HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, June 30, 1983*

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rev. Donald J. Young, Glen Carlyn Road Baptist Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer.

Let us pray:

O God, we acknowledge You as giver and sustainer of life and through Your Son provider of eternal life. We pray Your wisdom and guidance upon our leaders as they meet here today to deliberate on matters which not only affect your creation but Your people as well.

We acknowledge Your blessings upon us and give thanks to You for Your care and watching over us. We thank You for the freedom and liberties which have been given to us. Help us as we attempt to preserve them.

We pray Your wisdom and leadership upon our President and Your guidance as he as well as leaders of this great Congress lead us this day, as well as in the days to come.

We pray guidance upon them as they seek to be sensitive to the needs of the people they represent.

In Jesus our Lord's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1271. An act with regard to Presidential certifications on conditions in El Salvador;

H.R. 1746. An act to authorize appropriations for the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3223. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 3223) entitled "An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CHILES, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. SASSER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE REVEREND DONALD J. YOUNG

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Members of the House of Representatives that it is an honor and privilege that I have to introduce and present to you Rev. Donald J. Young.

Rev. Donald Young is minister of Education at Glen Carlyn Road Baptist Church in Falls Church, Va. Reverend Young is a graduate of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (December 1981), Louisville, Ky. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Young, reside in Oaklawn, Ill., and he is married to Debbie Young, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lonnie Dye of Granite City, Ill. Reverend Young and his wife, Debbie, have one daughter, Dawne Renee.

I am very pleased to have had Reverend Young on the floor of the House of Representatives. May God continue to bless him in spreading the good news of the Gospel.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a Member of the Joint Committee on Printing:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 29, 1983.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my resignation from the Joint Committee on Printing. Since I am no longer a member of the Committee on House Administration, it is appropriate that I be replaced by a minority member of that committee.

Sincerely,

LYNN MARTIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that there will be no 1-minute speeches until after the resolutions are disposed of. The House will consider four resolutions that we hope to be able to adopt. It is expected that we will rise at a very reasonable hour today, in view of the fact that many Members have reservations to go back to their districts.

AUTHORIZING AN INVESTIGATION AND INQUIRY BY THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 254 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 254

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry and investigation into improper alterations of House documents including, but not limited to the alleged alteration of transcripts of joint hearings entitled, "EPA Oversight: One Year Review", before certain subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, Ninety-seventh Congress, second session, July 21, and 22, 1982, and to determine whether any individuals have violated the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other applicable standard of conduct, or engaged in any other misconduct with respect to the events investigated. The scope of the inquiry and investigation may be expanded by the committee to extend to any matters relevant to discharging its responsibilities pursuant to this resolution or the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized and directed to report to the House of Representatives any findings, conclusions, and recommendations it deems proper with respect to the adequacy of the present Code of Official Conduct or the Federal laws, rules, regulations, and other standards of conduct applicable to the conduct of Members, officers, or employees of the House of Representatives to prevent alteration of transcripts of hearings or other documents of committees of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. The committee, after appropriate notice and hearing, shall report to the House of Representatives its recommendations as to such disciplinary action, if any, that the committee deems appropriate by

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the House of Representatives and may provide such other reports of the results of its inquiry and investigation as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of conducting any inquiry or investigation pursuant to this resolution, the committee is authorized to request or compel—

(1) by subpena or otherwise—

(A) the attendance and testimony of any person—

(i) at a hearing; or

(ii) at the taking of a deposition by one or more members of the committee; and

(B) the production of things of any kind; and

(2) by interrogatory, the furnishing under oath of such information as it deems necessary to such inquiry or investigation.

(b) A subpena for the taking of a deposition or the production of things may be returnable at such places and times as the committee may direct.

(c) The authority conferred on the committee by subsections (a) and (b) of this section may be exercised—

(1) by the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly, or, if either declines to or is unable to act, by the other acting alone, except that in the event either so declines or is unable to act, either shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised, and the committee shall be convened as soon as practicable to render that decision; or

(2) by the committee acting as a whole.

(d) Subpenas and interrogatories authorized under this section may be issued over the signature of the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them. A subpena may be served by any person designated by either of them and may be served either within or without the United States.

(e) Any member of the committee or any other person authorized by law to administer oaths may administer oaths pursuant to this resolution.

(f) All testimony taken by deposition or things produced by deposition or otherwise, or information furnished by interrogatory pursuant to this section, other than at a hearing, shall be deemed to have been taken, produced, or furnished in executive session.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting any inquiry or investigation pursuant to this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act, without regard to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

SEC. 6. The committee is authorized to seek to participate and to participate, by special counsel appointed by the committee, on behalf of the committee and the House of Representatives in any judicial proceeding concerning or relating in any way to any inquiry or investigation conducted pursuant to this resolution, including proceedings to enforce a subpena.

SEC. 7. The authority conferred by this resolution is in addition to, and not in lieu of, the authority conferred upon the committee by the Rules of the House of Representatives. In conducting any inquiry or investigation pursuant to this resolution, the committee is authorized to adopt special rules of procedure as may be appropriate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: In section 3, strike "may provide such other reports of the results of its inquiry and investigation as the committee deems appropriate." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "shall in any event report to the House the results of its inquiry and investigation, and said report shall be made to the House not later than December 30, 1983.".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as is the custom of the House in matters such as this, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) for purposes of debate only, and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 254, which authorizes an investigation and inquiry by the Committee on Standards and Official Conduct, was reported by the Committee on Rules as a privileged resolution, and, in accordance with the rules of the House, it is to be debated for 1 hour in the House.

House Resolution 254 was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) and by the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE). The Committee on Rules reported this resolution yesterday by voice vote after hearing testimony from these gentlemen, as well as the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILER).

The resolution authorizes and directs the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to undertake an investigation into improper alterations of House documents including but not limited to transcripts of joint hearings held July 21 and 22, 1982, before certain subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Science and Technology to review the operation of the Environmental Protection Agency. The resolution authorizes and directs the committee to determine whether any individuals have violated the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, other standards of conduct, or engaged in any other misconduct with respect to the events investigated. An amendment was agreed to during the course of yesterday's hearing in the Rules Committee which directs the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to report the results of their inquiry to the full House no later than December 30, 1983.

With adoption of the House resolution, as amended, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct will investigate thoroughly all allegations of the alteration of the transcripts, and will report their findings along with any disciplinary action deemed necessary to the full House by the specified date.

I should point out to my colleagues that the provisions of clause 4(e)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, empower the committee to conduct an investigation of alleged violations of the Code of Official Conduct or of any law, rule, or regulation of the House applicable to the conduct of Members, officers, or employees.

However, it was considered important by the Ethics Committee and the Committee on Rules to have a clear mandate from the full House of Representatives that the Ethics Committee pursue a complete investigation and inquiry into the alleged alteration of hearing transcripts and other committee documents, and to permit the committee to use special procedures to facilitate the investigation.

The resolution we are considering today provides the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct the discretion of determining the scope of the inquiry and of making recommendations to the House regarding the adequacy of existing laws, rules, and regulations applicable to Members of Congress.

In addition, the resolution grants the committee special procedural tools to facilitate its investigation into these matters. I should like to review these "special tools" for my colleagues. To begin with, House Resolution 254 authorizes the committee to request or compel, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of any person at a hearing or at the taking of a deposition by one or more members of the committee, and the production of things of any kind.

In addition, the resolution grants the committee the authority to compel, by interrogatory, the furnishing under oath of such information it deems necessary to the investigation.

The resolution further allows the committee to meet without regard to clause 2(m) of House Rule XI at any time or place within the United States whether the House is meeting, has adjourned, or recessed.

The resolution authorizes the committee to participate, by special counsel appointed by the committee, on behalf of the committee or the House of Representatives in any judicial proceeding concerning this investigation, including proceedings to enforce a subpena. Similar authority has been granted for other investigations as well as the investigations conducted by the Ethics Committee during past Congresses.

The resolution also makes clear that authorities conferred upon the committee by means of the resolution are in addition to the committee's authority under House rules. Finally, the committee is empowered to adopt special rules of procedure as may be appropriate to facilitate this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply concerned over the allegations which have been raised of improper alteration of documents. It is vital to our function as policymakers that we are able to entrust completely the accurate representation of our ideas and opinions in official proceedings. The special tools granted by House Resolution 254 to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct will facilitate the investigation and lay these questions to rest.

I recommend that we adopt this resolution so that the committee can proceed with a clear mandate from the full House and the tools with which to conduct an expeditious and judicious investigation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

□ 1015

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to apologize to the Members on our side of the aisle for not having knowledge of the fact in advance that we were not going to have 1-minute speeches first today. I know a lot of Members were here in anticipation of giving 1-minute speeches and were inquiring about what the time schedule would be.

If we had known before the 10 o'clock hour, I assure you the Members would have been so advised.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that House Resolution 254 is not the first choice of most of us on this side of the aisle. My colleagues will recall that yesterday the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN) rose to a question of privilege of the House and presented a privileged resolution, House Resolution 245, that would have created a bipartisan, select committee to investigate in open hearings the alteration of House transcripts and documents. But that resolution was referred to the Rules Committee on a motion offered by the majority leader.

Later yesterday afternoon, about 5 minutes of 5 o'clock, to be precise, the chairman of the Rules Committee notified me that there would be an emergency meeting at the 5 o'clock witching hour, not to consider the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN), but, rather, to take up a resolution introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Standards that same day.

His resolution would vest in the Standards Committee expanded authority to investigate the improper alteration of House documents including the transcripts from the joint hearings on the EPA witchhunt held in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have fully supported my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have been directly affected by these transcript alterations and who have pressed for a prompt, thorough, and open investigation.

The wrong that has been done to these Members and to the House goes to the very heart of what is defined by House Rule 9 as a question of privilege; that is, matters which affect both the integrity of the proceedings of the House and the rights, reputations, and conduct of Members in their representative capacities.

Mr. Speaker, the numerous examples of transcript alterations which have been previously cited in colloquys on this floor would seem to point to a pattern that may extend way beyond the three committees now being mentioned and involved. It seems to point to a pattern and a practice of malicious misconduct aimed at discrediting and defaming Members of this House.

As I have said before, in all of my years I have been around here, 15 years, I have never heard of this sort of thing occurring. But I fear, as I have talked to people and asked questions, that it is more widespread than maybe we realize; yet, and I am not talking about one side of the aisle or the other, it could be applicable to both sides.

We are not talking here about somebody's idea of a joke, as we had a few years ago when some 1-minute speeches or some speeches were turned in, in Members' names, but they really were not the ones that wanted those speeches turned in.

No, it is not that kind of a joke, which was a violation, by the way, of the rules, and involved the integrity of the House, too. And it is not an isolated dirty trick but, rather, a gross violation of the integrity of our committee proceedings which lie at the very foundation of our Nation's legislative process.

For if the legislative history made by the duly elected Representatives of the people is subject to malicious alteration and distortion by anonymous, nonelected staffers, then the credibility of this institution, the people's branch, is in serious jeopardy.

All our written records become suddenly suspect in the eyes of the people, the press, and the courts.

How much weight, for instance, are the courts likely to give to the legislative history we supposedly made as Representatives when the actual source of that history is in doubt? And yet that is the situation in which we find ourselves until the guilty are found and punished and adequate steps are taken to prevent the recurrence of such abuse.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, my first choice to deal with this was a special, select committee devoted exclusively to investigating transcript and document alteration in an open and expeditious manner.

This preference was not a vote of no confidence in our standing Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I do not mean that at all. I do not mean to imply that and I do not want members of that committee on either side of the aisle to feel that.

Rather, it was a realistic recognition of the need for a special mechanism to immediately restore confidence in the House, and also a recognition, at least on my part, that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is busy right now. They have a lot to do.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is already investigating several serious matters, and I understand may be reporting in some way in the month of July. That has to be a burden, or an impediment to moving quickly in this particular situation.

It was therefore our feeling that the House might best be served by a short-term special investigating committee and we would like to have had that considered by the Rules Committee, but it was not considered.

Having said all of that, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that I will support the pending resolution because I think it is important that we move on out in this situation.

We have been assured by the chairman of the committee and assured by all of the ranking Members and chairmen on this side of the aisle that this thing is not going to be shunted aside. It is going to be acted on quickly and I think it is important that we do that.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. The gentleman says that he intends to support the present resolution. Does the gentleman intend to support it even though there is a possibility that the rules that will be established by the investigating committee will not make this open to the public?

Mr. LOTT. Yes; yes, I will, even though I would prefer, and I asked these questions in the Rules Committee, that it be totally open, even to the subpenaed testimony.

But I must say this, and the gentleman is an attorney and must share some of this concern, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct sometimes has allegations, rumors, which they must investigate and they must have subpenaed testimony. Sometimes it involves people who are totally affected who are totally innocent, but the mere fact that they are called in to give testimony or there has been a rumor that they may have

done thus and such, their own person is violated.

I really wrestled with this question. But I think we must be careful that we not in our exuberance to get to the bottom of this allow other people who are really fundamentally innocent to be besmirched by the process. Therefore I have confidence in the members of the Ethics Committee that they are not going to let this thing proceed in a covered up fashion.

If they do, we will mark that day and that process well. But until they do I just think we have to err on the side of not going that far.

I know there are people on this side of the aisle that will not agree with that particular point. But I do feel like there are other things that must be considered.

Mr. GEKAS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEKAS. Then the gentleman is really saying he will support this because there is nothing else? This is the only ball game in town?

Mr. LOTT. That is basically it.

Mr. GEKAS. The gentleman would prefer the select committee but if there is no other way to bring the facts forward and put them on the record that this would be at least an alternative?

Mr. LOTT. The gentleman is right. That is right.

I will support any effort here today on the floor still to go with the select committee because I really and truly believe that that is the best way to go. But failing that, I believe it is important that this thing be moved forward here in the House and that it be pressed at the Justice Department as far as possible on the criminal violations and civil rights violations that have occurred here.

This is not the end of this matter. This is the beginning of getting it fully investigated.

But I do not think we should in any way impede moving forward. If you cannot have it the way you would prefer it you go forward with the next best available tool and this appears to be all that we may have at this point in view of the vote that occurred yesterday.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LOTT. I would like to speak briefly about the resolution itself.

First, the resolution does expand the authority of the Ethics Committee to include all improper alterations of House documents; it authorizes the committee to determine whether any individuals have violated any rule, law, or standard, or engaged in any other misconduct; and it may investigate any matters relevant to the scope of the inquiry.

In short, Mr. Speaker, by the terms of this resolution the investigative authority of the Ethics Committee is expanded far beyond its normal jurisdiction under House rules.

Second, the resolution permits either the committee or the chairman and ranking majority member acting jointly, or either acting separately, subject to committee approval, to compel testimony and documents by subpena, deposition, or interrogatory.

Moreover, the resolution permits any Member of the committee to take depositions, which will greatly help to expedite the investigation.

Third, the committee is granted authority to use special counsel to participate in any judicial proceedings relating to the conduct of the investigation and enforcement of subpenas. Without this new authority the committee woud have to come back to the House each time any of its actions are challenged in the courts, or we could be forced to fall back on our power to punish for contempt, an imperfect mechanism for compelling compliance with subpenas as we well know.

Fourth, while the original resolution left the matter of a report open and sometimes the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has submitted a report and other times, for a variety of reasons it has not, I thought it was absolutely essential in this instance that the House get a report in a timely fashion of what was being found by the investigation.

If after that timely report more investigation or more activity was involved, fine, they could still go ahead and do that but we must have a report and we must have a timely report to the House of what is involved here.

The majority on the Rules Committee, acting with the minority, did agree that that report language would be included in the resolution and that there would be a date certain to report, and that date certain is not later than December 30 of this year.

I thought that was an important feature because we do not want it to just disappear into a very busy committee without any report ever coming back.

Finally, the committee is authorized and directed to report to the House its findings and recommendations on the adequacy of existing rules and laws to deal with integrity of House documents in order to prevent such abuses in the future. I am hopeful new rules and safeguards are proposed that will eliminate any future opportunity for altering Member's remarks in such an improper and malicious fashion.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered it. I am obviously very much concerned about this matter. I do take it as being very serious and I know that the chairmen of the various committees also do.

I think it is very interesting that while the national press revels in an orgy with an irrelevant campaign issue, when on something that involves the rules of the House, the integrity of the institution, potential criminal activity as well as civil rights violations, no interest in this issue.

I hope the House will act more responsibly than those in the national media are, and I have to say that I think we are.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to take the floor this morning to debate this issue and that the time of the House will have to be further tied up to talk about what are admitted improprieties and criminal activities on the part of certain unknown staff members.

The chairmen of the three committees involved should have investigated this matter when it first came to light, identified who on the committee staffs were responsible for the transcript alterations, fired them, and referred the entire matter to the Justice Department for criminal prosecution that is bound to ensue since three Federal criminal statutes have been violated here.

But that has not happened and there has been a stonewalling of any effort to get to the bottom of this matter, to weed the rotten apples out, and to restore the integrity that is necessary for the proceedings of the House of Representatives.

□ 1030

Now, let us look at what has happened in the past week and a half. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) told about the hurry-up emergency meeting of the Rules Committee yesterday that was called on 5 minutes notice to act on this resolution and to bring it up today. And I think we should recall what happened yesterday during the proceedings in the House on the Consumer Products Safety Commission authorization legislation, where, in the midst of a debate on a very important amendment, the committee suddenly rose, the Speaker resumed the chair and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) asked unanimous consent to bring this issue up without notice to the Members. Fortunately, our colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was present to object so that at least the Members would have some notice that this issue was coming up. There has been no contact by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations or the Committee on Energy and Commerce with those of us whose comments in the hearings were butchered up, to try to see how we all could cooperate together to get to the bottom of this matter without having a formal Ethics Committee investigation.

Now, all these failures are history and we are here today and now and it does not do the House proud, but we have got to decide how to proceed.

As the gentleman from Mississippi has indicated, he is going to support this resolution on final passage and so am I because this is the last shot we have left. But I think we ought to vote down the previous question so that the special Standards Committee's rules that say that anything in the investigatory stage is held in secret, do not apply. If the previous question is voted down I intend to offer an amendment that says:

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding any rule of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, all meetings, hearings, and depositions authorized by this resolution shall be open.

This does not mean that everything has to go on in public, but what it does say is that the House rules, rather than the Standards Committee's rules on secret meetings prevail and that means there has to be a rollcall vote in the Standards Committee before they go into secret session.

Vote "no" on the previous question, adopt the amendment and then pass the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I heard on television the chairman of the Democratic National Committee calling for a special prosecutor on a campaign-related problem where criminal misconduct is alleged. Here today, with this resolution we are dealing with a problem where everybody who has reviewed the material admits flatly there are criminal violations involved and yet the Democrats in this House come before us today calling for treating this whole matter in a business-as-usual fashion.

We are not going to have business as usual when it comes to investigating the briefing book; the chairman of that subcommittee has already announced that he is going to hire additional investigators to take care of that matter. But yesterday in this emergency session of the Rules Committee the Ethics Committee chairman announced there that his committee could handle this thing with just the same amount of staff and the same amount of resources that they now have. In other words, no special attention here. Business as usual. But special prosecutors and all of that on the briefing book scandal.

It seems to me that what we are seeing here is a case of unmitigated hypocrisy. I think select committee was the right route to go, because what a select committee would do is assure a full and open investigation.

Yet, at the Rules Committee yesterday, even though the select committee resolution was brought to this floor and voted to go to the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee did not even take up that resolution, they did not even give it a cursory look. Instead they took up their own resolution which we have on the floor today. Did not even give the idea of the select committee a cursory look.

It seems to me that is hyprocrisy.

I suppose the process proposed here is better than nothing. But it certainly is not the vigorous action proposed when the Democrats think that they have some advantageous political issue of their own.

So, I too will probably vote for this resolution. It is all we have. But I think that it is clear that this House is not capable of fully investigating itself and therefore it seems to me that where this matter has got to go now is to the Justice Department.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

Mr. GREGG. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I come to this floor today, I guess, as a Member who has learned a great deal in the last few weeks, a Member who has come to recognize that even in the most jaded moments we have reached a new low here. The fact that this House has decided not to take this matter up in the open is something which I think this House is going to regret in the future.

