovers the answer: By increasing government spending. Because they know this would raise too many eyebrows, they call it "investment."

The economy task force, headed by Rep. Timothy E. Wirth, D.-Col., abounds in new plans for extending government direction of the economy. Washington will help "restructure and revitalize our basic manufacturing industries", "expand our high technology growth industries"; "invest in long-term basic research" and "disseminate the benefits of new technologies" (the moribund Synthetic Fuels Corporation comes to mind).

The government will also increase aid to education; renovate the "public infrastructure"; manage the transition of workers from manufacturing to high technology industries; and it will have a new bureaucracy, the "Economic Cooperation Council" for "gathering the facts" and "anticipating problems." All this will restore "the pioneer spirit."

These Democrats have little to say about how they will finance their ambitious ideas to save our country. Budget and tax policy do not interest them very much, occupying only several paragraphs of the report. One of the few statements, on public infrastructure investment, tells us. "The question of how best to finance these programs will have to be resolved in the future." The Democrats' estimates from the Congressional Budget Office amount to $35 to 40 billion a year.

Yet they also say they believe a balanced budget is "very important" and that we must "control federal spending." But one can search page after page of the report without finding a clue as to what, if any programs they would cut, except, perhaps, defense. About all we are told is that "decisions must be made in our spending priorities" and "we must strengthen our congressional budget process and constantly review existing government spending and tax programs."

Thus, the bold new "Direction for the 1980's" will require either a huge tax increase or will result in even worse deficits than those now projected. The Democrats' answer to the crisis of private investment is more government spending. Behind the rhetorical mask of investment and productivity lies a policy of more of the same; a policy whose professed aim is to reduce unemployment and inflation, but whose past short term successes led in the long run to higher unemployment and inflation—and the election of President Reagan.

Are the Democrats the party of the workingman and the hard pressed middle class, as they claim to be? Of the elderly? Are they the party of compassion? In pondering the gulf between their rhetoric and their policies, we should take note of Gibbon's comment on Caesar. "By declaring himself the protector of the people, he had subverted the constitution of his country."●

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 Thursday, March 3, 1983, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 4

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Energy's research and development programs, focusing on nuclear energy programs (other than breeder reactor programs).

SD-366

Joint Economic

To hold hearings on the employment-unemployment situation for the month of February.

SD-628

10:00 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings on the administration's federalism proposals.

SD-215

Judiciary

To hold hearings on S. 216, proposed Federal Anti-Tampering Act.

SD-226

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

*Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Economic Regulatory Administration, Energy Information Administration, and the Office of Hearings and Appeals, all of the Department of Energy.

SD-192

MARCH 7

8:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Education.

SD-116

9:00 a.m.

*Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the legal ramifications of constitutional amendment proposals, including Senate Joint Resolution 3, with the specific goal of reversing the Supreme Court's decision in Roe against Wade, relating to the right to abortion.

SD-226

9:30 a.m.

*Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Energy Emergency Preparedness Act (Public Law 97-229).

SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, and voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs of the United Nations.
SD-192
Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1984 Congressional Budget.
SD-608
Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 529, to revise and reform the Nation's immigration laws.
SR-418
2:00 p.m.
*Appropriations
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation appropriating funds for job assistance programs, committee report to the Budget Committee, and budget deferrals of the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Agriculture.
SD-192