It seems to me that when Members, over six or seven Members have their words actually churned and reversed and redirected, that this House owes those Members a little more consideration. What has been an essentially very fast-track attempt to get this matter out of public eye.

The facts, the factors of the movement to the Rules Committee last night have been reviewed, the facts of the way yesterday's debate was carried have been reviewed, the factors of the attempt to get unanimous consent yesterday have been reviewed.

It is truly an unfortunate situation. I would like to add one other point. That is a point that has been raised here relative to the national press coverage of this issue.

It clearly is the ultimate hypocrisy that the national press has made a major issue out of what is an important issue, the Carter briefing books, and then totally ignored something which goes to one of the most fundamental rights the American people have and that is free and clear access to our Government.

I look at the Washington Post, for example, today a front page story on the Carter notebooks, today an editorial on the Carter notebooks. Well, what do they talk about with this issue, well, it is about 1½ column inches stuck on pages 3, 4, or 5. In the annals of yellow journalism this paper clearly gets a good solid lemon. And if truth in advertising were applied to the national media, especially to this newspaper today, they would have to print its columns at a 45-degree angle. This paper belongs in the trash because that is about what the quality of the reporting of this issue has been.

And as a practical matter the national media coverage of this has also been on the same level and if I sound frustrated, I am, obviously, and I am not going to win this battle and I will vote for the final resolution because it is the only choice we are going to have around here. But the fact is that we have been treated poorly here today, not only by this Congress has also by the national media and especially by the primary source in this city.

Thank you very much.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILER).

Mr. HILER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I too, am frustrated and rising to support this particular resolution; that was not the most preferred resolution I would like to have seen but it is the only one in town today.

I am somewhat disappointed of the events that took place in the last 24 hours. Yesterday morning Mr. WINN offered a privileged motion, Mr. WRIGHT offered a motion to refer that resolution to the Rules Committee, the House voted overwhelmingly to refer it to the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee did not even take up that particular motion, that particular resolution. But even before that time period, when we were in the 5-minute rule in debating the Consumer Products Safety Commission legislation, the Ethics Committee tried to pass by unanimous consent their resolution.

In my estimation that was totally subverting what the House voted to do just several hours before that. There was then an emergency meeting called in the Rules Committee, 5 o'clock; the Republican members did not even know what it was about. The resolution that was referred to the Rules Committee was not taken up. I hope that the investigation that will be undertaken by the Ethics Committee will be more orderly and more complete than the events of the last 24 hours. I think there is a tremendous irony in what is happening today. We are voting to send this matter to the cocoon of the Ethics Committee, while we read in today's paper how the broadened inquiry into the briefing book, the question of how the Carter documents came into the possession of the Reagan campaign is being investigated by the Justice Department at the request of the White House; additionally it is being considered whether to have a widened congressional inquiry into how the Reagan Campaign Committee obtained the documents.

The committee is going to decide whether to issue subpenas and hold public hearings.

We are going to hold public hearings, subpena powers on what happened down at the White House. Yet, when we are talking about what happened in this very House of Representatives with what is definitely criminal behavior we are going to hold it behind closed doors. I am pleased that the Rules Committee did include in the Ethics Committee resolution a provision which mandates that the Ethics Committee report to this House the result of its finding by December 30. I think that is a major plus for the resolution that the Ethics Committee is required to report.

So, those of us who are involved, the rest of the House and the American people will have a chance to know what did happen. I wish that this had taken place in a more open fashion. But I am happy that it is going to be investigated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, too, want to deplore the double standard mentioned so often by my colleagues here, not only by virtue of the press coverage that has assumed an imbalance between the debate papers and this particular fiasco, but also with respect to the general public's feelings and knowledge about what happened.

I asked several staff members and several constituents at different times in the last few days: "Have you heard anything about the debate papers controversy?" Universally the answer was, "Yes, I saw it on the TV, read about it, I heard something about it."

I asked them, "Have you heard anything about the scandal in the House of Representatives whereby speeches and words and actions of Members of the House have been distorted, deleted, and altered by somebody, somewhere?" They said, "No," universally.

So, that double standard on press coverage and on notoriety exists without question. That is why I have so pointedly asked the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), as to whether or not the Ethics Committee is going to make any of this public. It must be made public and as soon as things are present that should be made public for the purposes of balancing this kind of situation.

In my judgment, we are seeing the first shot in what will be a new scandal which, when given the proper press coverage, will be called Altergate. That is a situation where people are altering our words and opening the flood gates of scandal. It is an Altergate situation.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a member of the Ethics Committee, I would like to say that I view this, as a very serious matter. It goes to a very fundamental part of our entire process.

I, for one, and I am sure I speak for the Republican members on the Ethics Committee, are very concerned about this matter.

We do not intend to allow anything to be covered up.

This affects everyone on the majority and minority side in this body. It reflects on our entire system. We cannot afford to have the American people lose faith in our system, because if they do, all that we do is for naught.

I would like to say that we need additional powers, if we are to investigate this matter, those things concerning interrogatories, subpenas, and depositions, as has been point out already.

I would like to say one further thing in all fairness: Those people who have concerns about closed hearings, and I have heard some people say that there will be no open hearings, I would like to say this: There is a very good reason, in the investigative part of our committee proceedings, to require executive, closed hearings to keep from ruining the reputation of innocent people who can have their entire reputation, their families, their lives, destroyed by hearsay in an open hearing.

□ 1045

We cannot afford to let that happen.

If and when, in this part of our proceedings, we find evidence of wrongdoing, then that person is charged with allegations and the hearings then go open.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What happens if that person should be fired or resign at the time the Committee on Standards has decided to formally charge him?

Mr. SPENCE. That still does not prevent the hearings from going open. As a matter of fact, I will give a hypothetical case to the gentleman—and he should know, he served on the committee. He is an attorney.

In an open hearing involving drugs, someone says: "Well, I heard that Joe sold drugs to Congressman Sensenbrenner." Open hearing. You cannot get that back. You have been harmed.

What we do in a closed hearing is to go to Joe. He says: "No, I didn't sell drugs to Congressman Sensenbrenner." That never goes open. It is a grand jury type proceedings there. Later on it goes open if we find basis for what he says.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KAZEN). The time of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has expired.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. If the gentleman will yield further, what happens when you ask Congressman SENSENBRENNER whether he ever brought drugs from Joe? Under the gentleman's procedures, even if Congressman SENSENBRENNER should want to testify in open, under oath, that he never bought drugs from anybody, under the gentleman's rules, that would have to be in closed hearings so that I could never exonerate myself in public until some time in the future when you come out with a report saying, "We have investigated this and he is innocent."

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman ever wants to go to that place and deny something he has not been accused of in public, the gentleman can feel sure he will have that opportunity.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, having no requests for time, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 151, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—250

Ackerman	Bonker	Daschle
Addabbo	Borski	de la Garza
Akaka	Bosco	Dellums
Albosta	Boucher	Derrick
Alexander	Boxer	Dicks
Anderson	Breaux	Dingell
Andrews (NC)	Britt	Dixon
Andrews (TX)	Brooks	Donnelly
Annunzio	Brown (CA)	Dorgan
Anthony	Bryant	Downey
Applegate	Burton (CA)	Durbin
Aspin	Carper	Dwyer
AuCoin	Carr	Dyson
Barnard	Chappell	Early
Barnes	Clarke	Eckart
Bates	Clay	Edgar
Beilenson	Coelho	Edwards (CA)
Bennett	Coleman (TX)	English
Berman	Collins	Erdreich
Biaggi	Cooper	Evans (IL)
Boggs	Coyne	Fascell
Boland	Crockett	Fazio
Bonior	D'Amours	Feighan

Ferraro
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Forsythe
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gore
Gray
Guarini
Hall (IN)
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Harkin
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jenkins
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kennelly
Kildee
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Markey
Martin (NY)
Matsui
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McNulty
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Panetta
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Shannon
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Simon
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)
Zablocki

NAYS—151

Archer
Bartlett
Bateman
Bereuter
Bethune
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Carney
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Coleman (MO)
Conable
Conte
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis
DeWine
Duncan
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Frenzel
Gekas
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gramm
Green
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Hartnett
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hunter
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson
Kasich
Kindness
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Mazzoli
McCain
McCollum
McDonald
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
McKinney
Michel
Miller (OH)
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Paul
Petri
Porter
Pritchard
Pursell
Regula
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rudd
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schneider
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solomon
Stangeland
Stump
Sundquist
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Williams (OH)
Winn
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—32

Badham
Bedell
Bevill
Boner
Byron
Conyers
Daniel
Dickinson
Dowdy
Dreier
Dymally
Erlenborn
Fuqua
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Harrison
Heftel
Jones (NC)
Kemp
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Martinez
Mavroules
McCandless
McDade
Mrazek
Smith (IA)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Weaver
Whitten
Williams (MT)

□ 1100

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote.

Mr. Mrazek for, with Mr. Badham against.

Mr. Heftel of Hawaii for, with Mr. McCandless against.

Mr. Dymally for, with Mr. McDade against.

Mr. Boner for, with Mr. Denny Smith against.

Mr. Lehman of California for, with Mr. Robert F. Smith against.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington and Mr. LUJAN changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KAZEN). The question is on the resolution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—409

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (NC)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bethune
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Crockett
D'Amours
Dannemeyer
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Forsythe
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Frost
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (IN)
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leath
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Markey
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McDonald
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Paul
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Simon
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Snowe

Snyder	Thomas (GA)	Whittaker
Solarz	Torres	Williams (MT)
Solomon	Torricelli	Williams (OH)
Spence	Towns	Wilson
Spratt	Traxler	Winn
St Germain	Udall	Wirth
Staggers	Valentine	Wise
Stangeland	Vander Jagt	Wolf
Stark	Vandergriff	Wolpe
Stenholm	Vento	Wortley
Stokes	Volkmer	Wright
Stratton	Vucanovich	Wyden
Studds	Walgren	Wylie
Stump	Walker	Yates
Sundquist	Watkins	Yatron
Swift	Waxman	Young (AK)
Synar	Weaver	Young (FL)
Tallon	Weber	Young (MO)
Tauke	Weiss	Zablocki
Tauzin	Wheat	Zschau
Taylor	Whitehurst	
Thomas (CA)	Whitley	

NOT VOTING—24

Badham	Erlenborn	Lehman (CA)
Bedell	Fuqua	Martinez
Boner	Hance	Mavroules
Byron	Hansen (ID)	McCandless
Daniel	Harrison	Mrazek
Dowdy	Heftel	Smith (IA)
Dreier	Kemp	Smith, Robert
Dymally	Leach	Whitten

□ 1115

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF MIKE PRELOH

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that after 41 years and 6 months, Mike Preloh, the superintendent of the garage at the Rayburn House Office Building is retiring today. He had 36 years working for the Congress, preceded by 5 years in the military service.

Mike has had a very long and distinguished career of dedicated service to the Members of Congress and he has always been very helpful to me and to my staff and to everybody of whom I am aware. As a member of the Committee on House Administration, which has jurisdiction over the parking garages, I have had many occasions to deal directly and personally with Mike.

I think he has been an outstanding public servant. I know we will miss him. I know he has many friends here in the Congress who would like to be aware of the fact that he is retiring today after 41½ years of Government service, and I am sure that they will all join in wishing him well.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the retirement of Mike Preloh.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KAZEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5(b) of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each question of adopting resolutions or on ordering the previous question on resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after all debate has been concluded on each resolution and after each question to be determined by a "nonrecord" vote has been disposed of, the Chair will then put the question on each resolution or on the previous question thereon, on which further proceedings were postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, HOUSING AND URBAN RURAL RECOVERY ACT OF 1983

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 248

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to amend and extend certain Federal laws that establish housing and community and neighborhood development and preservation programs, and for other purposes, the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with, and all points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI are hereby waived. Immediately after the short title has been designated by the Clerk, it shall be in order to consider amendments printed in the Congressional Record of July 11, 1983, by Representative Gonzalez of Texas and, if offered by Representative Gonzalez or his designee, said amendments shall be considered en bloc and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, all points of order against said amendments for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI, are hereby waived, and said amendments shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by Representative Gonzalez and a Member opposed thereto, before they are considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. After the disposition of said amendments, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered for amendment. After said substitute has been read for amendment in its entirety, it shall be in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record of July 11, 1983, by Representative Wylie of Ohio and, if offered by Representative Wylie or his designee, all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provision of clause 5, rule XXI, are hereby waived, and said amendment shall be debatable for not to exceed two hours, equally divided and controlled by Representative Wylie and a Member opposed thereto, before it is considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Amendments to the table of contents of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order at any time during the consideration of said substitute. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1130

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), and pending that I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1, the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983 with 2 hours of general debate. The rule is designed to preserve the options of the Members with alternative approaches to housing recovery and presents a fair and equitable parliamentary procedure for consideration of this bill.

The rule waives points of order under section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act which prohibits consideration of any bill which authorizes the enactment of new budget authority for a fiscal year unless that bill has

been reported on or before May 15 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year. The waiver is necessary because the bill as introduced authorizes various Federal housing, community, and economic development programs which would become effective upon enactment—presumably in fiscal year 1983—and because it was not reported in a timely fashion. However, during markup the Banking Committee adopted an amendment making the authorizations effective October 1, 1983, thereby curing the Budget Act violation.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 provides for the consideration of the Banking Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text for the purpose of amendment. To facilitate the amendment process the rule also specifies that the substitute shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections with each title to be considered as read.

House Resolution 248 waives clause 5 of rule XXI to permit consideration of the committee substitute and two designated amendments. That rule prohibits appropriations in legislative bills. Various provisions of the committee substitute contain amendments which are effective in the current fiscal year, to housing and related laws. Many of those changes could allow funds already appropriated for fiscal year 1983 to be used for the new programs provided in the substitute. Thus, the waiver of clause 5, rule XXI is required. However, such waivers are usually noncontroversial in the case of bills making changes in multiyear funding programs.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. GONZALEZ, is to be commended for his diligence in shepherding this legislation through the Banking Committee and for his commitment to the preservation of our Nation's housing programs in the face of critical budgetary constraints. The gentleman will offer amendments designed to conform the bill to the fiscal parameters of the budget resolution.

Under the terms of this rule, there will be 1 hour of general debate of the Gonzalez amendments prior to the consideration of any other amendments. Since these amendments would apply to more than one title of the bill, they will be considered en bloc and will not be subject to a division. After the disposition of the Gonzalez amendments the committee substitute shall be considered for amendment and amendments to its table of contents shall be in order at any time.

After the committee substitute has been read for amendment in its entirety, Mr. WYLIE would be permitted to offer a substitute proposal which will be debatable for 2 hours prior to its consideration for amendment.

Although this resolution structures the amendment process, any germane amendment could be offered. Upon conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendent, one motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 authorizes $13 billion for assisted housing programs for the poor, the handicapped, and the elderly. It authorizes $4 billion for rural housing programs under the Farmers Home Administration. A new housing program designed to encourage the production of multifamily housing is established by this legislation.

The bill provides $4.5 billion per year for community development block grants through fiscal year 1986 and authorizes up to $250 million for such grants in areas that are experiencing high levels of unemployment.

The bill sets aside $50 million for a homesteading program in which HUD would transfer vacant properties to local governments which in turn would offer them to needy families.

H.R. 1 continues the significant GNMA tandem program, which is essential under current market conditions, to permit construction of section 8 housing.

Mr. Speaker, difficult decisions confront the Congress, on the scope of our national commitment to decent and affordable public housing. This rule provides a reasonable basis for consideration of the merits of the basic housing issues under a fair and open procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule and urge adoption of House Resolution 248 so that we may proceed to the consideration of this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation made in order by this rule is one of the biggest budget busters of the entire Congress.

This bill, the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983 is $15.7 billion over the President's recommendation and $8 billion over the amount appropriated last year.

With all the talk about excessive budget deficits, there is no way we should be considering adopting a bill with such high authorization levels. Expressed in percentages, this bill embodies a 43-percent increase over fiscal year 1983's funding levels. We should be talking about reducing spending in this bill, or at the very least holding it to last year's levels. But this bill abandons even the pretense of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, in addition there are program changes in this bill such as the rollback of tenant rents, which will aggravate our budget deficit situation for years to come. Specifically, the bill rolls back the public housing tenant rent contributions from 30 to 25 percent of income.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we do not want anyone to pay too much in rent as a percentage of income. But according to testimony in the Rules Committee, the average middle-class rental family is in fact paying well over 30 percent of its income in rent. It does not seem fair to me to have the average factory worker's family paying close to 40 percent of income for housing, and then decree by law that those who are on general assistance will not pay more than 25 percent.

Mr. Speaker, another thing in this bill which concerns me is that the previously enacted targeting provision, directing assistance to lower income families, defined as 50 percent of area median income or lower, would be repealed. Under this bill eligibilty would be restored to families earning up to 80 percent of area median income.

Mr. Speaker, there is another subject this bill fails to properly address, and that is rent control. There is general agreement that rent control—and even the mere threat of rent control—is a disincentive to rental housing development. Without an amendment to deny these new funds to communities that place rent controls on new nonsubsidized projects, the communities that do the most to discourage new production through rent control will be leading candidates for receipt of the funds. The project selection criteria put a heavy emphasis on the severity of the shortage of rental housing. The cities with a shortage of rental housing are the rent control cities. This bill would reward those cities that refuse to help themselves. It would do so at the expense of those communities which are trying to solve the rental housing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other concern that I raised in the Rules Committee, which should be mentioned here as well. That is the problem we have gotten into in the past of subsidizing rents in some pretty fancy buildings. These housing subsidies are supported by the taxes of working people, many of whom cannot afford to live in luxury housing. It is not fair to take the taxes of these working people, to support someone less productive or nonproductive, in better housing than the workers can afford. The committees establishing these programs should do careful oversight to prevent this misuse of taxpayers funds.

With regard to the administration's position, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the Rules Committee meeting we were informed that this bill is totally unacceptable to the administration. Ac-

cording to information provided by the Office of Management and Budget, if this bill were to reach the President's desk in its present form, it would be recommended for disappoval.

□ 1140

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time and rise in support of the rule.

In rising in support of the rule, I want to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), chairman of the full Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, for their leadership and agreement to what I regard as a very generous rule on the housing bill.

It will, as has been suggested, provide for 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 1. Then there is a provision for 1 hour of general debate on some amendments which may or may not be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ). Then there are two hours of general debate on a substitute which I may or may not want to offer.

But in any event, as far as the rule is concerned, I see no problem. I support the waiver of the technical violation of clause 5, rule XXI and the Budget Act violations. The reason for the Budget Act waiver is that the original H.R. 1, as introduced, applied to fiscal year 1983. With the committee amendment, it will apply to fiscal year 1984.

Having said that, H.R. 1 is very controversial, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA). To begin with, it is $15.7 billion over the administration's request and $8 billion over the amount appropriated last year.

In addition, there are numerous changes in existing law and several new programs to which we in the minority will object.

I should point out that although the bill was voted out of the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee on a voice vote, I know of no members of the minority on the committee who would support the bill H.R. 1 in its present form.

I have talked with the chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) and I applaud their stated intent of bringing H.R. 1 into line as far as budget authority figures are concerned and, of course, we will want to take a look at that.

As has been pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) there are some other programmatic changes, such as the tenant rent provision, which we would still object to, as well as some other new and untried programs.

But, when H.R. 1 reaches the floor, I would hope that we can move expeditiously. There will be no intent on the part of the minority to engage in any dilatory tactics.

As I have suggested, there will be some changes in the law, and if the amendments which will be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) do not meet these objections, then we will try to package those into a substitute which I may want to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MCKINNEY).

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to congratulate the Rules Committee on both sides of the aisle for coming up with a rule which I consider to be eminently fair.

I find great troubles with H.R. 1 as it is presently constituted, but this is not the time to argue the case, and that will take place, I believe, on Monday and ensuing days when we return.

I strongly support the rule and hope it passes.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN).

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and also to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), for his hurculean efforts on this legislation and also to compliment the ranking minority member of our full committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE), as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee, because, as was stated by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE), at no point has there been any dilatory tactics.

We have managed to disagree most agreeably.

As a result thereof, our committee work has been most pleasant for all parties concerned.

I wish to state at this time that I realize that the fact we reported out this bill on a voice vote was a matter of cooperation by the minority rather than approbation. I wish to make that statement.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed. Point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 250 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 250

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXXI, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1150

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 250 is an open rule providing for the con-

sideration of H.R. 10, the National Development Investment Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

It should be noted that the rule makes in order the Public Works Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original text for purposes of amendment. In addition, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by titles instead of by sections and each title shall be considered as read.

House Resolution 250 further provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

There are no waivers granted under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10 extends and consolidates the programs of the Economic Development Administration and reauthorizes programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission. The Rules Committee was advised that the bill enjoys bipartisan support, and I am not aware of any opposition to this open rule. I would urge my colleagues to adopt the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This measure was voted out of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation by a vote of 50 to 0 and reported by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs by a voice vote.

I know of no opposition to the rule although the administration opposes the measure itself. But it is an open rule and the Members of this body will have an opportunity to discuss it freely and openly and offer amendments on the floor of the House when the bill is debated.

I live in the heart of the Appalachian region and I was on the Public Works Committee when the program first originated.

It has served a good purpose. This bill authorizes sums for the completion of activities authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

With regard to EDA, the eligibility requirements have been tightened.

The extension continues until 1991 on the Appalachian highway program, and until 1986 on the economic development program.

Admittedly, there is controversy involved on the bill but I know of no controversy whatsoever on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take this time to explain the bill which is very simple in itself.

We did explain it in some detail at the hearing before the House Committee on Rules. I do want to thank the Rules Committee for reporting out a clean and straightforward rule that will give Members an opportunity fully to debate the legislation, to offer whatever amendments any Members may choose to offer. We do bring to the House an updating of both the economic development program and the Appalachian Regional Commission program which at this time and for the foreseeable future, however much the recovery may proceed with vigor, will still be needed by certain areas of the country which will unavoidably not share in the recovery and will need the targeted kind of assistance available under these two programs.

We will look forward to debating these programs and explaining the legislation in full on Monday, July 11. I want to thank the Committee on Rules again and particularly my colleague on the House Public Works Committee, the ranking member of the Economic Development Subcommittee, Representative CLINGER of Pennsylvania, who has cooperated fully and given of his time and talent and creative ideas to the shaping of this legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 126, COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S TRUMAN

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 226 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 226

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 126) providing for the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman in the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. WHEAT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR) for the purposes of debate only. Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 226 is the rule providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 126 which provides for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman.

The concurrent resolution establishes a bipartisan Joint Committee on Arrangements which is instructed to plan a joint meeting of the Congress honoring our 33d President. The joint committee is to be composed of 16 members: The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate and seven Members from each of the two Houses. The joint committee is instructed to plan a program, issue appropriate invitations, and coordinate its functions with the activities of the Truman Centennial Committe, Washington, D.C. The joint committee is authorized to spend not more than $25,000 for these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule reported from the committee is a simple one. It provides for consideration of the resolution in the House with the previous question considered as ordered. In effect, the process established for consideration is the same as that for a privileged resolution. House Resolution 226 would be considered in the House under the hour rule. As is customary, the floor manager would yield 30 minutes of the debate time to the minority. No amendment would be in order unless the floor manager yielded for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the procedure provided for in the rule is fully consistent with the practice of the Rules Committee in considering noncontroversial measures of this kind. The rule provides for the expeditious handling of House Concurrent Resolution 126 and allows adequate time to debate the matter fully.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 226 is the rule under which the House will consider the concurrent resolution to commemorate the 100th birthday of one of Missouri's most illustrious sons, President Harry S Truman.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 126. The rule provides for consideration of the resolution in the House, rather than in the Committee of the Whole. The effect of using this procedure is to preclude the offering of any motions or amendments, unless the floor manager yields for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this procedure is fully consistent with the practice of the House and of previous recommenda-

tions of the Committee on Rules in considering commemoration resolutions of this kind.

The essence of this rule is to provide for our consideration in the House of Concurrent Resolution 126, and since we will take that matter up momentarily, I urge the adoption of the rule.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN).

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my support for House Concurrent Resolution 126, which creates a joint committee to plan a joint session of Congress to commemorate Harry S Truman's 100th birthday.

I feel that a joint session of Congress would be appropriate to commemorate Mr. Truman's 100th birthday. His growing popularity today is based not only on what he accomplished as President, which was a great deal, but on the kind of man he was—his style. The admiration is for his buoyancy of spirit, his vigorous combativeness, and his invincible faith in the United States and its people.

What were once regarded as possibly faults—his impetuosity, shooting from the hip, and his writing of angry letters—now are seen as part of his spirit that let him stand the heat of tough decisions and stay in the most closely watched kitchen in the world.

His decisions set the pattern for American foreign policy for succeeding decades. That the United States did not, with the coming of peace, retreat once more into her traditional isolationism owes much to Truman's readiness to face the facts as he saw them, acknowledge his mistakes and change course where necessary.

This ability to grapple with the great issues of the time was especially striking for a man whom many had considered unfit for the task. That he was able to assume the burdens of world leadership for his country can be attributed not only to his innate toughness of mind and body, but to his lifelong study and keen sense of history.

A historic joint session of Congress would only be a fitting tribute to this great American.

Today we fully recognize and admire the leadership qualities Mr. Truman exercised in directing our country through difficult times. I strongly support creating a committee to organize a joint session of Congress to honor President Truman on his 100th birthday.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, HOUSING AND URBAN RURAL RECOVERY ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 248.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, House Resolution 248.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 291, nays 110, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—291

Ackerman
Addabbo
Akaka
Albosta
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (NC)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Bonior
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Britt
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Clarke
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Corcoran
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
D'Amours
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Ferraro
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Forsythe
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gore
Gray
Green
Guarini
Hall (IN)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hefner
Hertel
Hightower
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kennelly
Kildee
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leath
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Markey
Marlenee
Marriott
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Shannon
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Simon
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)
Zablocki

NAYS—110

Archer
Bartlett
Bateman
Bereuter
Bethune
Bilirakis
Bliley
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Conable
Coughlin
Craig
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeWine
Duncan
Edgar
Edwards (AL)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Frenzel
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gramm
Gregg
Gunderson
Hartnett
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hubbard
Hunter
Hyde
Kasich
Kindness
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
McCain
McCollum
McDonald
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
Moorhead
Nielson
O'Brien
Oxley
Packard
Pashayan
Paul
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roth
Rudd
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Smith, Denny
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stump
Thomas (CA)
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Winn
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—32

Badham
Bedell
Boland
Boner
Byron
Collins
Daniel
Dowdy
Dreier
Erlenborn
Ford (TN)
Fuqua
Hall (OH)
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Harrison
Heftel
Jones (NC)
Kemp
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Martinez
Mavroules
McCandless
Pepper
Pritchard
Smith (IA)
Smith, Robert
Swift
Weaver
Whitten
Wright

□ 1210

Mr. WIRTH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF HARRY S TRUMAN

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 226, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 126) providing for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 126

Whereas the year 1984 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman on May 8, 1884;

Whereas Harry S Truman was born and reared in rural Missouri, enjoyed a boyhood reminiscent of Huckleberry Finn's, graduated from high school, made his living for a decade on a farm behind a plow, joined the Army in the First World War, and, as a captain, led Battery D, 129th Field Artillery, 35th Division, in combat in the Meuse-Argonne and at Verdun;

Whereas he served for a decade as judge (commissioner) of Jackson County, Missouri, and, among other responsibilities, oversaw the building of some of the first paved roads around Kansas City;

Whereas he was elected to the United States Senate and took his seat in 1935, serving as a member of the Senate Appropriations, Military Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, was instrumental in writing major pieces of legislation, including the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and the Transportation Act of 1940, proposed and served as chairman of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program (the "Truman Committee"), which was estimated to have saved taxpayers billions of dollars on war contracts;

Whereas under Franklin D. Roosevelt, he served as Vice President of the United States from January 20, 1945, to April 12, 1945;

Whereas upon the death of Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, Harry S Truman was sworn in as President of the United States at the climax of the Second World War and with almost no preparation for the historic military and diplomatic problems that were piling up on the United States, including the question of using the atomic bomb to end the war against Japan quickly so as to save Japanese and American lives in the end;

Whereas with modesty, courage, and commonsense he took up the cause of opposing Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, the Balkans, the Black Sea Straits, and Iran, directed that, despite Roosevelt's sudden death, the United Nations Conference on International Organization meet in San Francisco as scheduled to establish the United Nations, and successful recommended that the Senate approve ratification of the charter, bringing the United States into the United Nations;

Whereas he presided over the turbulent task of postwar reconversion of the economy from wartime to a peacetime production, obtained passage of the landmark Employment Act of 1946 that declared that "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practical means . . . functions and resources" to foster "maximum employment, production and purchasing power", prevailed upon Congress to pass the National Housing Act of 1949 to provide low-cost housing and slum clearance, won a bitter battle in Congress to keep control of nuclear weapons in civilian hands, introduced legislation for national medical insurance that was the forerunner of Medicare, which has assured adequate medical treatment for millions of Americans, unified the Armed Forces in a new Department of Defense and created modern new organs of government, including the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency;

Whereas he directed that the United States be the first nation to recognize the new State of Israel in 1948 and began the special relationship that has existed between Americans and Israelis;

Whereas he ordered the racial desegregation of the armed services in 1948 and the same year submitted to Congress the first Presidential special message on civil rights, based on a report To Secure These Rights, which proved to have laid out the agenda for the civil rights reforms of the 1960's;

Whereas by his decision to institute an airlift at the time of the Soviet blockade of Berlin in 1948 and 1949, he balked an attempt by the Kremlin to dominate all of Germany, if not of Europe;

Whereas under his policies the former energy states of Japan and Germany (West Germany at least) were brought into a friendly and constructive relationship with the United States;

Whereas in 1950, he resolutely drew the line against further Communist expansionism and upheld the ideal of collective security by committing American forces—later joined by those of other members of the United Nations—to throw the invading North Korean Communist Army back to the 38th pararell in Korea, preserving South Korea, still a steadfast ally; and

Whereas he took as his slogan "The Buck Stops Here" and said in his farewell address of January 15, 1953, "I have tried to give it everything that was in me" and left office, after virtually two full terms, with employment and prosperity high and the Western World firmly allied against possible Communist aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) in order to provide for an appropriate commemoration by the Congress of the centennial of the birth of Harry S Truman, thirty-third President of the United States of America, there is established a Special Joint Committee on Arrangements (hereinafter referred to in this concurrent resolution as the "joint committee") which shall be composed of sixteen members as follows:

(1) The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) Seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, four upon recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate and three upon recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(3) Seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, three upon recommendation of the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) The members of the joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Any vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) For the purposes of paragraph 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, service of a Senator as a member or chairman of the joint committee shall not be taken into account.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to—

(1) make arrangements for a joint meeting of the Congress to be held on Tuesday, May 8, 1984, or such other day as may be designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in the Hall of the House of Representatives in commemoration of the centennial of the birth of Harry S Truman;

(2) plan the proceedings of and issue appropriate invitations for such joint meeting; and

(3) coordinate the joint committee's arrangements with the activities of the Truman Centennial Committee, Washington, District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The joint committee may—

(1) appoint an executive director, who shall serve without compensation, and accept such other volunteer services of individuals as it deems appropriate;

(2) adopt rules respecting its organization and procedures; and

(3) sit and act at such times and places as it shall deem appropriate.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the joint committee under this concurrent resolution may not exceed $25,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. WHEAT) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR), for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 126 which provides for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman. House Concurrent Resolution 126 was introduced on May 11, 1983 by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee (Mr. PEPPER), and the entire Missouri delegation.

The Committee on Rules reported this concurrent resolution on June 7,

1983, as a matter of original jurisdiction by an unanimous voice vote.

Honoring the accomplishments of our former Presidents and leaders has always been a bipartisan consensus in Congress. In fact, it would be difficult to overstate the importance of commemorating our leaders and national history.

Congress has previously created centennial commissions to plan national observances honoring Presidents from Washington and Lincoln to Wilson and Roosevelt.

In addition, Congress has met in joint session to mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of George Washington in 1932, the Lincoln sesquicentennial in 1959 and the 100th anniversary of Franklin Delano Roosevelt just last year.

The concurrent resolution establishes a 16-member, bipartisan joint committee on arrangements to provide for the centennial anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman. The Joint Committee is responsible for planning a joint meeting of Congress to honor our 33d President; issuing appropriate invitations and coordinating its functions with the activities of the Truman Centennial Committee in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution further provides that the committee appoint an executive director who will serve without compensation and that the committee be authorized $25,000 for administrative costs which it may incur.

Congress has frequently appropriated funds for Presidential memorials. In 1982, Congress authorized appropriations for the construction of a memorial to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. During the 96th Congress, Members provided $121,000 for the printing of a collection of essays entitled "Herbert Hoover: Reassessed." And in 1974, Congress observed the centennial anniversary of President Hoover's birth by authorizing $7 million to construct a building at the Hoover Institute at Stanford University.

Mr. Speaker, Harry S Truman was the seventh Vice President to succeed to the highest elected office in the land as a result of the death of a President. The circumstances under which he assumed the Presidency would have overwhelmed a lesser man. The Nation was at war and in shock at the loss of one of its most revered Presidents.

Truman admitted later that when he learned of F. D. R.'s death, he felt like, and I quote, "the Moon, the stars and all the planets had fallen on me."

But Harry S Truman, who grew up close to the soil in the Midwest, had the courage, indomitable spirit, vigorous intellect and endless energy to get the job done.

Harry Truman was born in Lamar, Mo., on May 8, 1884. He served in the U.S. Army as a Jackson County judge and as a U.S. Senator before assuming the Vice Presidency and finally, the Presidency.

The Presidency of Harry S Truman is firmly lodged in Presidential lore because of his now famous slogan, "The Buck Stops Here." But our 33d President contributed more to our country's history than catchy phrases.

Harry Truman assumed the Presidency and was faced with the responsibility of bringing a horrible war to a close and preparing Americans for life in a profoundly changed postwar era.

In a joint address to Congress, Truman said "Peace must be built upon power, as well as upon good will and good deeds." Harry Truman made the decisions to insure a just peace and bring this Nation safely and securely through a terribly dangerous and unsettled era.

He summoned the courage to push the war with Japan to an end by ordering the use of the first atomic bomb.

He fought to assure a lasting peace by advocating the establishment of the United Nations, by securing enactment of the Marshall plan to rebuild the economy of Western Europe and by creating the Truman doctrine to block Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe and around the globe.

Author Robert Donovan, who expertly chronicled the Truman Presidency, said that Truman's political views were a mixture of Wilsonian and Rooseveltian liberalism, midwestern progressivism and border-state conservatism. That mix enabled Truman to obtain passage of the landmark Employment Act of 1946 and the National Housing Act of 1949. He also introduced legislation for national health insurance that was the forerunner of medicare. Truman was also responsible for the creation of such modern Government institutions and agencies as the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

In 1948, President Truman ordered racial desegregation of the armed services and submitted the first Presidential message on civil rights— a message which would become the blueprint for civil rights reforms in the 1960's.

Mr. Speaker, it is the privilege of the Congress to have the opportunity to honor a man who in life carried his own greatness with unfailing humor and modesty.

Mr. Speaker, Harry S Truman was a doer, not a dreamer. He embodied the best of the principles that this Nation was founded on. He exemplified the courage, the patriotism, the desire, the humor, and the energy that helped mold this country into the world's greatest democracy. As long as Americans remain devoted to these principles, they shall cherish the memory and record of Harry S Truman.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 126 establishes a Joint Committee on Arrangements to provide for a joint meeting of Congress in commemoration of the centennial of the birth of our 33d President, Harry S Truman.

All of the members of the Missouri delegation are proud to be original sponsors of the concurrent resolution, which is brought to the floor today as a matter of original jurisdiction from the Committee on Rules. I am pleased to report that it is also cosponsored by our distinguished colleague from Florida, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, Mr. PEPPER, and the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader, Mr. WRIGHT.

The concurrent resolution establishes a 16-member special Joint Committee on Arrangements to plan and issue invitations for the joint meeting of Congress, which will be held on May 8, 1984, or on a day otherwise designated by the Speaker.

This date, May 8, 1984, is the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Harry Truman, and the joint meeting of Congress is viewed by those of us who introduced the concurrent resolution as the culmination of a full year of various commemorative events.

Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues are aware that several years ago we here in the Congress chose to commemorate President Truman's service to the Nation in a very special way. We did not fashion a statue or some other such memorial; we created a living memorial known as the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the entire Missouri delegation for the introduction of this resolution, and all the other Members who have cosponsored the resolution.

□ 1230

I think we will all look forward next year on May 8 to the commemoration by the joint session of Congress honoring Harry S Truman. I had the honor and privilege of serving in the House during his administration. In fact, I was first elected to the House in 1948 with Harry Truman. To my mind, he is one of our greatest statesmen in the history of this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his kind remarks and for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, since the inception of the scholarship fund in 1977, we have provided 264 young men and 259 young women with scholarships for study in the field of public service.

I am very proud to have served as a director of the Truman Scholarship Fund since its creation, for the scholarships we have awarded are among the most prestigious and significant education programs available to the young people of this Nation today.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman gave much of himself in service to this Nation, and I believe it is most appropriate that we here in the Congress pay our 33d President the high honor called for in this concurrent resolution.

As the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. WHEAT) has explained, the 16-member special joint committee will include the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. Seven Members of the other body will be appointed by the President pro tempore, four from the majority and three from the minority side. Seven Members of the House will be appointed by the Speaker, four from the majority and three from the minority side.

The joint committee created by this concurrent resolution is similar to the one that we created in the last Congress to commemorate President Roosevelt, in that it will appoint a volunteer executive director, who will serve without compensation, and to accept other volunteer services as it deems appropriate.

The expenses of the joint committee are not to exceed $25,000 and they will be paid for out of the contingent fund of the House.

The joint committee will plan the proceedings for the joint meeting of Congress and issue appropriate invitations. The committee is instructed to coordinate its arrangements with the activities of the Truman Centennial Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman was a man who assumed the awesome responsibilities of the President of the United States in a difficult and critical time in our history. He went on to prove that he was a man who could act decisively and shoulder the responsibilities that had to be made at that time.

Harry Truman brought World War II to an end. He set up the Marshall plan to assist war-torn nations abroad, and he gave vital support to freedom-loving countries throughout the world. He fought Communist takeover wherever it threatened, with such actions as the Truman doctrine in Turkey and Greece, and the Berlin airlift.

Harry Truman gave our Nation courageous leadership in a time when such leadership was essential.

He always considered himself to be "just a simple man from Missouri." He was not self-impressed with the role thrust upon him as President. He knew his shortcomings and he never thought of himself as infallible.

His courage, his integrity, his compassion and his commonsense and his remarkable ability to reach the people of this Nation and to gain their trust stands as a shining example for all of us who serve in Government today.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in urging passage of this resolution.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the sponsor of this bill, who has worked so hard in bringing it to this point in our consideration.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago while I was waiting in the chair to take this matter up, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) came up to me and he said, "Speak well, because we want President Truman to receive his just due today."

I might say that it is very difficult to use words and to have them properly reflect the life of such an outstanding Missourian and American.

Mr. Speaker, President Harry S Truman once commented to the National Conference of Editorial Writers that he enjoyed spending a good part of every morning going over the daily newspapers "to find out lots of things about himself that he had never heard of." The truth is, Mr. Speaker, President Truman was underestimated in his day, and time has shown us the wisdom of this man from Independence. The legislation we are considering today, House Concurrent Resolution 126, will give us an opportunity to record the achievements of one of America's finest Presidents, Harry S Truman.

This bill, to provide for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Truman, calls for a special joint session of Congress to be convened on May 8, 1984. A bipartisan Special Joint Committee on Arrangements will be appointed by the House and the Senate leadership to plan the event and issue invitations. The record of this proceeding will be an invaluable historic document and a tribute to a great man and a great American. The entire Missouri delegation has joined me in cosponsoring this bill, as have over 100 other Members of this body.