MARCH 8

8:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the President's budget request for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Energy's conservation and supply programs.
SD-366
9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-538
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SR-253
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 589, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for capital improvement projects on Guam.
SD-366
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.
S-126, Capitol
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the U.S. Railway Association, and Conrail.
SD-138
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 431, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 through 1987 for clean water programs, and S. 432, extending the 1984 compliance date for certain requirements of the Clean Water Act.
SD-406
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the Treaty of Friendship with Tuvalu (Ex. W, 96th Cong., 1st sess.), Treaty of Friendship with the Republic of Kiribati (Ex. A, 96th Cong., 2d sess.), Treaty with Cook Islands on Friendship and Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary (Ex. P, 96th Cong., 2d sess.), and the Treaty with New Zealand on the Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary between the United States and Tokelau (Treaty Doc. 97-5).
SD-419
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the proposed Education for Economic Security Act, and to review math and science education programs in elementary and secondary schools.
SD-430
Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol
Joint Economic
To resume hearings to examine the impact of the President's new federalism program on State and local government.
2212 Rayburn Building
11:30 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1984 from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.
SR-325
2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, and the National Endowment for the Arts.
SD-192
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for energy research and environment programs of the Department of Energy.
SD-192
Foreign Relations
African Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on United States/African relations.
SD-419
Small Business
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Federal minority business development program of the Small Business Administration.
SR-428A
Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 9

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for elementary and secondary education, education block grant, and impact aid.
SD-116
9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 607, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Federal Communications Commission.
SR-232A
9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Soil and Water Conservation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for soil and water conservation programs.
SR-328A
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SR-253
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 615, providing for a free market to establish long-term incentives to produce and market ample natural gas supplies at a reasonable cost, and related measures, including S. 60, S. 239, S. 291, S. 293, and S. 370.
SD-366
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold closed hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant workers union (HEREIU).
SD-342
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the current status of the multilateral development banks of the Department of the Treasury.
SD-192
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, and the Office of the Inspector General and the Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation.
SD-138
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-538

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 431, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 through 1987 for clean water programs, and S. 432, extending the 1984 compliance date for certain requirements of the Clean Water Act.
SD-406

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the Department of State, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
SD-419

Judiciary
Security and Terrorism Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the U.S. Attorney General's domestic security investigative guidelines.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the proposed Education for Economic Security Act, and to review math and science education programs in elementary and secondary schools.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for veterans' health care services.
SR-418

1:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Science Foundation.
SR-253

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.
SD-192

Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on U.S./European relations.
SD-419

Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

Small Business
Business meeting, to mark up S. 499, to require the usage of tax-exempt financing in connection with the Small Business Administration's section 503 Certified Development Company program.
SR-428A

MARCH 10

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for vocational and adult education, education for the handicapped, and rehabilitation services and handicapped research.
SD-116

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, focusing on fisheries programs.
SR-253

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from the Secretary of Commerce on the overall budget for the Department of Commerce, and on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for general administration, Economic Development Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, Patent and Trademark Office, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, National Bureau of Standards, Minority Business Development Administration, Economic and Statistical Analysis, and the Bureau of the Census.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-538

Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on S. 615, providing for a free market to establish long-term incentives to produce and market ample natural gas supplies at a reasonable cost, and related measures, including S. 60, S. 239, S. 291, S. 293, and S. 370.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisidiction.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Veterans' Administration.
SD-124

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on automobile safety, focusing on occupant protection.
SD-562

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 431, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 through 1987 for clean water programs, and S. 432, extending the 1984 compliance date for certain requirements of the Clean Water Act.
SD-406

Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on the Taiwan Communique.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on problems occurring from the manufacture and distribution of imitation controlled substances, known as look-alike drugs.
SD-628

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior.
SD-192

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission of the Department of Energy, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
SD-192

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
SD-406

MARCH 11

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on automobile safety, focusing on the role of Government and industry in bringing improved car safety technology to the marketplace.
SR-253

9:30 a.m.
*Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on S. 615, providing for a free market to establish long-term incentives to produce and market ample natural gas supplies at a reasonable cost, and related measures, including S. 60, S. 239, S. 291, S. 293, and S. 370.
SD-106

10:00 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings to examine certain tax preferences for banks, credit unions, savings and loan associations, and other financial services.
SD-215

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on S. 615, providing for a free market to establish long term incentives to produce and market ample natural gas supplies at a reasonable cost, and related measures, including S. 60, S. 239, S. 291, S. 293, and S. 370.
SD-366