The special joint session of Congress will be the highlight of a year of commemorative centennial events. For nearly a year now I have been working with the Truman Centennial Committee to lay the groundwork for the Truman centennial celebration. Together with the Missouri congressional delegation, we have been successful in achieving the passage of legislation which I authored to establish the Harry S Truman National Historic Site at his home in Independence, Mo. Additionally, the Postmaster General has confirmed plans to issue a commemorative postage stamp pursuant to legislation which I introduced in April. I am also pleased to announce that the Smithsonian Institute is planning a museumwide exhibition on President Truman.

The Truman Centennial Committee, under the direction of the Honorable Clark Clifford, has been coordinating other events. Most notable are a traveling exhibit which will tour the Midwest, and a documentary film tracing Truman's life from his birth in Lamar, Mo., to his retirement in Independence.

President Truman believed that "Men make history and not the other way 'round. Progress occurs when courageous, skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better." President Truman was just such a leader. The special joint session of Congress, which we are considering today, will provide us an opportunity to reflect on the man and to reflect on his legacy.

Harry Truman was a farmer and a merchant. He served his country in the Army, and his State as a county court judge and as a U.S. Senator. In 1945, Truman assumed the most awesome responsibility of his life and became the 33d President of the United States. As President, Truman made the fateful decision to use the first atomic weapon, which led to the end of World War II. He formulated a new direction for U.S. foreign policy, including opposition to Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe, establishment of the United Nations and the Marshall plan, and recognition of the new State of Israel. Simultaneously, President Truman presided over the turbulent task of postwar reconversion of the U.S. economy from wartime to peacetime production. He secured passage of the landmark Employment Act of 1946, as well as the National Housing Act of 1949. He saw to it that control of nuclear weapons would remain in civilian hands, and introduced legislation for national medical insurance that became the forerunner of medicare. And, with courage and commonsense, Truman ordered the desegregation of the Armed Services and submitted to Congress the first Presidential message on civil rights.

Truman had hoped that his epitaph would read "A Good Public Servant." Mr. Speaker, there is no argument that he was, and he was more. He was a leader with foresight. He was a loving father and husband, and a man of the people. At this time in our Nation's history, when our faith in ourselves and our Government seems to be easily shaken, we would be serving our fellow countrymen well by honor-

ing this simple man who did such great things for his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not thank my fellow Missourian, the gentleman on the Rules Committee (Mr. WHEAT), who as a fellow Jackson Countian of President Truman, for his assistance in this bill; also special thanks to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR) who also serves on the Rules Committee and the entire Missouri delegation for its bipartisan and unanimous consideration and help on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this resolution.

□ 1240

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may require to my colleague from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON).

Mr. EMERSON. It is with considerable nostalgia and enthusiasm that I am a cosponsor of this resolution and rise in strong support of it.

With nostalgia, I say, because it seems almost impossible that a whole century has passed since Harry S Truman was born.

I was born in 1938 when he was vigorously representing Missouri in the U.S. Senate. I can very vividly recall the era of his Presidency and his subsequent years.

Indeed, it has been my very personal pleasure to have known many of President Truman's contemporaries in Missouri, When he was a politician there, traveling about, the methods of politics were so much simpler than they are today where we are consumed with television and the radio and the print media. The way they used to do it was just get in a car and go, and go from county seat to county seat and meet whatever folks may be at the square and in the courthouse.

You can still travel around Missouri and find many people who had their personal visits with and have many, many fine personal recollections of that moment that they spent with Harry Truman.

It is with enthusiasm also that I rise in support of this resolution because I think it is appropriate to reflect on the life, the times, and the contibutions of Harry Truman. Indeed, to reflect on his commitment and his tenacious spirit. He added greatly to the lore of politics and government and, indeed to our language. He was not as polished in his speech perhaps as were his contemporaries, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, but he could nonetheless get very much to the point, often in a very witty and pungent manner.

As a matter of fact, I reflect almost daily upon one of my very favorite quotes from President Truman. I say reflect almost daily on it because it comes to mind frequently serving in this Chamber. He once said of one of his adversaries, he said:

> He is a man so firmly in possession of the truth that the facts don't matter very much.

The facts and the truth did indeed matter a great deal to Harry Truman and I think it is altogether fitting and proper that we honor him in the manner contemplated by this resolution. I heartily encourage my colleagues to give it their strong support and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to comment on this legislation and lend my support to House Concurrent Resolution 126. I first wish to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the Missouri delegation, and the majority leader for their dedicated attention and hard work in getting this bill considered by the House.

As the Members of this body know, Congress has officially commemorated other notable Presidents on the anniversary of their birthdays, including George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I feel it is only fitting that we honor this country's 33d President.

President Truman was a man of the people and an exceptional President who took this Nation through some troubled times. I happened to be an infantryman in Europe when President Roosevelt passed away. We all remember some of the significant events during Mr. Truman's term as President, his Marshall plan, the dropping of the A-bomb during World War II, the Truman doctrine, his 1948 whistlestop campaign, and of course we cannot forget Truman—the piano player.

This measure is a fitting tribute to the life, and memory of the gentleman from Missouri. Last month, Congress approved the legislation to designate the Harry S Truman home in Independence, Mo., as a national historic site. And today we will approve the resolution establishing the commemoration of the 100th birthday of Missouri's favorite son. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 126.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORRADA).

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to speak in support of House Concurrent Resolution 126, which provides for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman.

President Truman played a pivotal role in shaping the end of the Second World War and the world in which we now live. In retrospect one can fully appreciate the importance of the decisions that were made during those years in terms of the effect they had on our present life.

His commitment to helping create a more democratic and just world is seen in the international front by his role in helping establish the United Nations and in the Berlin airlift. Domestically, he laid the groundwork for the historic civil rights laws of the 1960's by ordering in 1948 the racial desegregation of the Armed Forces and by issuing the first Presidential special message on civil rights.

In Puerto Rico, President Truman will always be remembered and honored as the President who negotiated our transition to greater self-government in 1952. With the enactment of the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act as part of Public Law 81-600, Puerto Rico achieved more stability within its status as a territory of the United States. Although the Commonwealth status which we achieved in 1952 is not a permanent one, President Truman's role in focusing the Nation's attention on the status of Puerto Rico was of great consequence.

I look forward to the activities commemorating the birth of Harry S Truman and I urge my colleagues to approve this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I recently visited with my colleague, IKE SKELTON, at the Truman Library and saw the Truman Home, and I believe that he is one of the greatest Americans that we have had in our history and certainly in the 20th century.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution.

I came to Congress in January 1949. Thirty years before that I met the first President of the United States that I had ever met when I was only 7 years of age, and that was Woodrow Wilson. And 30 years later I met Harry Truman.

I think if I never meet another President in my entire life I will have met two of the greatest men that have ever been President of the United States.

The affection that Harry Truman had for mankind and for his country and his dedication to principle is something we all know about. It is axiomatic.

Another part of Harry Truman which I was pleased to enjoy was the easy way in which he gave friendship. He would call me up and ask me to come down to the White House. I went to dinner there a number of times and met him in hotels and at other types of dinners and things like that. He seemed always very interested in talking with me because I was a veteran

and he was a veteran and he had a rapport with people who had been in the military.

I guess the thing I liked about him best was the fact that he was frank and open in his correspondence and conversation. He was so very candid and so very warm and so very frank and sincere in everything he said or did.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the honor we are giving to the President here is certainly very much in order. Not only was he a great President, but he was also a great man, I am glad that in my youthful years as a Congressman I was able to share the friendship he so readily gave to all Members of Congress.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say at this time on behalf of the Missouri delegation we want to express our appreciation to you and to the Members of the House for the consideration of this resolution which we are proud to present on behalf of our favorite son from Missouri, Harry Truman.

I urge adoption of the resolution and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal today about the esteem in which our former President was held. Last month I had the opportunity to meet with Margaret Truman Daniel, who talked about the lack of recognition during President Truman's time.

□ 1250

Although it is belated, I am glad to have the honor not only to represent the district, part of the district along with Mr. SKELTON from which Harry Truman came but to participate in Congress honoring our former President in the 100th year of the Commemoration of his birthday.

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 126, providing for the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Harry S Truman. It is fitting and proper that the Congress should provide a forum to pay tribute to one of its distinguished former Members and one of our Nation's greatest leaders.

Harry S Truman was born in Lamar, Mo., on May 8, 1884. After serving time in the U.S. Army during World War I, he was elected judge of the Jackson County Court in Missouri in 1922. Two years later, Harry Truman became presiding judge of the court and was again elected in 1930. His accomplishments include a strong administrative background, especially as a builder of some of the first paved roads.

I would also like to highlight some of his legislative accomplishments. During his first Senate term, Harry Truman worked hard in support of the New Deal. As an active member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, he helped to produce the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and the Transportation Act of 1940. As head of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense program, Harry Truman led an attack on the waste and graft in the World War II defense program.

Harry S Truman served as Vice President in 1944 under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and on April 12, 1945, Harry Truman was sworn in as the 33d President of the United States. On May 8, President Truman sought and received the unconditional surrender of Germany and helped establish the United Nations, one of the first forums for international debate and resolution. As President, he also brought America into the atomic age.

President Truman's accomplishments in foreign affairs were significant. He enlarged post-World War II foreign policy, which prompted the recovery and reconstruction of Western Europe and Japan. A series of foreign aid policies on behalf of the United States from 1947 to 1949 included the Truman doctrine, which granted aid to Greece and Turkey and promised assistance to other nations threatened by outside pressures; the Marshall plan, which used American economic resouces to stimulate the recovery of European economies outside the Soviet sphere of influence; and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the first peacetime military alliance.

In domestic affairs, President Truman expanded and improved established programs and defended them against hard opposition. One of his domestic victories was the passage of the Housing Act of 1949, which included a provision for public housing. On behalf of civil rights, he worked harder than any of his predecessors. His personal concern about the plight of black Americans and America's racial climate moved the former President to act. He fought vigorously to obtain passage of a law assuring equal job opportunities for blacks, and eliminating poll taxes, lynchings, and discrimination on public transportation.

President Harry S Truman's accomplishments in both domestic and foreign affairs have been eminent, and I am pleased to support this resolution.●

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 126, a bill to commemorate the 100th birthday of Harry S Truman.

As you know, this legislation provides for the establishment of a bipartisan special joint committee on arrangements, composed of 16 persons—including the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, seven Members of the House and seven Members of the Senate, to officially commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of our 33d President, Harry S Truman. In addition, the joint committee will work closely with various individuals and organizations across the country to coordinate a nationwide series of commemorative events.

A veteran of World War I, President Truman was elected in 1922 as judge of Jackson County, Mo. In 1934, he began a 10-year career in the U.S. Senate. While a Member of this prestigious body, Harry Truman played a pivotal role in the development of numerous measures designed to help all Americans. And, it was he who thought up the idea of establishing the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense program. Commonly referred to as the Truman Committee, it was instrumental in searching out millions of dollars of waste in our Nation's defense program. We could only wish we had Harry Truman with us today to hear his views on waste in the defense budget, 1980's style.

Being elected in 1944 as President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Vice President, he was sworn in as President upon the death of Roosevelt on April 12, 1945. As we know, he entered the oval office at a chaotic time in the history of the modern world. However, President Truman, in a style only he could carry, met and conquered the many challenges of the day. His many contributions to world peace, civil rights reform and his understanding and compassion for common folk will live for years to come.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has officially commemorated other notable Presidents on the anniversaries of their birthdays, including George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Surely, Harry Truman should be added to this list.

Harry S Truman was a friend of mine, and I know he will be remembered by historians as one of the greats. He was a fighter, but he was fair. He looked out for the people like no one else could, and the 1948 Presidential campaign can attest to his skills and courage. Almost single-handedly he won that hotly contested election. Who can forget the now-historic photograph of President Truman holding the newspaper with the headline, "Dewey Defeats Truman."

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation to honor one of the greatest Americans who has ever lived.●

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 126, providing for establishment of a special joint congressional committee to plan activities in conjunction with the commemoration of

the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Truman.

The Congress has a tradition of participating in commemoration of significant dates in American history and honoring former Presidents. Most recently, the celebration last year of the centennial of President Roosevelt's birth was an impressive and memorable occasion.

In keeping with that tradition, this bill will provide for congressional participation in the events planned for next year to commemorate the 100th anniversary of President Truman's birth, in coordination with the Truman Centennial Committee, the Truman Library, and the Harry S Truman Library Institute.

President Truman was a truly outstanding leader who, upon the untimely death of President Roosevelt, moved into office to complete the work of his predecessor in winning the war and assuring the peace that followed. Under his guidance, the Nation was restored to prosperity under new challenges in a greatly changed environment. The rest of the world that was so ravaged by war was rebuilt through his Marshall plan and stabilized by the establishment of the United Nations. President Truman also rose to meet the new challenges brought on by greatly altered world power relationships, particularly standing up to the growing Soviet threat to the fragile peace. His Truman doctrine has been the foundation of most of our postwar strategic planning and foreign policy.

It is most fitting that the Nation celebrate this man who contributed so much to the postwar world. I have been pleased to join in sponsoring this resolution that will assure congressional participation in the important events to commemorate Harry Truman's centennial.●

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, in the year you joined the House as a young Representative from Massachusetts, Harry Truman departed the White House for his clapboard home in Independence, Mo.

During his 7 years as President, he concluded the peace with Germany and Japan; presided over the transition to a peacetime economy, launched the Marshall plan and the Berlin airlift and initiated the modern struggle for guaranteed civil rights. His achievements, so long overlooked by political pundits, could be listed in great detail, but President Truman would have objected to such elaborate attention. He was a simple fellow of few words, and any commentary should be fashioned after his model: short and sweet, and if not sweet, at least short.

I am delighted by the idea that on the 100th anniversary of Mr. Truman's birth the Congress will have a joint committee—on which you will sit—to assist in organizing a commemorative celebration. Mr. Truman was no stranger to Maryland. Indeed, not far from my home in St. Mary's County is the small island of Jefferson, where Mr. Truman would convene with Governor Richie and call to the poker table a quorum of the area's finest players for the purpose of demonstrating the random probabilities of drawing an inside straight. Few in politics could ever bluff Maryland's Albert C. Richie, in a legislature or on a card table. But President Truman seldom worried at his game, and it is said, never bluffed.

Clearly and strongly I support House Joint Resolution 126. I encourage any colleague who may consider these times too tumultuous to permit such celebration to recall the turbulent years of the Truman presidency. We should never be too busy to reflect on the trials of those who did so much to open a period in American history which, even as we speak, may be facing its most grueling challenge.

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague Congressman IKE SKELTON in saluting President Harry S Truman's 100th birthday.

I well remember the days of Harry Truman in the White House. And so do my fellow Guamanians. He was responsible for so much of the gains my territory made in the early 1950's. It was Mr. Truman who overrode the opposition of the old War Department and transferred Guam from the Department of the Navy to the Department of Interior. That single step did as much as anything to institute civilian, rather than military, government for a territory which had been ruled by the U.S. Navy since 1898.

Second, it was President Truman who supported and later signed legislation known as the Guam Organic Act which granted American citizenship to the people of my territory. All too often Americans take their citizenship for granted, not realizing what a cherished possession it really is. We on Guam do not take our citizenship for granted. I know what it was like not to have citizenship and my American citizenship is one of my most prized possessions—thanks in part to the wisdom and friendship of President Truman.

Obviously, we on Guam remember Mr. Truman with the fondest memories. And we always will. On this occasion I am honored and proud to join with my colleagues here today and look toward Heaven and say "Mr. President, happy 100th birthday." Thank you.●

Mr. WHEAT. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 226, the previous question is considered as ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 5, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—382

Ackerman	D'Amours	Hall (OH)
Addabbo	Daschle	Hall, Ralph
Akaka	Daub	Hall, Sam
Albosta	Davis	Hamilton
Alexander	de la Garza	Hammerschmidt
Anderson	Dellums	Hansen (UT)
Andrews (NC)	Derrick	Harkin
Andrews (TX)	DeWine	Hartnett
Annunzio	Dickinson	Hatcher
Anthony	Dicks	Hawkins
Applegate	Dingell	Hefner
AuCoin	Dixon	Hertel
Barnard	Donnelly	Hightower
Barnes	Dorgan	Hiler
Bartlett	Downey	Holt
Bateman	Duncan	Hopkins
Bates	Durbin	Horton
Bedell	Dymally	Howard
Beilenson	Dyson	Hoyer
Bennett	Early	Hubbard
Bereuter	Eckart	Huckaby
Berman	Edgar	Hughes
Bethune	Edwards (AL)	Hunter
Bevill	Edwards (OK)	Hutto
Biaggi	Emerson	Hyde
Bilirakis	English	Ireland
Bliley	Erdreich	Jacobs
Boehlert	Evans (IA)	Jeffords
Boggs	Evans (IL)	Jenkins
Bonior	Fascell	Jones (OK)
Bonker	Fazio	Kaptur
Borski	Feighan	Kasich
Bosco	Ferraro	Kastenmeier
Boucher	Fiedler	Kazen
Boxer	Fields	Kennelly
Breaux	Fish	Kildee
Britt	Flippo	Kindness
Brooks	Florio	Kogovsek
Broomfield	Foglietta	Kolter
Brown (CA)	Foley	Kostmayer
Brown (CO)	Ford (MI)	Kramer
Broyhill	Ford (TN)	LaFalce
Bryant	Forsythe	Lagomarsino
Burton (CA)	Fowler	Lantos
Burton (IN)	Frank	Latta
Campbell	Franklin	Leath
Carney	Frenzel	Lehman (FL)
Carper	Frost	Leland
Carr	Garcia	Lent
Chandler	Gaydos	Levin
Chappie	Gejdenson	Levine
Cheney	Gekas	Levitas
Clarke	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Clinger	Gibbons	Lewis (FL)
Coats	Gilman	Lipinski
Coleman (MO)	Gingrich	Livingston
Coleman (TX)	Glickman	Lloyd
Conable	Gonzalez	Loeffler
Conte	Gore	Long (LA)
Conyers	Gradison	Long (MD)
Cooper	Gramm	Lott
Corcoran	Gray	Lowery (CA)
Coughlin	Green	Lowry (WA)
Courter	Gregg	Lujan
Coyne	Guarini	Luken
Craig	Gunderson	Lundine
Crockett	Hall (IN)	Lungren

Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Marlenee
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McNulty
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whittaker
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wilson
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zablocki
Zschau

NAYS—5

Archer
Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
McDonald
Paul

NOT VOTING—46

Aspin
Badham
Boland
Boner
Byron
Chappell
Clay
Coelho
Collins
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Dowdy
Dreier
Dwyer
Edwards (CA)
Erlenborn
Fuqua
Goodling
Hance
Hansen (ID)
Harrison
Heftel
Hillis
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kemp
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Markey
Martinez
Mavroules
McCandless
McKinney
Michel
Pepper
Simon
Smith (IA)
Smith, Robert
St Germain
Stenholm
Weaver
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wright
Young (AK)

□ 1300

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1983, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3392

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Friday, July 1, 1983, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 3392.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 273, EXTENSION OF 8(a) PILOT PROGRAMS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 273) to amend section 8(a)(1) of the Small Business Act.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 23, 1983.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pensylvania (Mr. McDADE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL).

□ 1310

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on the bill (S. 273) which would reopen during fiscal years 1984 and 1985 two minority enterprise pilot programs to be conducted by the Small Business Administration.

The first of these programs is a pilot procurement program under which the Small Business Administration has the exclusive authority to determine which procurement needs of a Federal department designated by the Presidnet (other than the Department of Defense or a component thereof) are suitable for inclusion in the Small Business Administration's 8(a) program. Under this program, the Small Business Administration contracts to provide goods and services to Federal departments and agencies and then subcontracts the work to a socially and economically disadvantaged firm.

This pilot originally was enacted into law in 1978 by Public Law 95-507 and the President selected the Army as the Department which would participate. During its 3-year existence, only 14 contracts valued at some $100 million were included. Based on these small numbers, the committee is not able to evaluate the results of this pilot and thus is recommending that it be reinstated for an additional 2 years.

The only basic change from this proposal as it passed the House as H.R. 861 is that the Defense Department and its components are excluded from further participation. Thus, the President will be selecting a civilian agency to participate in the pilot.

The second pilot also was originally enacted in Public Law 95-507. Under this pilot, the Small Business Administration was authorized to waive Federal bonding requirements for 8(a) contractors who cannot obtain a surety bond if they are startup concerns and have not participated in the 8(a) program for over 1 year.

It took the Small Business Administration more than 2 years to adopt final regulations and it never did adopt standard operating procedures or issue instructions to field offices as to implementation of the program. Of course, this resulted in no waivers ever being granted.

I find this situation to be intolerable as in effect a Federal agency is simply deciding that a pilot program is not going to succeed and thus they will not even try it. This is a decision to be made by the Congress and it will be made after the Small Business Administration conducts the pilot program and after we are able to evaluate its results.

I have made this position known to the agency and I am hopeful that they are now willing to move forward and give both of these pilot programs a fair and adequate test.

I want to thank my colleagues who worked on this legislation and particularly the ranking minority member, JOE McDADE.

I urge approval of the conference report.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL), and I rise in support of this legislation. We have worked together and brought the House a good bill. It is supported by all of the members of our committee on both sides of the aisle and by the administration. It is a good bill. We have the word of our Administrator of the SBA that he is going to make this program work. I believe he will.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to adopt its legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, who has contributed so much to this and other pieces of legislation in our committee, and I congratulate the gentleman for the work he has done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his kind remarks, and I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee for the fine work they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DAUB), who probably has more input into this bill than anybody on our side of the aisle. Although I stand here, the gentleman from Nebraska has done more than anybody to make it work.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his diligence in getting this matter resolved. I think the 8(a) program, particularly, although the bonding program is important, is a good program. I am particularly delighted to recall to the chairman and the ranking minority member our colloquy with respect to the technology shift, so that we can develop some nontraditional small business opportunity. I think the conference report brings us that opportunity, and I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the conference report, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ADDABBO), a member of the committee.

Mr. ADDABBO. I rise in strong support of the conference report on S. 273 which would extend the 8(a) pilot program and the surety bond waiver pilot program until September 30, 1985.

Under Public Law 95-507, the 8(a) pilot program was established to grant SBA the authority to select contracts from an agency, designated by the President, for inclusion in the 8(a) program. This authority is sorely needed since under the regular 8(a) program SBA can only receive those contracts which individual agencies voluntarily offer.

It is unfortunate that this administration has chosen to ignore the needs of the minority business constituency. As the author of Public Law 95-507, I find it necessary to constantly remind SBA that the purpose of the 8(a) program is to promote the business development of minority-owned firms so that they may become competitively viable in the free enterprise system. The 8(a) pilot program, is important not only to redirect the agency's purpose to business development, but also to help minority-owned firms receive the lucrative, sophisticated contracts they have been historically denied. SBA must fulfill congressional intent by being forceful and aggressive with the designated agency.

The surety bond waiver program, first authorized by Public Law 95-507, is of critical importance to minority businesses. However, SBA has never implemented this pilot program.

Minorities have historically had difficulties in obtaining bonding for contracts that they are otherwise capable of performing. It is for this reason that the surety bond pilot program was established. The program authorizes SBA to waive all Federal bonding requirements for its 8(a) contractors who are start-ups and in the program for 1 year or less, provided certain conditions are met. However, SBA did not waive a single bonding requirement for any 8(a) contractor. An extension is needed to determine the effectiveness of this program and to let the SBA know, in the clearest terms, that it is the Congress which makes the law.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the extension of these two programs. It is incumbent upon the Congress to show the minority business community that we, unlike the administration, will not turn our backs on their needs.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who have worked on this legislation. There was a bipartisan effort, it has been very successful and we do urge the approval of the report.

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 273, a bill to extend through fiscal year 1984 SBA pilot program under section (8) of the Small Business Act.

The pilot procurement program under section 8a of the Small Business Act is very important for the economic and industrial development of Puerto Rico and a primary source of job creation.

Through the 8(a) program SBA provides eligible minority disadvantage firms in Puerto Rico as well as in the Nation with such contract, financial and technical support as may be needed to promote their competitive viability within a reasonable period of time.

Actually there are in Puerto Rico a total of 27 small business concerns certified under the 8(a) programs. These firms are receiving more than $23 million in Federal procurement and, as a result, a total of 1,500 new jobs have either been created or maintained.

Also, as part of joint efforts between the Government of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Government to improve the economic conditions of the Island and to increase employment opportunities, the SBA is expanding the Federal Government contract opportunities in Puerto Rico. This will be done by increasing the number of eligible firms under the 8(a) program to 45. This should give our island an additional input of $30 million in Federal contracts and help create 1,500 new jobs.

Small businesses are the cornerstone of our Nation's free enterprise system. Their growth and development is critical to our economic stability. By far, small businesses have proven to be the best single source of job creation. At a time when our Nation appears to be moving back toward economic health, that job creation small business contributes to an economic recovery must be recognized and supported.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 273.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 6, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—367

Ackerman	Boucher	Dellums
Addabbo	Boxer	Derrick
Akaka	Britt	DeWine
Albosta	Broomfield	Dickinson
Alexander	Brown (CA)	Dingell
Anderson	Brown (CO)	Dixon
Andrews (NC)	Broyhill	Donnelly
Andrews (TX)	Bryant	Dorgan
Annunzio	Burton (CA)	Downey
Anthony	Burton (IN)	Duncan
Applegate	Campbell	Durbin
Archer	Carney	Dymally
AuCoin	Carper	Dyson
Barnard	Carr	Early
Barnes	Chandler	Eckart
Bartlett	Chappie	Edgar
Bateman	Cheney	Edwards (AL)
Bates	Clarke	Edwards (CA)
Bedell	Clinger	Edwards (OK)
Beilenson	Coats	Emerson
Bennett	Coelho	English
Bereuter	Coleman (MO)	Erdreich
Berman	Conte	Evans (IA)
Bethune	Cooper	Evans (IL)
Bevill	Corcoran	Fascell
Biaggi	Coughlin	Fazio
Biliraki	Courter	Feighan
Billey	Coyne	Ferraro
Boehlert	Craig	Fiedler
Boggs	Crockett	Fields
Bonker	D'Amours	Fish
Borski	Daschle	Flippo
Bosco	Daub	Florio

Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Forsythe
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gore
Gradison
Gramm
Gray
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (IN)
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen (ID)
Hansen (UT)
Harkin
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hefner
Hertel
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kogovsek
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin
Levine
Levitas
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long (LA)
Long (MD)
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Markey
Marriott
Martin (IL)
Martin (NC)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McNulty
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Ottinger
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patman
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pritchard
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ratchford
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Shannon
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Simon
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whittaker
Williams (MT)
Williams (OH)
Wilson
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zablocki
Zschau

NAYS—6

Crane, Daniel
Crane, Philip
Leath
Marlenee
McDonald
Paul

NOT VOTING—60

Aspin
Badham
Boland
Boner
Bonior
Breaux
Brooks
Byron
Chappell
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conable
Conyers
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Davis
de la Garza
Dicks
Dowdy
Dreier
Dwyer
Erlenborn
Franklin
Fuqua
Goodling
Hance
Harrison
Hartnett
Heftel
Hightower
Hillis
Ireland
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kemp
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Leland
Lewis (CA)
Martinez
Mavroules
McCandless
Michel
Montgomery
Morrison (WA)
Pepper
Pursell
Rostenkowski
Smith (IA)
Smith, Robert
St Germain
Stenholm
Sundquist
Traxler
Watkins
Weaver
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wright

□ 1320

Mr. GIBBONS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to ask that the record reflect how I would have voted on rollcall vote No. 236, agreeing to conference report on S. 273. I was present to vote all day, but I was unavoidably delayed at the time of rollcall vote No. 236, and I was not able to get to the floor on time to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted to agree to the conference report.

I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to set the record straight.●

□ 1330

NATIONAL ATOMIC VETERANS' DAY

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to authorize and request the President to designate July 16, 1983, as "National Atomic Veterans' Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I merely wanted to take this opportunity to inform the House that the minority has no objection.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for bringing up this particular recognition day for "atomic veterans."

On July 16, 1945, mankind's future was altered as never before, for on this day man became witness to the most incredible unleashing of physical power ever to befall his eyes. Trinity, the world's first atomic weapon was exploded that day. Our world and our lives have been changing ever since.

The servicemen who observed this and 234 subsequent nuclear detonations know better than anyone just how irrevocably one's life can change when touched by these awesome instruments of war. Now, some 38 years later, a quarter of a million veterans are living, painfully, with the effects that these explosions may have had on their bodies.

Although the evidence is still inconclusive, recent medical and statistical studies suggest a positive correlation between certain diseases and exposure to ionizing radiation. A 1980 study by the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta indicates that of 3,224 participants in the 1957 nuclear test explosion "Smoky," the incidence rate for leukemia is nearly three times the normal estimate; findings by physicians at the Radiation Research Institute in Berkeley, Calif., suggest an extraordinarily high incidence rate of rare forms of muscle and bone diseases among atomic veterans; and preliminary health surveys of 700 detonation observers conducted by the National Association for Atomic Veterans resulted in more than half of those questioned reporting mental and/or physical birth defects in their children.

Despite this and other medical data, the Veterans' Administration takes the position that the average doses of radiation received by the servicemen involved was too low to have manifested physical injury. In fact, of the 3,000 radiation-related claims submitted by atomic veterans or their widows to the Veterans' Administration, only 65 have been awarded.

As time drags on, these veterans grow evermore afraid that no one is listening—that no one cares. The fear they harbor is real. The fear they harbor is exclusively their own. Only atomic veterans know the lonely feeling of traveling through life wondering if the firery blase they witnessed years ago is still shaping and clouding their world today.

In a sense, the most tragic facet of the peril that pervades atomic veterans' lives is the uncertainty surrounding the fate of their health and their children's well-being.

So, let these unique and patriotic veterans be certain that someone cares—that someone will delve deeper into their plight and attempt to calm their worry. Let them know that someone, at least, sees their suffering and hears their cries.

July 16 comes once a year to most of us. In the lives of others it is a day

that repeats itself every time chemotherapy for cancer is undergone, every time a retarded son or daughter is born.

I urge you today to vote in recognition, in support, and in honor of these our atomic veterans. Vote to give them July 16, 1983, as a day which will stand for the importance of resolving issues related to the exposure of these men to ionizing radiation.

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to recognize the plight of over 250,000 Americans who served their country honorably and at great personal sacrifice. I am speaking of the former servicemen who were exposed to ionizing radiation during tests of nuclear weapons between 1945 and 1962. Between 1945 and 1962, there were at least 235 atmospheric nuclear weapons tests conducted in the Pacific and American Southwest. Tragically, as a result of their presence at these test sites, many of these veterans, as well as their children, are suffering from cancer and other diseases attributable to radiation exposure.

The negative consequences of these tests were not adequately assessed and proper precautions for the protection of the servicemen were not taken. Also, there was not sufficient monitoring of the nuclear exposure experienced by the servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, these veterans admirably fulfilled their obligation to serve the United States. Today, we have the chance to take an initial step toward assuring that the Government of the United States lives up to its obligations to these veterans by voting in favor of House Joint Resolution 210. This resolution focuses attention on the concerns of "atomic veterans" by designating July 16, 1983—the 38th anniversary of the first detonation of an atomic weapon—as "National Atomic Veterans' Day." I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.●

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 68

Whereas approximately two hundred and fifty thousand veterans of the United States, while serving in the active military, naval, or air service during the period beginning in 1945 and ending in 1963, witnessed and participated in at least two hundred and thirty-five atmospheric nuclear weapons tests conducted in the Pacific Ocean and the Southwestern United States or served in Hiroshima or Nagasaki during the period of the occupation of Japan by the military forces of the United States immediately following World War II;

Whereas these Atomic Veterans patriotically served their country meeting the needs of national defense during this critical period in history;

Whereas the health of many of the Atomic Veterans and of many of the natural children of such veterans may have been adversely affected by the exposure of such veterans to ionizing radiation from the detonation of atomic or nuclear weapons;

Whereas the Congress recognizes the patriotism and dedication of the Atomic Veterans and the importance of resolving the issues arising from the problems caused by the exposure of the Atomic Veterans to ionizing radiation; and

Whereas July 16, 1983, is the anniversary of "Trinity", the first detonation of an atomic weapon, which took place at Alamogordo Air Force Base in New Mexico on July 16, 1945: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating July 16, 1983, as "National Atomic Veterans' Day" and calling upon all Federal, State, and local government agencies and people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN BUSINESS WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 18) designating September 22, 1983, as "American Business Women's Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object; but I wanted to inform the House that the minority unanimously supports this resolution.

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 18 designating September 22, 1983, as "American Businesswomen's Day."

During World War II many women began to fill jobs left vacant by men who joined our armed services. By the end of the war 37 percent of the American work force was female. By 1970 the number had increased to 43 percent, and in 1980 the number of women working in the United States has almost doubled that of post-World War II and reached 65 percent.

In my opinion, women should be recognized for their outstanding contributions and accomplishments to the American business community.

All women, including the unsalaried homemakers and corporate executives are all making an important contribution to our way of life in this country. It is for these reasons that I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to honor American businesswomen by acknowledging their contributions and accomplishments.●

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 18

Whereas there are forty-three million working women integrally involved in determining the direction of both the private and public sectors of our Nation;

Whereas American businesswomen hold active, responsible, decisionmaking roles at all levels of business, and thus influence the direction of our Nation; and

Whereas the Congress recognizes the important contributions of American businesswomen to our Nation's continuing vitality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That September 22, 1983, is designated "American Business Women's Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL PORT WEEK

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 173) to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period commencing October 2, 1983, as "National Port Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 173, which recognizes the importance of the inland, Great Lakes, and coastal ports of our Nation. Ports have always played a significant role in our history and in the economic development of the United States. Today we are the preeminent

trading nation of the world and over 95 percent of our products moving in international commerce pass through our ports. In recent years these shipments amounted to almost 2 billion short tons of waterborne commerce contributing over $35 billion annually to the gross national product.

As a lifetime resident of New York City, I fully appreciate the importance of a healthy port to the economic life of a region. Just as the historic "Boston Tea Party" sparked a political revolution, an improvement at any port has an economic impact far beyond the expectations of the principle participants.

In recognition of this vital role played by our ports, Congress has in each of the last 5 years passed resolutions urging the President to designate the first week in October as "National Port Week." I would point out that both President Carter and President Reagan have wisely heeded our counsel.

Each session Congress considers literally hundreds of these commemorative resolutions, yet only a handful obtain the requisite number of cosponsors. The support of National Port Week by 222 Members of this House is a significant reflection of concern for a vital resource. The action we take is highly valued by port officials throughout our great land.

I thank you for your support of this resolution and may I remind my colleagues that we still must act on what I view as a priority item—the enactment of meaningful port development legislation during this session of Congress.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 173

Whereas the ocean, Great Lakes, and inland river ports and terminals of our Nation constitute a valuable national asset which have fostered commerce and industry and have contributed to the growth of America's cities;

Whereas the past development of public ports in the United States was a result of fruitful cooperation with the Federal Government constructing and maintaining the navigable waterways and harbors and local municipalities assuming primary responsibility for land-based port facilities;

Whereas our ports are vital links in the United States transportation system and are indispensable to the foreign and domestic commerce and to the national security of our Nation;

Whereas the preservation and improvement of our national network of commercial ports is vital to expanded international trade and the attainment of a favorable trade balance;

Whereas the commercial ports of the United States are responsible for the continued employment of more than one million workers and, in 1982, generated a total of $70,000,000,000, in direct and indirect benefits to the United States economy and over $1,500,000,000 to the balance-of-payments accounts; and

Whereas there is vital need to focus public attention upon the value of a viable and competitive system of commercial ports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the seven-day period commencing October 2, 1983, as "National Port Week" and to invite the Governors of the several States, the chief officials of local governments, and the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL REYE'S SYNDROME WEEK

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) designating "National Reye's Syndrome Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I rise really in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, first, may I express my profound thanks and appreciation to the gentlewoman from Indiana, Mrs. KATIE HALL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. As we all know, Congress oftentimes is accused of not moving expeditiously on legislative issues. Such is not the case involving this legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 34, designating the week of November 7 through November 13, 1983, as "National Reye's Syndrome Week." It was only a few days ago that we were able to collect the necessary number of sponsors—now totaling nearly 230—and so notified Chairman HALL. In literally a few working hours, I am privileged to be on the floor to thank Chairman HALL, the entire membership of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, especially my Michigan colleague and its chairman, WILLIAM D. FORD, and to seek House passage this afternoon of Senate Joint Resolution 34.

I represent, as mentioned earlier, nearly 230 Members of the House who graciously lent their support to this legislation. I would add that it is particularly good to count both Mrs. HALL and BILL FORD as cosponsors. I am also very pleased to inform you that identical legislation in the Senate, sponsored by Senator DONALD W. RIEGLE, has met with similar success.

It is our highest hope that the resolution will truly help to inform all parents of the symptoms and results of Reye's syndrome so that they can prevent serious harm to their children.

It is ironic that this year, 1983, marks the 20th anniversary since Dr. Ralph Douglas Reye, an Australian pathologist, first described the symptoms and course of this disease. Even after 20 years, most regrettably, Reye's syndrome remains, to a large extent, a medical mystery.

But, two persons, who in my personal interest and involvement in this matter, deserve the greatest credit and recognition of all, would not accept that "mystery." Doris and John Dieckman lost their 11-year-old son, John Stewart Elliott Dieckman, to Reye's syndrome on April 12, 1976. Since that time the Dieckmans have devoted fantastic time and effort in the battle against this dreaded disease. Today is a special day for this House of Representatives, but it is an even greater day for the Dieckmans and so many others like them who have carried on a most valiant fight against Reye's syndrome.

Their perseverance, along with hundreds of others, has led to the National Reye's Syndrome Foundation. Now, with increased research activity into the cause of RS going on throughout the country at medical research centers, this resolution would be a wonderful complement to boost public interest, awareness, and concern in Reye's syndrome. The activities of National Reye's Syndrome Week will accelerate and generate even greater concern and support in fighting this disease which strikes children.

No one really knows the number of victims. One Federal health official believes there may be 1,000 cases a year nationwide. An independent researcher thinks there is a submerged "iceberg" of undiagnosed Reye's that may total several thousand cases a year. But nobody knows for sure.

But, to this day, we do know it remains a mystery. No known cause and no preventative, no certain cure.

We, here today, are contributing—probably in a most small way—but contributing—to give those so involved in this fight the means and the possibility of doing even better in the months and years ahead.

I am very proud to be a part of this effort, and I am equally proud of our U.S. House of Representatives in volunteering to help.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 34

Whereas Reye's syndrome is a disease of unknown cause which normally attacks healthy children eighteen years of age and under, both male and female, which can kill or cripple more than half of its victims within several days by attacking the muscles, liver, brain, and kidneys, and which affects every organ in the body;

Whereas Reye's syndrome is recognized by the Food and Drug Administration to be one of the top ten killers among all children's diseases;

Whereas Reye's syndrome was first recognized as a specific illness in 1963 and is a new illness in name only since children have been affected for decades by the illness and Reye's syndrome cases have been improperly diagnosed;

Whereas the reporting of cases of Reye's syndrome is required in only one-half of the States (for the purpose of this joint resolution, "States" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the other territories and possessions of the United States);

Whereas volunteer Reye's syndrome organizations are established throughout the United States and are supported by thousands of parents;

Whereas national Reye's syndrome volunteer organizations exist to encourage involvement of the Federal Government in supporting Reye's syndrome research; to encourage coordination of the treatment and research efforts by the various Reye's syndrome treatment and research centers; to establish Reye's syndrome as a reportable disease in every State; to establish at the Center for Disease Control a position for the review of data on Reye's syndrome patients; to sponsor a multicenter research study by recognized authorities on Reye's syndrome; to sponsor programs to educate parents and medical professionals with respect to diagnosis and treatment of the illness; and to raise funds for research into cause, prevention, and treatment of Reye's syndrome;

Whereas Reye's syndrome incidence continues to increase at a pace greater than the attention of the public, the Federal Government in general, and the Congress in particular; and

Whereas the chief executive officers of several States have declared certain periods of time as Reye's syndrome weeks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, That the week of November 7 through November 13, 1983, is designated "National Reye's Syndrome Week." The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1220

MEDICARE CRISIS DEMANDS COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTION

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

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, exploding increases in health care costs threaten the solvency of the medicare program. This past March the Congressional Budget Office predicted that, without corrective action, medicare will be broke by 1987 or 1988 and will run increasing deficits every year thereafter. These deficits could approach $300 to $400 billion by 1995. Legislation is pending before the Congress to establish a "National Social Security Reform" type of commission to examine the financial problems of the medicare system. Already an advisory committee to the Social Security Administration is proposing additional benefit reductions in medicare to forestall this impending crisis.