MARCH 14

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for student financial assistance, student loan insurance, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loan and insurance, and educational research and training activities overseas.
SD-116

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, focusing on weather and satellite programs.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 267, to facilitate the development of interstate coal pipeline distribution systems by granting the Federal power of eminent domain to those interstate pipelines which are determined to be in the national interest.
SD-366

1:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for Amtrak.
SR-253

Finance
Economic Growth, Employment and Revenue Sharing Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 41, to extend the revenue sharing program for local governments through fiscal year 1986, and S. 525, to require that installment payments of revenue sharing allocations be paid at the beginning of each quarter.
SD-215

MARCH 15

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Institute of Education, education statistics, bilingual education, and libraries, all of the Department of Education.
S-126, Capitol

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SR-253

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Soil Conservation Service, and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD-124

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Energy's research and development programs, focusing on conservation and renewable energy programs.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 336, to revise prohibitions against persons guilty of criminal offenses holding specified offices or positions, and clarifying the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor relating to the detection of and investigation of criminal violations relating to ERISA.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Interstate Commerce Commission.
SD-138

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorization Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, Foreign Agricultural Service (including Public Law 480), Office of International Cooperation and Development, Department of Agriculture.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Energy.
SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for departmental administration of the Department of Energy.
SD-192

MARCH 16

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for college housing loans, special institutions, Howard University, departmental management (salaries and expenses) Office for Civil Rights, and Office of the Inspector General, all of the Department of Education.
SD-116

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Terrence M. Scanlon, of the District of Columbia, to be a commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SR-253

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, Securities and Exchange Commission, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance and Monetary Policy Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 397, S. 407, and S. 434, bills to improve the enforcement of export administration laws.
SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Civil Aeronautics Board.
SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing educational assistance for certain members of the Armed Forces.
SR-418

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission.
SD-192

MARCH 17

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the

11-059 O-87-33 (Pt. 3)

Railroad Retirement Board, ACTION (domestic program), Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.

SD-116

9:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the status of the strategic petroleum reserve.

SD-366

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1984 from AMVETS and the Blinded Veterans Association.

334 Cannon Building

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and the National Agriculture Library, Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Railroad Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).

SD-138

Select on Intelligence

Budget Authorization Subcommittee

To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Surface Mining of the Department of the Interior, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

SD-192

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy.

SD-192

MARCH 18

8:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, Marine Mammal Commission, and the Small Business Administration.

S-146, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Agency Administration Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the indemnification of and contributions to Government contractors.

SD-226

MARCH 21

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Handicapped Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SD-430

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the current health and future prospects of defined benefit pension plans under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act.

SD-562

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Energy's research and development programs, focusing on fossil energy programs.

SD-366

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Appalachian Regional Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

SD-192

MARCH 22

8:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, and the President's Commission on Ethical Problems in Medicine.

SD-116

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Economic Research Service, Statistical Research Service, and the World Agricultural Outlook Board, Department of Agriculture.

SD-124

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Labor and Human Resources

Aging, Family, and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the broken family, focusing on its effects on children.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to receive testimony from the U.S. Attorney General on the overall budget for the Department of Justice, and on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for general legal activities, Antitrust Division, general administration, Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals Service, and the Office of Justice Assistance, Research and Statistics.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources

Handicapped Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

SD-430

Small Business

To hold hearings on umbrella contracting procedures and their impact on small business.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Panama Canal Commission, and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Select on Intelligence

Budget Authorization Subcommittee

Closed business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and the Smithsonian Institution.

SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

2:30 p.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for judicial review of certain decisions made by the Veterans Administration.
SR-418

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Governmental and Public Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Office of the Inspector General, Office of the Secretary, and departmental administration, Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Legal Services Corporation, U.S. Information Agency, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Council on Environmental Quality.
SD-124

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family, and Human Services Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the broken family, focusing on its effect on adults.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for energy conservation programs of the Department of Energy.
SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

APRIL 4

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

APRIL 5

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Human Nutrition Information Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Minerals Management Service, and the Institute of Museum Services.
SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1984 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

APRIL 6

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Social Security Administration, and refugee programs, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review adverse health effects from exposure to radiation, and other related matters.
SR-418

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1984 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

APRIL 7

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Farmers Home Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Office of Rural Development Policy, and the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, drug task forces, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal prison system.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

APRIL 8

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

APRIL 11

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

APRIL 12

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Institutes of Health,

Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

8:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SD-138

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-192

Select on Intelligence

Closed business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1984 for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior.

SD-192

APRIL 13

8:30 a.m.

*Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Inspector General, Office for Civil Rights, policy research programs, and departmental management (salaries and expenses).

SD-116

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Judiciary, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Commission on Civil Rights.

S-146, Capitol

Finance

To hold hearings on S. 544, to promote economic revitalization and facilitate expansion of economic opportunities in the Caribbean Basin region.

SD-215

10:00 a.m.

Veterans Affairs

Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation providing for certain veterans' health care services, proposed legislation providing educational assistance for certain members of the Armed Forces, and proposed legislation providing for judicial review of certain decisions made by the Veterans' Administration.

SR-418

APRIL 14

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior.

SD-192

8:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Centers for Disease Control, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Science Foundation.

SD-124

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-192

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of vocational education programs.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Office of Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System.

SD-192

APRIL 15

8:30 a.m.

Appropriations

*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-116

APRIL 19

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Office of Indian Education.

SD-192

APRIL 20

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Judiciary, U.S. International Trade Commission, and the Federal Maritime Administration.

S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for fossil energy research and development programs of the Department of Energy.

SD-192

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, The Judiciary, and related agencies.

S-146, Capitol

APRIL 21

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Energy's research and development programs, receiving testimony from public witnesses on energy research, conservation and renewable energy, nuclear energy, and nuclear waste activities.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-124

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of State, and certain international organizations.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of bilingual education programs by the Department of Education.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

SD-192

APRIL 25

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for transportation related programs.
SD-192

APRIL 26

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for transportation related programs.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of the Interior.
SD-138

APRIL 27

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for transportation related programs.
SD-192

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
SD-192

APRIL 28

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the strategic petroleum reserve, and the naval petroleum reserves, Department of Energy.
SD-138

APRIL 29

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-116

MAY 2

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-116

MAY 3

8:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
SD-116

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for territorial affairs.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for territorial affairs.
SD-138

MAY 5

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Revenue Sharing (New York City loan program), Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the National Credit Union Administration.
SD-124

MAY 12

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-124

MAY 18

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review adverse health effects from exposure to agent orange, and other related matters.
SR-418

2:00 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To continue oversight hearings to review adverse health effects from exposure to agent orange, and other related matters.
SR-418

MAY 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
SD-124

MAY 24

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
SD-124

JUNE 8

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for certain veterans' compensation.
SR-418

JUNE 15

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review certain health care and other services provided Vietnam veterans.
SR-418

JUNE 22

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on certain health care services for veterans.
SR-418

JUNE 29

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation providing for certain veterans' compensation.
SR-418

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.
Special on Aging
To hold hearings on the future of Medicare.
SD-628

MARCH 16

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 564, to establish the U.S. Academy of Peace.
SD-430

APRIL 12

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family, and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the domestic volunteer services program.
SD-430

APRIL 13

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of vocational education programs.
SD-430

APRIL 19

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family, and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for adoption services.
SD-430

APRIL 20

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of bilingual education programs by the Department of Education.
SD-430

APRIL 26

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family, and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for child abuse prevention and treatment programs.
SD-430

JULY 20

10:00 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the role of management in implementing automated data processing systems at multiple VA hospital sites.
SR-418