This developing issue should sound familiar to my colleagues who this year witnessed the dismantlement of social security pension benefits under the guise of saving the program. Like the social security debate, I fear that proposed solutions to the medicare problem are already being limited to further benefit reductions, user fee increases or limits on provider reimbursements. Each of these solutions, enacted individually or in combination, would deprive many elderly of needed health care and would not meet the medicare deficit unless implemented in draconian fashion.

Solutions which are limited to medicare benefit cuts or fee increases will not meet the medicare deficit because the root cause of the problem is not limited to medicare. The financial ills which plague medicare are reflective of the inability of the medical industry to control health care costs. Even at a time when the overall rate of inflation has been reduced dramatically, health care costs continue to rise to record heights. In 1982, hospital costs increased 13.3 percent, more than triple the general rate of inflation, and are projected to increase 13 percent annually for the next decade for medicare beneficiaries.

The rising costs of medical care have lead some to wonder whether the country can sustain its commitment to the poor and elderly. Coronary bypass operations cost from $20,000 to $40,000 each. Hip replacements with associated hospitalization and therapy run from $5,000 to $10,000 per patient; and the costs of renal dialysis now exceeds $2 billion a year.

Because almost three-quarters of medicare expenditures go for reimbursement to hospitals, these rapidly escalating costs contribute greatly to increasing medicare program costs. Since 1970 medicare outlays have increased almost an average 18 percent each year, and in fiscal year 1982 they were over $50 billion. With health care costs expected to double in the next 7 years, the fiscal pressure on medicare will be enormous. Despite 2 years of medicare cuts totaling $22 billion, the CBO estimates that medicare spending will also soon double, reaching $112 billion by 1988. Between 1983 and 1988 this is an annual average increase of 14.4 percent.

The response of the Congress to this problem cannot be limited to simply imposing additional copayments, deductibles, and premiums on medicare beneficiaries. Since 1976 the part A deductible has increased by almost 200 percent. The part B deductible has increased by 25 percent in the last 3 years. Per capita, the part A coinsurance charges borne personally by the elderly have increased 345 percent over the last 10 years. Physician services not paid by medicare is increasing faster than the elederly's income. Total physician charges passed on to beneficiaries have increased 200 percent over the last 5 years and now exceed $2 billion.

The result is that seniors, on average, now pay 20 percent of their income for health care, the same amount as they did in 1965 when medicare was enacted.

The administration's 1984 budget included $2 billion in additional medicare cuts. Together, the changes suggested would shift $10.4 billion in medicare costs to the elderly over the next 4 years. Hospital costs for the average medicare recipient would increase by 100 percent in 1984 alone.

Clearly, health care in this Nation is at crisis. The magnitude of this problem will not yield to simple solutions. It will not be met by denying medicare or medicaid assistance to the elderly and poor of our Nation, nor by simply cost shifting to private paying patients and other third party payors. Rather, a comprehensive approach is needed to hold down health care costs. Several States, including my own State of New Jersey, are attempting to restrain hospital costs by enacting mandatory cost restraint programs. The success of these programs depend on strong utilization review programs to insure that hospitals are neither over nor under-

paid for their services. I find it contradictory, Mr. Speaker, that this year the administration would seek a $2 billion reduction in medicare benefits, and at the same time propose the elimination of mandatory utilization review which helps contain costs by decreasing unnecessary hospital use.

THE IMPACT OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND ON THE POOR IN BORROWING NATIONS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, before the House begins debate on the bill to increase the International Monetary Fund (IMF) quota, I hope that my colleagues will consider the impact IMF policies have on the masses of poor people in the borrowing nations. In country after country, export-led development policies have often substituted for internal policies aimed at self-sufficiency. In addition, IMF's strategy of using austerity as a solution to the payments problem further damages the ability of the poor to meet their basic needs.

Several years ago, Congress passed legislation requiring the U.S. Executive Director to the IMF to insure that loan agreements do not adversely affect borrowers' plans for economic development and the basic human needs of their poorer citizens. This provision was added to the law because many then in Congress were concerned that the IMF was unnecessarily damaging the chances for long-term economic growth as well as forcing the poor to bear most of the short-term burden.

Implementation of this provision is even more crucial today than it was 3 years ago. Yet, to many experts, it appears that this excellent legislation has been ignored. This situation requires further investigation. Tomorrow, joined by many colleagues, I will be sending a letter to Secretary Regan, asking him to describe the steps the Treasury Department has taken to implement this legislation.

A prompt response is clearly imperative.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Kentucky President Reagan extrolled the virtues of vocational education, yet he proposes a 39-percent reduction for fiscal year 1984 for vocational instruction, a $350 million cut that would seriously impair the effectiveness of this program.

In my State of Wisconsin this would cut us down from $17 million in Federal aid in 1981, to $10 million in fiscal year 1984.

One example of the excellent programs which would be cut by the President's proposal in Wisconsin is the displaced homemakers' program. This program retrains people, usually women, who have worked for years as caretakers, child rearers, cooks, and housemaids, at no salary, of course, and have suddenly lost their means of support due to divorce or death of the spouse.

About 80 percent of the displaced homemakers are over 40 years old and have particular difficulties trying to enter the job market. Last year, 51 percent of those enrolled in the displaced homemakers' program obtained jobs after this training and produced incomes and tax revenues far in excess of the cost of the program.

This is but one example of the vital, successful, and cost-effective help which vocational education provides in my State.

Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in this country has been hovering above 10 percent. Wisconsin's rate is over 11 percent, partly resulting from national forces, but also as a result of important structural changes in our economy as we move from smokestack industries. In this context, vocational and adult retraining becomes even more important in that preparation.

Mr. Reagan's new found love for vocational education is commendable, but it is directly contradicted by his relentless tries to emasculate the budget in that area.

□ 1340

CARTER BRIEFING PAPERS

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the American people are entitled to all the facts relating to the theft of the Carter briefing papers.

President Reagan is not providing these facts. Instead he has asked the Justice Department to conduct an investigation.

This is not good enough. The administration is not qualified to investigate itself.

Mr. Speaker, we have in chapter 39 of title 28, United States Code, a procedure for the appointment of independent counsel, formerly special prosecutor, in situations where there are allegations of violations of Federal criminal law by executive branch officials. Under these provisions, the Attorney General can apply for an independent counsel if he determines that the investigation of such alleged criminal activity may result in a political conflict-of-interest for the Department of Justice.

Under the provisions of chapter 39, the Attorney General would apply to a special division of the Federal Circuit Court of the District of Columbia for the appointment of independent counsel by that division of the court.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know who is responsible for the release of these important documents to members of the Reagan Presidential campaign. We do know that high ranking members of the Reagan administration have admitted receiving these documents, and we have reason to believe that they knew that they had been inappropriately acquired from the Carter campaign.

The Attorney General should go to the court and request the appointment of an independent counsel in this matter, for there is clearly a political conflict-of-interest.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR VOCATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is said that when you give a man a fish you feed him for a day but when you teach a man to fish you teach him to feed himself for a lifetime.

In pursuit of this principle, vocational and adult education programs, to which the American people have given their support over the years through the Congress, have given the opportunity to millions of our citizens to gain work skills that are needed to feed, to clothe, and to house themselves for a lifetime.

Graduates of vocational education programs have become productive, taxpaying citizens in our society and not the jobless dependents of the Federal welfare system.

Surely these programs are worthy investments we can make in our future. However, Mr. Reagan's proposed budget would reduce vocational education programs by 39 percent. In my home State of Arkansas over 12,000 people seeking skills to get jobs would be denied that opportunity if the President's program were adopted. It means our capacity to attract new industry to our State and to provide new jobs and lower unemployment will be severely handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the President refusing our people the opportunity to fish, he is chasing them away from the fishing hole and surrounding it with barbed wire and posting it with a sign that says "No trespassing."

SURPLUS FOOD

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, last Monday Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ECKART, and I went to Kansas City to tour the Inland Cave of Beatrice Food, 1 of 600 sites containing the more than 3 billion pounds of surplus food.

We had an agreement that the media, including the electronic media, could tour with us. When we arrived the rules had changed and no cameras were allowed. Therefore we Members decided not to tour.

Mr. Speaker, what do they have to hide? Is the cheese moldy? Is the milk caked?

How much is being wasted when 20 million Americans go to bed hungry every night?

We are calling upon the GAO to tell this Congress how much surplus food is wasted, thrown away. We are also asking the Government Operations Committee to determine if the Department of Agriculture put pressure on Beatrice Foods not to allow the American people to view the conditions of this food.

We think it is a disgrace and we will get to the bottom of this issue.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. ENRIQUE MENDEZ

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

Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of satisfaction that I take this opportunity to recognize and commend an outstanding serviceman and fine Puerto Rican, Maj. Gen. Enrique Méndez, for his 28 years of unyielding service to our Nation and the U.S. Army.

Today General Méndez is retiring from the U.S. Army with a remarkable military record.

He finished his outstanding military career in the position of Commander of the Walter Reed Army Medical Center to which he was appointed by President Reagan in September 1981. Prior to his position at Walter Reed, General Méndez's assignments included those of Deputy Surgeon General of the Army; Director, Health Care Operations in the Office of the Surgeon General; Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Health Services Command, San Antonio, Tex.; Director of Nonresident Health Education at the Academy of Health Sciences in San Antonio, Tex., and Chief, Medical Corps Career Activities Division. His outstanding performance of duties has earned him various awards which include the Loyola University Alumni Award; Legion of Mint with Oak Leaf cluster; Army Commendation Medal; Expert Field Medical Badge, and Distinguished Service Award from the Federal Health Care Executive Institute Alumni Association.

He retires as the highest ranked Puerto Rican and Hispanic Officer in the U.S. Army Medical Corps and having nurtured a personal legacy of credentials. The people of Puerto Rico are justly proud for his achievements, standards of excellence and unyielding dedication to the ideals that make the United States such a great Nation. He has become, and will be for years, a model of achievement and excellence for younger Puerto Ricans and Hispanics aspiring to serve their country.

General Méndez returns to the Island to be in charge of the Ponce School of Medicine where I am sure his vast experience in the field will lead him to excel. I congratulate General Méndez for his outstanding career in the service of our Nation and wish him and his dear wife Olga the best in their future.

INITIATING TALKS WITH THE SOVIET UNION TO EXPLORE NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR COOPERATIVE EAST-WEST VENTURES IN SPACE

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with six of my colleagues, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President initiate talks with the Soviet Union to explore new opportunities for cooperative East-West ventures in space.

Moving toward cooperation rather than militarization in space can reduce one significant possible arena for a deadly nuclear superpower confrontation.

Our resolution calls on the United States and the U.S.S.R. to renew the 1972 Treaty on Space Cooperation. This 5-year agreement pledged the United States and the Soviet Union to cooperate in the exploration of space. It was first signed by President Nixon and was renewed by President Carter in 1977. Unfortunately the Reagan administration has allowed it to expire.

Under this treaty our two countries formed working groups and successfully conducted joint experiments and shared data on a regular basis. Perhaps the greatest single achievement of the 1972 space agreement was the Apollo-Soyuz mission of 1975.

The signing again of a joint space exploration treaty would provide our two nations with an important opportunity to pursue the policies of cooperation rather than confrontation.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this worthwhile resolution.

THREE IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the third anniversary of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. Three years ago today legislation was signed authorizing and appropriating $17.7 billion with the goal of producing 2 million barrels of oil equivalent per day. We were told that the Corporation would probably never spend any of the money—it was to be used for loan and price guarantees for productive ventures.

Mr. Speaker, an examination of the Corporation's record indicates that this is not the case. I do not have the time to describe every uneconomic synfuels project that has received—or soon will receive—massive Federal subsidies in the name of "energy security." Suffice it to say that it now appears that the Corporation could actually spend all of its appropriation—without even coming close to its production goal.

But it is not too late. If we act now we can prevent the Corporation from committing billions of tax dollars to unjustified projects. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3380, which I have introduced with Mr. WEBER, which would abolish the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

EFFECTS OF TELEPHONE DIVESTITURE

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern across our Nation about the real impact of telephone divestiture and local telephone rates. There is every indiction that local phone rates may skyrocket as early as January 1984.

As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging I am especially apprehensive about what this will mean to our Nation's elderly. Will the divestiture of the telephone industry disconnect many elderly from the outside world? What can we do to stop it?

If local phone rates rise senior citizens will be faced with something else vital to their lives that they cannot afford. The fastest growing segment of our elderly population are those living alone. In fact, almost one-third of all seniors live alone. For many of them, the telephone is the main, if not only, link they have with the outside world, with remaining family and friends, with the medical community, with the police and fire department. Will divestiture cause a telephone to become a

luxury an older person cannot afford—when it is really a necessity?

We have an obligation to protect elderly consumers from the impending increases in telephone rates. It is a critically important issue which must be given top priority by Congress.

□ 1350

DR. WILLARD FRANK LIBBY

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I call the attention of my colleagues to the great work and contributions of Dr. Willard Frank Libby.

Throughout his life, Dr. Libby contributed to our society through the application and advancement of science. Despite his rigorous schedule, he consistently became involved in activities and issues which needed attention. Among his many accomplishments, he contributed heavily to increasing the standards and broadening the scope of our science educational system. He also dedicated most of his career toward solving with new technology many of the problems he saw facing our society.

Among his biggest contributions, Dr. Libby invented the diffusion barrier, a process still utilized to enrich most of the fuel for light water reactors outside the Communist-bloc countries. This process has enabled the United States to gross over $6 billion and profit by $3 billion through the sale of reactor fuel. Although most of his work on this project was initiated while not under Federal employment, Dr. Libby joined in with many scientists during World War II in signing over the rights on his work to the Government. With the war requiring sacrifices from so much of the country, he felt it to be his duty in the interests of our national security.

While Dr. Libby has been recognized by scientific institutions throughout the world, including being awarded the Nobel Prize in 1960 for his invention of the radiocarbon dating system, the U.S. Government, a body which has benefited so greatly from his work, has not given Dr. Libby the recognition and appreciation which his work deserves.

For this reason, I am requesting that the Congress join me in requesting the President of the United States to award, posthumously, the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Dr. Willard Frank Libby. Today, I have introduced a House resolution expressing these views, and urge my colleagues to add their support to this endeavor.

The text of the resolution follows:

H. RES. 255

Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that Doctor Willard Libby, inventor of the diffusion barrier, should receive, posthumously, the Presidential Medal of Freedom

Whereas Dr. Willard Frank Libby invented the diffusion barrier, a process utilized to enrich most of the fuel for light water reactors outside of the Communist bloc countries;

Whereas Dr. Libby's enrichment process has enabled the United States to gross $6,000,000,000 and profit by $3,000,000,000 through the sale of reactor fuel;

Whereas Dr. Libby devoted his career to the effective application of science to solving significant and profound social problems;

Whereas Dr. Libby discovered many new radioactive elements important to our understanding of the structure of matter;

Whereas Dr. Libby invented radiocarbon dating, for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1960, enabling the human progress toward civilization to be dated for the last 50,000 and perhaps 100,000 years;

Whereas Dr. Libby made use of tritium, produced by atmospheric weapons tests, to measure the time for exchange of atmosphere between rivers and oceans, exchange between the hemispheres, and exchange between the stratosphere and troposphere, a major contribution to geophysics, agriculture, and meteorology;

Whereas Dr. Libby contributed to the important field of superconductivity by discovering a new class of metals, stable only at high pressures, and demonstrating their superconductive properties, of great potential value in decreasing the expense of electrical distribution processes;

Whereas Dr. Libby developed the theory of catalysis and proved that electron tunneling is a major part of catalysis, a theory which is currently being utilized and has reduced the cost of the manufacturing of chemicals, foods, and fuels, and is expected to further reduce such costs in the future;

Whereas Dr. Libby consistently encouraged the expansion of roles and education in the sciences, through creation of the profession of health physicist, to regulate radioactive emissions and to be independent evaluators of reactor design for safety and health, of which there are now some 10,000 professionals, and through design of the profession and degree of Doctor of the Environment, to address and manage problems of the environment, of which there are now 60 graduates;

Whereas he trained and graduated 102 Ph. D. chemists and taught more than 2,000 graduate and undergraduate chemistry students;

Whereas Dr. Libby has been recognized by distinguished scientific societies throughout the world, including the National Academy of Sciences, the Royal Swedish Academy of Science, the Hiedelberg Academy of Science, and the Bolivian Society of Anthropology;

Whereas, Dr. Libby has been the recipient of many honorary degrees and awards for his pioneering research, in addition to the Nobel Prize, including the Columbia University Chandler Medal, the American Chemical Society Award for Nuclear Applications in Chemistry, the Elliott Cresson Medal of the Franklin Institute, the Willard Gibbs Medal, and the Albert Einstein Medal Award; and

Whereas the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor in the Nation, was established in 1945 to appropriately recognize Americans who have made an especially meritorious contribution to the security or National interest of the United States, world peace, or cultural or other significant public or private endeavors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should award, posthumously, to Willard Frank Libby, the Presidential Medal of Freedom in honor of his outstanding career and extensive contributions to the advancement and application of science.

FLYING THE F-16

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

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had one of the most exciting moments of my life. It was a moment of immense pride and national achievement. I was a copilot of the F-16.

I feel certain that when the history of our time is chronicled, the development of the F-16 will be hailed as one of man's greatest achievements.

As I floated through the beauty of our free, clear skies I felt the freedom of God's world as captured by man's own imagination and skills.

As in all moments in history the machines—as magnificent as they may be—pale in comparison with the quality of the men and women who develop and operate them.

F-16 pilots such as Lt. Col. Milan Zimer, Lt. Col. Joseph L. Oberle, Lt. Col. John L. Nystrom, Jr., Capt. Jack L. Ivy, Col. Ronald R. Fogelman, and airmen such as S. Sgt. Mary Richardson and Airman First Class Stanley Nykita, who service them as ground crews are some of the greatest patriots of our time.

They risk their lives every day to keep us free and light the fires of freedom with their talents, dedication, and selfless determination to keep us free.

Mr. Speaker, if you have not flown the F-16, I invite you to do so for I believe you will join me in my admiration for this marvelous aircraft and the pilots who fly it.

BIPARTISAN DEBATE ON EDUCATION POLICY

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there should be no doubt in any of our minds that education policy must become one of this body's most critical concerns. No longer must we speculate about the condition of American education: Numerous and well-respected studies have been released within the last 3 months that detail the declining quality of education in this country. But the first question that faces those

of us concerned about education policy is whether this Congress will debate education policy in a serious way or allow the debate to degenerate into partisan rhetoric that is so useless in terms of our developing constructive alternative education policies. The public wants, the public expects, the public demands that informed, serious debate. I would share with my colleagues a recent editorial from the Dallas Times Herald which speaks to this question. In the words of the editorial:

The education issue, obviously, is an extraordinarily important one, and it deserves serious debate by serious people, not disingenuous posturing by politicians seeking electoral gain."

It is my hope that we will address questions of education policy seriously and with a sensitivity for its complexity and importance to the future. The new Education Policy Task Force of the Republican Research Committee, which I cochair with my colleague Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON, will play a role in the serious-minded articulation of education policy issues and the development of constructive alternative solutions for our colleagues to consider. I hope that Members from both sides of the aisle will engage in that serious-minded debate.

WORK OPPORTUNITIES AND RENEWED COMPETITION ACT OF 1983

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 3434, the Work Opportunities and Renewed Competition Act of 1983, I applaud my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. JONES) for his diligent work.

This legislation could provide significant investment toward modernization of our basic manufacturing industries. As the Representative from Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, the home of this country's second largest steel company, the Nation's major producer of heavy trucks and other manufacturing industries, I am aware of the kind of capital investment needed to revitalize our basic industries and make them competitive again.

Basic industries such as steel, autos, and railroads have not been able to take advantage of investment tax credits they have earned because they have not realized sufficient profit to use the credits to offset their tax liability. The Work Opportunities and Renewed Competition Act of 1983 unlocks these tax benefits by allowing companies with unused investment tax credits to obtain 85 percent of the value of their credits when reinvested in new plants and equipment. The restrictions on the types of investment are clear and the full value of the reinvestment tax credit must be paid back by 1990.

This bill offers new hope for the steel industry as well as other basic industries. And most important, it provides a means to make those industries more competitive and helps put America back to work.

WE NEED CONSTRUCTIVE BIPARTISAN DEBATE ON THE EDUCATION ISSUES

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

Mr. WEBER. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the President today carries his campaign for a serious national debate on education to Louisville, Ky. In recent weeks we have seen the President initiate the first major dialog on education in many, many years.

Our colleagues in the House of Representatives have participated in this debate sometimes constructively and not so constructively at times.

A dear colleague letter circulated earlier this week to our Democratic colleagues from the Democratic leadership referred to the President's current efforts as campaign extravaganzas.

Democratic Members were invited to join in making a response to the President's campaign trip and were later urged to talk about reductions in vocational education projects.

Mr. Speaker, that is destructive rhetoric. What the country needs at this time is a serious national debate and dialog on the substantive issues that the President presented to the country, issues such as merit pay, attracting quality teachers, what constitutes a basic curriculum for America's children going into the next century? What length of school year and school-day should we be contemplating? What are the priorities within our curriculum?

We are prepared to discuss these issues substantively on the Republican side and my colleagues from Texas (Mr. BARTLETT) and from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) have formed a task force on the educational issue to insure that on our side of the aisle the debate is positive and constructive.

We need the same kind of response from the other side of the aisle.

DEMOCRATIC PROCESS ONLY AS GOOD AS OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM

(Mrs. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as important as money is to providing quality education to the children of America, it cannot and does not assure or create excellence in the classroom experience.

I am proud of the creative teachers in my district who have quietly and wisely developed new approaches with remarkable results. They give students the opportunity to work with local industry and use their new knowledge to develop and broaden the vocational curriculum and are enabling male and female students to consider nontraditional careers.

It is healthy that the quality of education in America should become the focus of a national debate. In a very real sense our democratic process will be only as good as our educational system and our economy only as strong as our schools and colleges.

Statistics as well as the experience of children and parents have given rise to deep concern. Let us address honestly the funding issues, but let us look also anew at better recognition of our excellent teachers, revitalizing parent involvement, issues of discipline and social promotion, redefinition of basic education, and all those matters that have surged to the fore.

□ 1400

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be allowed to have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

LET FCC ACT ON TV NETWORKS RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2250, Mr. WAXMAN's proposal to bar the Federal Communications Commission from completing its consideration of repealing the financial interest and syndication rules. These rules, adopted in 1970, prohibit the three networks from owning and syndicating television programing. The Commission is nearing its decision on whether the rules are needed to insure competition and diversity in television viewing options.

According to this bill's sponsor, the rules "insure competition and diversity." My friend from Colorado, Mr. WIRTH, a cosponsor of the bill, says: "We must only deregulate when it is

warranted by the level of competition."

Let us look at the rules in these contexts. First, what is the degree of competition in the production of television programing? In its comments on the rules of January 26, the Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust and his staff stated:

The program supply market appears to be competitive. The market is not concentrated, firms are able to exist holding small market shares, costs of production are constant, and there is substantial new entry.

In reply comments, the Antitrust Division noted that a report prepared for proponents of the present rules "recognizes that 'previous economic studies have shown that television program supply is competitive'" and that "'rules governing the network relationships with suppliers are not likely to have significant economic effects in the program supply market.' Thus, the Department believes that there is no support for the position that the rules enhance competition in program production."

In studying the rules during the Carter administration, the Federal Communications Commission network special inquiry staff found that, in 1978, the four leading suppliers of network programing provided 36.6 percent of the shows distributed by networks in terms of program hours, with the top eight providing 52.5 percent. Both percentages increased since the rules took effect in 1970. If there is concentration in this marketplace which affects competition, it is in the large production houses. Still, sources of programing appear to be competitive, and in such a situation the networks have no incentive to produce in-house, nor do they show any eagerness to do so.

Next, what about diversity of programing? Under the rules, the networks retain their authority to ascertain the tastes of the American viewing public and to decide on programing options in that light. Again, the Antitrust Division finds no benefit from the rules.

In sum, the Department believes the current rules do not increase the diversity of programming supplied to networks. The production market is competitive, and the networks' position as arbiters of the common taste is unchanged. In our view, proponents of the rule have failed to justify retention of the rules on "diversity" grounds.

In responding to a commentary in support of the rules, the president of the National Hispanic Arts Endowment, René Enriquez of the "Hill Street Blues" cast argued—

I feel that the major studios and production companies have simply not developed properties to feature Hispanics. At present, I know of only four Hispanic actors in prominent roles * * *. I am convinced that, by again allowing the networks to particapate in the syndication field, there will be greater diversity of programing and much greater opportunity for minority actors and minority production companies.

To expand on Mr. Enriquez's last remark, let me again quote from the Justice Department comments of January—

If larger, established producers are better able, and hence more willing, to bear risk than smaller or new producers, the current rules may make the larger producers relatively better off and new entry.

I am concerned about the degree of choices our citizens have in selecting television programing, and for most Americans the alternatives are the independent "free" television stations such as WGN and WFLD in Chicago. Their sources of programing are largely reruns of programs first aired by networks, and the rules were designed in part to insure that these independent stations would have fair access to syndicated programs. Of course, since 1970 many additional options have become available to television viewers; access to them is increasing all the time, and the advent of low-power television stations in the near future will substantially contribute to this.

Producers of television programs are not forced to relinquish rights to syndication of their products, and indeed they have considerable power to resist network entreaties to do so. In its reply comments, the Antitrust Division staff noted that major studios are "able to spread risk across a large number of programs," that they can hedge risks by having programs on each network and that "many major investors can pool the risk of investment * * * with other unrelated risks to build a diversified portfolio." Therefore, the producers are well-equipped to resist network bids for programs which do not, in the seller's eyes, reflect the program's worth even before it is aired.

Further, the Commission may concur with the Justice Department that "a narrow rule that only bars the networks from syndicating or exercising any control over the syndication of off-network prime time series" is appropriate. The key element of "The Department's Forced Sale Rule" suggestion would—

Require the networks to sell syndication rights in a one time sale without legal restrictions to a third party no later than a fixed time after the end of the network run.

Given that there are no competitive or diversity benefits from the existing, broad rule, this approach is clearly preferable to the current circumstance.

So, the purposes of imposing the rules in 1970 are either not fulfilled by their existence or can be met by more focused means. With syndication opportunities insured, by rule or otherwise, the only real effect of the rules is to unfairly treat the networks. Pay television services and independent television stations can today hold a financial interest in and the syndication rights to the programing they air, but not the networks.

A recent New York Times article pointed out that the pay services HBO and Showtime are "offering program fare that until now has been the exclusive province of the networks: original made-for-television films, miniseries, and continuing comedy and drama series." I hope this heightened diversity continues in this and other forms of television, but as that occurs we must adjust our policies to accommodate the change. Either we must include all programing under the rules or we must revise them.

A California coproducer contacted by my staff during my study of this issue, saying that HBO usually insists on obtaining all rights to programing when acquiring its first-run license, urged that the rules be expanded to encompass developing media. My preference is definitely for deregulating such transactions except where that would give rise to inefficient antitrust actions with respect to syndication.

In Illinois' largest city and television market, Chicago, all three network-affiliated stations are owned and operated by the networks. While the independent stations in Chicago can own and syndicate programing, the rules restrict the ability of the stations owned and operated by networks to provide many interesting and high-quality program services. For example, WBBM, the CBS-owned Chicago station, has produced an acclaimed series of concerts by the Chicago Symphony. It may well have been of considerable interest to viewers in other Midwestern locales, but the rules preclude WBBM from syndicating the series.

Syndication would allow these "O&O's" to produce programs at an initial financial loss that may be recovered through sales to other stations, increasing program diversity locally and elsewhere. These programs would undoubtedly include those centering on matters of public concern, which should be of special interest to my colleagues.

In Illinois, we have many talented producers and substantial production facilities, and the rules' potentially adverse impact on small- and medium-sized producers' financing opportunities is thus important to the growth of this industry in our State as across the country. "Because the financial interest and syndication rules establish unnecessary restraints and limit the available financing sources, Illinois urges that they be repealed," wrote the State Commerce Department director on behalf of the State.

In both the Carter and the Reagan administrations, the Commission has devoted substantial resources to studying effects of the rules in action. The

inquiry conducted during the tenure of the Carter administration concluded that—

The principal effects of these rules has been to remove the networks from the syndication business and to deny networks and suppliers a variety of arrangements for financing program development and production which appear to have been mutually beneficial [and that] there may have been a tendency, as a result of the enactment of the rule, for concentration to increase in the program supply industry. Small suppliers who were previously able to shift risk to the network are unable to do so to the same extent.

The vote by the Commission on proposing review of the rules was 7 to 0. Other expert Federal agencies have commented in support of revamping the rules.

As I said at the outset, after many years of consideration, the Commission is preparing to rule on the present need for, effectiveness of, and appropriateness of the rules. Let us permit the Commission to act. Any further action by Congress on this matter may be taken after it does so, and with the benefit of its analysis in hand. I ask my colleagues to contemplate these remarks in considering H.R. 2250.●

THE FAIR HOUSING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to amend title VIII of the Civil Rights Act—the Fair Housing Amendment Act of 1983. This bill will greatly strengthen the methods of enforcement under title VIII and broaden the classes of individuals protected by the antidiscrimination provisions of that statute.

The introduction of this bill today clearly reflects a bipartisan concern in the House of Representatives over the ned for a stronger Federal fair housing law. Joining with me as the principal cosponsor is my friend and colleague, DON EDWARDS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights. The Honorable PETER RODINO, the able and distinguished chairman of the full Judiciary Committee, is also a cosponsor. In addition, we are joined by JULIAN DIXON (chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus), BILL CLINGER (chairman of the House Wednesday Caucus), BOB GARCIA (chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus), PAT SCHROEDER (cochair, Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues), BILL GREEN, STU MCKINNEY, JIM LEACH, CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, and GEORGE MILLER.

Our bill is endorsed by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, a coalition of 165 national organizations, including the NAACP, the Urban League, the League of Women Voters, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Council of Churches, the AFL-CIO, the ACLU, the National Organization for Women, and the National Council of Senior Citizens.

Everyone agrees that the existing enforcement mechanisms in title VIII are inadequate. Under current law, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development can attempt only to resolve discrimination complaints filed with his agency through the "informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion." But title VIII grants HUD no authority to compel conciliation agreements or enforce any final agreement which might result. Any agreement reached is purely voluntary in nature.

Furthermore, the litigation authority of the Department of Justice in title VIII cases is limited to those instances where the Attorney General concludes that there has been a pattern or practice of discrimination or where the denial of equal housing opportunity raises issues of general public importance. The third method of enforcement, private suits by individuals alleging discrimination, presumes that the individual has both the time and the resources to pursue a private civil action. While there may be good faith disagreements over the best manner in which to strengthen enforcement under title VIII, there is a universal consensus that existing enforcement powers must be enhanced.

The bill we are introducing today provides for an administrative hearing process, utilizing independent administrative law judges appointed by a Presidentially selected three-member Fair Housing Review Commission. A complainant would have the right to intervene in this hearing process. If the initial decision of the administrative law judge is not affirmed by the Fair Housing Review Commission, review of the final order may be sought in the appropriate Federal circuit court of appeals. It is important to emphasize that, under this bill, administrative enforcement is a last resort. Before a case is referred for a hearing, the Secretary of HUD must attempt conciliation and may, with the consent of both parties, refer the case to the Department of Justice for binding arbitration. The Attorney General will continue his responsibility to pursue pattern or practice suits as well as cases which pose issues of general public importance.

The ability of an individual to pursue private action is also enhanced under the bill. The statute of limitations for such actions is expanded from 180 days to 2 years. The bill also removes the language in the current law which greatly restricts an individual's eligibility for attorney's fees and removes the $1,000 limitation on punitive damages.

The classes of individuals protected by title VIII is expanded to include handicapped persons and families with children. A landlord must allow a handicapped lessee to make reasonable modifications in the premises. However, where the landlord resides on the premises, the handicapped person is responsible for the restoration of the premises at his/her own expense upon leaving.

This legislation also recognizes that strong fair housing enforcement must occur at the State or local level. Thus, the Department of Housing and Urban Development would continue its review of State or local laws to determine whether or not they are "substantially equivalent" to the Federal law. In instances where HUD has certified a State or local law, a complaint would be referred to the appropriate State or local agency, which would then proceed to hear and decide the case. HUD would be no longer involved. Only in those instances where substantially equivalent State or local laws do not exist, would the administrative process at the Federal level be invoked. Of course, an aggrieved individual retains his or her right to pursue a private civil suit up until the time an administrative proceeding has commenced. Finally, this bill codifies existing case law with respect to title VIII coverage of property insurance and real estate appraisers. See: *U.S.* v. *American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers*, 422 F. Supp. 1072 (N.D. Ill., 1977). *Dunn* v. *Midwestern Indemnity*, 472 F. Supp. 1106 (S.D. Ohio, 1979). The legislation makes it clear that a discriminatory act in any phase of the real estate financing chain would violate the terms of title VIII.

Identical legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senator MATHIAS with 38 cosponsors. I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committees in both Houses of Congress will soon be able to turn their attention to this important and necessary legislation.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 147, on June 2, 1983, the vote on the Wirth amendment to H.R. 3133, I was absent because of official business. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

EL SALVADOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I advised my colleagues that the administration had dispatched a group of military medical personnel to El

Salvador. Those people arrived in El Salvador only a matter of hours before a rocket and machinegun attack on the American Embassy there. Yet I wonder how many of my colleagues are aware that the number of American military advisers in El Salvador has just taken a 50-percent upward jump, or that this latest team is endangered by attacks, or that the violence in El Salvador is on a steady upward trend.

I know that the central legislative players in the game of Central America are primarily concerned about maintaining some kind of influence over how the game is played, in light of last week's Supreme Court decision striking down the one-House legislative veto. I understand that the latest authorization of money for Central America had been predicated on the idea of a legislative veto—that the administration would exchange cash today for a mortgage on administrative power down the line. But now that the one-House legislative veto is shorn away as a skivvy behind which to hide an unwillingness to grasp the nettlesome issue of whether to provide aid at all, some new device must be found. So I understand that in light of the need to strike some new bargain on aid for Central America, heads are distracted from the reality of the daily flow of events. But if we watched those events, and if we understood what is taking place, we would raise the real issue—why provide military aid at all? Why should the United States involve itself in what is more a civil war than anything else?

We hear the cry of Marxism, and the talk about how the rebels are getting aid from this, that or another Communist source. Marxism may well be the language of some of the rebels, but the root of rebellion is not in some foreign ideology—it is in the daily grind of poverty, ill health, injustice, and repression. It is in the anger, frustration, and disgust of people who know the contempt in which they are held by the countrymen who have ruled their lives for generations. The rebels use terror, and they have terror directed against them in turn. They are considered no better than dogs, rabid dogs at that, by the right-wing powers that be in El Salvador. Little wonder that there is rebellion.

As for Marxism, the truth is that rebels, no matter how just their cause, have been ignored by ourselves. We did not promote the cause of decency and justice; we simply sat by and let the Marxists enter the vacuum. If the rebels are Marxists, we, more than any other power, made them that way.

Suppose we want to undo the Marxists? Should we rely on military force? No, because a military force can do nothing about the issues of decency and justice. A military force can take ground, and it can provide security, but it cannot run decent schools, provide essential services, administer justice, or solve ages-old economic and social abuse. Only determined and decent governments can do those things—reach out to the people, hear their needs, and provide redress for grievances. And this is the nub of the issue in El Salvador. There is no sign that the rich and potent people of that country sympathize with the plight of their fellow citizens, let alone intend to provide meaningful help and hope for them. Indeed, the far right of El Salvador is very close to pushing through draft constitutional language that would frustrate hopes for future land reform, and might also wreck the usefulness of land reform that has already taken place. No, far from launching on efforts to cure the festering sores that rebellion feeds on, the most powerful elements in El Salvador remain adamantly opposed to any action that would change the existing order. They count on the United States to provide the aid they need to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. Their hands will never be sullied by the hard work of decent government, and their minds will not be troubled by the worryings of conscience. And so they feed the rebellion, and with each stage of its growth, they expect more help from the United States. And so far, our Government, oblivious to the lessons of Vietnam, Nicaragua, Iran, or anyplace else, responds with eagerness and alacrity.

The administration says that we have to provide aid because the rebels are getting help from outside sources—Nicaragua, Cuba, Libya, and so on. But rebellions of any consequence normally do get outside aid, and that includes our own American Revolution. Do we forget that our Revolution would probably have failed without the French assistance wangled by Benjamin Franklin, in his long mission to Paris? Do we forget the contributions of Lafayette? Do we forget, indeed, the direct military intervention provided by Admiral DeGrasse and his fleet of French ships off Yorktown? We would do well to remember that the enemies of England were more than happy to add to the King's discomfort by aiding his rebellious subjects in America. Likewise, we would do well to remember that our own Civil War would have had a profoundly different outcome if Jeff Davis had been able to obtain the help he desperately tried to get form European powers—help that never came, because the military possibilities looked so bleak after the Battle of Antietam. The rebellion of the Confederacy might have been doomed even with outside help—but the point is, such help was essential if there was to be even the ghost of success. So it is nothing new for rebels to seek help from the enemies of the powers that be, in this century or the 18th, or long before that.

Simply to say that rebels are getting aid from our enemies does not justify our providing aid to autocrats or fools. If we want democracy, we have to provide help to people who believe in democratic government. If we want to oppose marxists, we have to oppose them with ideas, not just guns—because they are appealing to the idea of justice and hope, and those ideals have great power when a people are oppressed and without hope. And it is not enough simply to spout slogans. Slogans do not replace teachers. Campaign jingles do not replace medical care, and they do not provide clean water. Radio messages do not feed anybody, and combat helicopters do not plow or seed fields. If we really want to pull the teeth of the Marxists, we have to do it by insisting that the Government of El Salvador go out and deal with their people—stand with them, not over them, stand by them, not above them. But we do not insist that the Government of El Salvador really grapple with the ills of their country—merely that they pay lipservice to the idea of reform.

And in fact, our policy likewise ignores the most pressing needs of the people of El Salvador. The medical team that has just arrived there will be assigned to caring for war casualties. That is necessary, and it is well and good. But the need for medical care among the civilian population is ignored, no matter that conditions in the country are inexpressably bad. If our own medical teams cannot aid the people of El Salvador, why can we not insist that the Salvadoran Government provide teams and clinics of its own?

The reason is that our policy ignores the cause of the Salvadoran civil war, or rebellion, or, as they call it there, El Problema, the problem. So it is that we provide aid for an army that sweeps through towns and villages, clears roads once in a while, and spreads general destruction, when we ought to be insisting that the military forces provide real security and that the Salvadoran Government provide real services and real help to the people who are caught in the middle. It does no good to capture a town by day and desert it at night. We should have learned that, if nothing else, in Vietnam. And no amount of aid, no amount of terror, will hold a government up forever. We should have learned that in Nicaragua, or in Iran. By ignoring the people of El Salvador, we consign them to oblivion or rebellion, whichever approaches first.

The Government of El Salvador has not demonstrated itself to be worthy of its own people's trust; why should we extend our trust and help? Our policies thus far have not insisted on

realistic and credible reform in El Salvador, which is the key to the whole situation. No, we simply press ahead with blind eyes. Meanwhile, here in the Congress, we concentrate on how to retain influence, even as the commitment of American military men rises, and the far right wing of El Salvador squeezes out the voices of reason and moderation, and with them, any hope that our contribution of treasure, and soon blood, will do anything more than buy them a few more days on the throne.

I say that we ought to confront the issue and set the policy—aid for a government that is something better than a shabby oligarchy, but nothing for a government that we would not ourselves accept if we had to live under it. We ought to get out of El Salvador. The government there has made its own trouble, shows no sign that it has learned anything, and has no inclination of doing anything more than using the United States as their proxy. It is Vietnam all over again. We do not have to make the same mistakes all over again, Get our troops out, or get them a government that works with them, not one that every day merely exploits their expertise, and brings them closer to peril. Look at the events, consider what is happening, and the consequences.

At this point I insert in the RECORD two newspaper stories relating to the dispatch of medical personnel.

The articles follow:

[From the San Antonio Express, June 28, 1983]

HEALTH SERVICE MEDICS HEAD TO EL SALVADOR

(By Ralph Winingham)

Members of Army Health Services Command, which has its headquarters at Fort Sam Houston, are among 26 military doctors and specialists in El Salvador, officials said Monday.

"The 26-member team left Sunday," Department of Defense spokesman Lt. Col. Carroll Williams told the Express Monday. "The only team breakdown we have is that some of them are from Health Services Command and some are from Forces Command."

It's not known if any members of the team are from Fort Sam Houston since Health Services Command oversees eight Army medical centers and 30 hospitals throughout the world. Forces Command is headquartered at Fort McPherson, Ga., and supervises all the Army's combat and reserve units in the United States.

Williams said names and duty stations of the team members are being withheld for security reasons.

Officials at Health Services Command Headquarters referred all questions about the team to the Pentagon, but added a defense spokesman is scheduled to make a statement about the team on Tuesday in Washington, D.C.

"We have been trying to get information about the team for five days," the services command spokesman said.

Williams said the team will be in El Salvador for about six months to train Salvadoran military medics and to provide health care to civilians when possible.

The medical group is not included in the administration's self-imposed 55-man limit on military advisers in the country, officials said.

The team includes one doctor, one nurse, four medical technicians, one warrant officer and 19 enlisted members. Military officials have said none of the team members are women.

Assignment of the team to El Salvador, which has prompted criticism from U.S. Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez and other congressmen, followed reports that as many as 35 percent of injured Salvadoran soldiers die from their wounds.

Military authorities said the rate was unusually high and compared the figures with a 1-in-28 death-from-injury rate for American soldiers during the Vietnam War.

Gonzalez has opposed the medical team assignment on the grounds President Reagan took the step without the approval from the U.S. House or Senate.

"The president did this on his own," Gonzalez said in June when the plans were released. "We have every sign the administration is about to deepen our involvement in El Salvador."

[From the San Antonio Light, June 23, 1983]

GONZALEZ CRITICIZES MEDICS' DUTY

WASHINGTON.—As the first group of Army medical corpsmen prepares to leave for El Salvador, unequipped with firearms, they enter a highly dangerous situation where they might be picked off by shooting terrorists, says Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez.

"If they get killed, I will hold President Reagan personally responsible," he added.

Gonzalez, D-San Antonio, said he is being informed of the lack of preparations and protection for these medics by "men who are affected." He declined to give their names, but he said he has been in touch with men engaged in the activities of El Salvador.

"The team of 13 medics will include only one doctor, not more, one male nurse, one administrator and corpsmen, not one-third of them doctors as the White House said earlier," the congressman said.

"They go without even quarters prepared for them and it is not certain how or where they will be housed," he said. "They have been told that they will not be equipped with firearms to defend themselves, but they were allowed to bring along their own arms if they possess a weapon like a gun. I think this ia an outrage."

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are looking down a tunnel that grows longer and darker. We have the power to change that, or to get out. But we can only change a wrongheaded policy, or get out, by taking responsibility. Sadly, it looks as if not even the carnage of Vietnam, the wreckage of Iran or anything else, emboldens Congress to summon up the courage to do what is right and responsible in El Salvador—insist on reform, real reform, or get out.

□ 1420

FINANCIAL SERVICES LEGISLATION—MODERN-DAY TOWER OF BABEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, last May I addressed the House posing a number of questions regarding current terminology used to describe the financial services industry. Since then I feel at times like it must have felt during the days when the Tower of Babel was being constructed. The confusion of voices and sounds emanating from trade group offices downtown, corporate headquarters in New York, the executive branch, the banking agencies, and the Halls of Congress is truly unbelievable.

Examples of this confusion abound. The U.S. League of Savings Institutions in a recent letter stated:

> The U.S. League is increasingly concerned about the high level of interest being shown by powerful investment banking and other securities firms in acquiring savings institution subsidiaries . . . We are also apprehensive about acquisitions of savings institutions by major retail organizations.

Yet the U.S. League is apparently not concerned about numerous savings and loans, through a service corporation subsidiary, offering their customers a full line of brokerage services. Nor is it apprehensive about the ownership today of savings and loans by a major steel company, by an oil and gas producer, by insurance companies, or by the largest retailer in the country.

The chairman of Prudential Insurance Co., is reported in the Washington Post to have supported a moratorium on cross acquisitions as a way of giving Congress time to do a comprehensive review of the banking implications of the mergers that are taking place. Yet Prudential has received notice from the FDIC that the FDIC has no objection to its acquisitions of a commercial bank in Georgia which Prudential will operate as a nonbank.

The chairman of Citicorp, in commenting on mergers of banks and nonbank companies, is quoted in the same article as saying:

> "That horse is long since out of the barn. To freeze this picture is, in effect, to allocate markets to those companies shrewd or lucky enough to be first off the mark.

Yet Citicorp is the largest horse that is out of the barn and is obviously enjoying its romp in the unfenced pastures of South Dakota.

The Federal Reserve Board has expressed concerns about these nonbank banks, about the agency's ability to control monetary policy, and about its regulatory authority over bank holding companies. The Board sent proposed legislation esablishing a moratorium on cross acquisitions to the Con-

gress last week. Yet the Board's legislation does not address the issue of bank and bank holding company acquisitions or chartering of discount brokerage operations. It argues that those activities are permissible under its interpretation of section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act—nonbanking activities section of the act. Its moratorium legislation, however, would effectively bar the operation of a statutory provision which permits nonfinancial companies to acquire savings and loans.

The Treasury Department is opposed to a moratorium and instead will apparently request the introduction of its so-called affiliate proposal. That bill, at least as it was drafted in the last Congress, would provide new and expanded powers for banks and bank holding companies. Yet that proposal did not include savings and loans or savings banks which as a result of legislation enacted in the last two Congresses compete head-on with commercial banks and bank holding companies. Reportedly the Department's new version will address this issue.

Assistant Attorney General Baxter, representing the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, testified before the Senate Banking Committee recently. In commenting on arguments that relaxing restrictions on interstate banking, for example, would lead to the demise of small banks and would result in concentration of economic resources, Mr. Baxter stated:

> Neither of these related arguments appears valid. For most banking services, there is little evidence of substantial economies of scale. Thus, smaller banks should be able to achieve efficient operating levels and continue to provide competitive services to a wide range of customers . . . . In addition, increasing the potential for new entry into presently concentrated markets should improve the competitive performance of existing firms.

Yet Mr. Baxter does not amply address the concerns of many persons that economies of scale may not be the real issue. The demands by major banks for new product offerings suggest that there may be economies of scope which allow larger firms to operate efficiently at sizes far above those suggested in studies limited solely to examination of traditional banking services like deposit taking. In addition, he does not address the question many raise about potential concentration of economic resources by suggesting that new entry into presently concentrated markets should improve the competitive performance of existing firms. In part, the issue is whether the old definitions of markets used to consider mergers and acquisitions in the banking field are totally relevant today. Do we, in fact, have a national market in which the largest firms—the Citicorps, the Bank of Americas, the Merrill Lynches—are the only ones who can realize economies of scope by virture of their being out of the barn first?

If we truly want to allow Congress time to decide these issues in a rational manner and to provide legislation which will shape the financial system of the future, then it might be wise to take all of these often confusing and conflicting positions into account and to enact moratorium legislation which really shuts the barn door and which brings as many of the horses back into the barn as possible. Such an approach would not prejudice congressional deliberations by structuring a moratorium in a manner which suggest that certain activities for banks are OK or that these are not. The bill which I am introducing today provides a true moratorium and would force all parties to work to produce permanent legislation which will give this Nation a financial system that will serve the country well in the future.

The bill would impose a moratorium, effective January 1, 1983, on all cross acquisitions of financial services firms. Thus, securities firms, nonfinancial firms, and insurance companies would be prohibited from acquiring banks and savings and loans. Banks and savings and loans, in turn, would be prohibited from acquiring or establishing brokerage operations or insurance companies. Depository financial institutions, whether national or State chartered, would be restricted to engaging in those activities which were permissible pursuant to Federal and State law as of January 1, 1983. The depository institution regulatory agencies would be prohibited from writing regulations or offering interpretations which would expand on powers or activities permissible for depository institutions. Thus, all regulations considered since January 1, 1983, with the exception of those implementing specifically the Garn/St Germain Act, would be nullified.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if supporters of a moratorium are serious about providing a calmer atmosphere in which Congress can consider financial services legislation then this approach is more equitable and would eliminate the prejudice which exists in the various proposals suggested to date. if we do not adopt such an approach, then it may well be better to consider legislation which directly addresses the issues that have been raised in recent months. Examples would include the expected Treasury Department affiliate proposal, the legislative recommendations of the insuring agencies discussed in their reports to the Congress this spring, and other proposals which would realine the financial services industry. No matter which approach, the country should not continue to be battered by the confusion of voices and sounds from the financial industry, the Congress and those in the Federal or State executive branches of government.●

H.R. 2760—COVERT ACTION IN NICARAGUA EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 2760 comes to the floor in July, the House will be asked to vote for or against covert military intervention in Nicaragua.

This vote will be preceded by a rare secret session of the House.

I urge all Members to participate in this historic debate and to become familiar with the crucial matters that will be discussed. They are extremely important to the direction of this Nation's foreign policy as well as to the vitality of the method the Congress has chosen to oversee the Nation's intelligence activities.

The following newspaper editorials bear on our discussion of H.R. 2760 and I commend them to all Members.

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1983]

A "REAGAN DOCTRINE"?

President Reagan's admiration for the "freedom fighters" currently attacking the Sandinistas led him the other day to state a "Reagan doctrine" that is sure to haunt him if he allows it to stand. Like the "Brezhnev doctrine," to which it bears an unfortunate family resemblance, it justifies a great power's decision to violate the sovereignty of other states.

Mr. Reagan got into the subject by observing that "there is a kind of bias in the treatment of guerrilla fighters. It depends on what kind of a government they are opposing." It sounded as though he were about to lay down a common standard by which all guerrillas should be judged.

Immediately, however, he drew a distinction between the "guerrillas" who, he said, are fighting the elected government of El Salvador not to bring freedom but to restrain freedom, and the "freedom fighters" in Nicaragua. What people refer to as "the government of Nicaragua," he said, came "out of the barrel of a gun. . . . Other than being in control of the capital, you might say, and having a handle on all the levers—what makes them any more a legitimate government than the people of Nicaragua who are asking for a chance to vote for the kind of government they want?"

Is Mr. Reagan asserting a right to encourage the overthrow of governments that take power by force and deny the vote? Few governments in the world would survive both tests. On the left, no sitting government led by a Marxist-Leninist party came to power by means other than revolution or coup, and none offers authentic elections. Is Mr. Reagan going to support Soviet and Chinese "freedom fighters"? Think of the many governments of the right that took and hold power by force alone. Is the president going to arm guerrillas against the regimes in Chile and Argentina?

In brief, the "Reagan doctrine" is a nonstarter. It shows that there is no good way to rationalize undermining governments

with which one is not formally at war. Any effort to raise such a standard leads to logical absurdities and invites ambitious governments of other persuasions to develop their own lame and arbitrary excuses to play dirty.

[From the Miami Herald, May 8, 1983]

THE CIA'S WAR

Nicaragua's regime is unelected, undemocratic, repressive, and potentially a menace to its neighbors. It is allying itself with the Soviet camp. The United States and its Central American friends are justified in condemning the Sandinista regime for its failings. They are right to be concerned about its potential threat to the region, up to and including the United States.

Nevertheless, the House Select Committee on Intelligence merits unqualified commendation for its effort to halt the CIA's secret war against Nicaragua. However legitimate the U.S. concerns about the Sandinista regime—and they are legitimate—trying to topple the regime by a CIA-led and financed mercenary army is a huge mistake. The Senate Intelligence Committee's vote for a "compromise" on Friday was, by contrast, a cop-out. That panel voted merely to delay a decision too long overdue already.

The CIA's secret war is against the law. Last December's "Boland Amendment" prohibits it. Perhaps more important, Article 15 of the charter of the Organization of American States (OAS) prohibits it. That article states that "no state or group of states has the right to intervene directly or indirectly for any reason whatever in the internal or external affairs of any other state." The day that the U.S. Government cavalierly abandons obedience to the rule of law is the day that it accepts anarchy and force as the global order. Congress is right to resist that day's arrival.

The CIA's secret war is counterproductive. Intended to hurt the Sandinistas, instead it provides them a hated foreign enemy—Yankee imperialism—to rally their nationalistic people behind and to justify their repression as necessary under trying circumstances.

The House committee's Democrats cite this concern as primary in their vote to shut off the CIA's war. Those Democrats, such as Wyche Fowler of Georgia, are regarded as moderates—not radicals, not "Commie-symps." Their stance underscores the absence of a political consensus behind the Administration's policy. History teaches that no such policy can long succeed when a divided nation refuses to support it. This policy risks revival of the bitter division that tore this nation grievously not long ago.

It also exposes the CIA anew to scorn and restriction after it was just rebuilding itself following the shakeup it underwent in the 1970s. Further, the policy hands the Soviets a propaganda coup; Central America is being called the U.S. Afghanistan, the U.S. East Europe, the U.S. empire.

Perhaps worst, this policy risks inflammation of a violent reaction against "Yankee imperialism" throughout the hemisphere. Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, and Mexico—the truly big strategic "dominoes" of the region—are united in opposing such U.S. intervention. They seek instead a regionally negotiated solution, one that would permit the Sandinistas to govern Nicaragua, however badly, because Nicaragua is sovereign.

The House committee voted to spend $80 million to block arms flows from Nicaragua, or elsewhere, to guerrillas in El Salvador. That was the Administration's alleged purpose for the CIA's covert war. The committee agreed; it just wants the aid now to be overt, and directed through legitimate regional governments, not mercenary armies. Good.

President Reagan is on target in denouncing the Sandinistas for betraying Nicaraguans. The Sandinistas promised elections and pluralism. Instead, they are delivering a contemptible government. By all means the United States should denounce them and help contain their aggression. But it is not up to Washington to determine who governs Nicaragua, or how. It most certainly is not up to the CIA.

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1983]

ONLY LEGAL WARS ARE WORTHY WARS

We are back to arguing not just about the wisdom of waging war but who decides.

President Reagan has assailed a House committee for prohibiting aid to a rebel army operating inside Nicaragua. But only days before, the President solemnly told Congress that his only aim was to interdict the flow of weapons *from* Nicaragua to guerrillas in other countries. He explicitly denied any desire to violate laws or treaties or to promote the overthrow of Managua's Marxist regime.

Not quite, it now turns out. Speaking more spontaneously, the President said he opposed any legal expression of those restraints, for which the House Select Committee on Intelligence had just voted. He denounced it as an irresponsible, dangerous precedent, leaving the executive branch unable "to carry out its constitutional responsibilities."

But Congress indisputably shares those responsibilities. Unless it does, practically speaking, there's no sustaining any foreign war or intervention.

The authors of the Constitution gave Congress exclusive power to "declare" war, but they well understood the likely inclination to wage undeclared war as well. As a contemporary of the founders, Justice Chase, wrote in supporting a unanimous Supreme Court in 1800: "Congress may declare a general war, or Congress may wage a limited war; limited in place, in object, in time."

The reason for this power-sharing was brilliantly anticipated by James Madison: "The management of foreign relations appears to be the most susceptible to abuse of all the trusts committed to a Government," he wrote, because it could be "concealed or disclosed, or disclosed in such parts and at such times as will best suit particular views."

Congress reaffirmed that doctrine when it overwhelmingly enacted a War Powers Resolution in 1973. It provides that a President cannot lawfully engage American forces for more than 90 days without express authorization by Congress. And special committees were established to authorize covert operations in which American honor and sense were at risk. The current Congress has accepted that responsibility in approving aid to Afghan insurgents who are resisting Soviet invaders.

In grasping now for a unilateral executive war power, President Reagan ignores his own failure to make a convincing case for covert aid to any Nicaraguan émigré army. He has been ambiguous about his motives and coy about the émigrés, piling confusion on contradiction in his policy.

Neither purism nor partisanship explains why Americans see a difference between aiding "freedom fighters" in Afghanistan and rebel forces in Nicaragua. The reason is distrust of an ill-defined policy for Central America. If Nicaragua is waging a significant war against El Salvador and deserves retribution or invasion, let the case be made openly, for Congress to judge.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 10, 1983]

CONGRESS ALSO HAS A ROLE IN DECIDING U.S. INTERESTS

What business does the Sandinista regime of Nicaragua have in trying to overthrow the government of neighboring El Salvador? None whatsoever. "It is the ultimate in hypocrisy," President Reagan declared in his televised address to a joint session of Congress, "for the unelected Nicaraguan government to charge that we seek their overthrow when they are doing everthing they can to bring down the elected government of El Salvador."

By the same token, though, what business does the United States government have in trying to overthrow the Sandinista regime, repressive as it is to its own people, unfriendly as it is to the United States?

For several months the CIA has been arming and training some 3,000 to 4,000 anti-Sandinista guerrillas, many of them partisans of the repressive Somoza regime that the Sandinistas overthrew. It has been engaged in this "covert" action that everyone knows about notwithstanding the Boland amendment that congress adopted last December prohibiting the United States from providing covert aid to military forces "for the purpose of" overthowing the Sandinista regime.

Mr. Reagan's response to that has been disingenuous at best. "We do not seek its overthrow," he declared in his address. "Our interest is to ensure that it does not infect its neighbors through export of subversion and violence. Our purpose, in conformity with American and international law, is to prevent the flow of arms to El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Costa Rica."

Taking him at his word, and ignoring a last-minute warning by CIA director William J. Casey of a possible "bloodbath," the House Select Committee on Intelligence has approved a measure specifically prohibiting the use of funds "for the purpose or which would have the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua by any nation, group, organization, movement or individual."

The committee also, however, authorized $80 million for overt aid to "any friendly government," meaning for the most part El Salvador and Honduras, to interdict the flow of arms to El Salvador from Nicaragua or anywhere else, like Cuba and the Soviet Union.

In an Oval Office news conference, Mr. Reagan, referring to the Nicaraguan insurgents as "freedom fighters," denounced the committee vote as "literally taking away the ability of the executive branch to carry out its constitutional responsibilities." That's not the issue. Members of Congress, also elected by the people, also have the constitutional responsibility to make their own judgments as to whether the policy of the executive branch is in accord with America's national interests.

This policy is not. The House panel's counterpart in the other body, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, has made its own judgment. It has voted to put the administration on a short leash, allowing

funds for covert operations in Latin America to continue through Sept. 1 but insisting on Congress' right to grant or withhold approval of specific covert operations.

Beyond that, the issue is not simply that the administration is dong what it denounces others for doing; and doing what it says it is not.

The issue of that what the administration is doing is leading into a blind alley.

Support of the detested Somocistas is a sure way of uniting Nicaraguans behind the Marxist-oriented Sandinistas, whose violations of human rights and mismanagement of the economy have disenchanted so many Nicaraguans who once supported them. It is also a sure way of raising throughout Latin America the specter of an "imperialist" United States that intervenes at its own will or whim in Latin American affairs.

The United States has the right to stop any flow of arms from Nicaragua. It ought not to encourage the flow of support to the Sandinista regime.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, May 25, 1983]

WITH A WINK AND A GRIN, REAGAN TAKES ON MANAGUA

In Central America's hottest war, leftist guerrillas are fighting—with an undetermined amount of help from Nicaragua—to overthrow the U.S.-supported government in El Salvador. In the region's second-hottest war, U.S.-supported guerrillas are fighting to overthrow the leftist Sandinista government in Nicaragua. That much is clear. What isn't clear, because of a smokescreen of hypocrisy and legalisms, is the official U.S. goal in the Nicaragua conflict.

The Reagan administration, mindful of congressional restrictions on U.S. aid to the anti-Sandinista guerrillas, insists that it has no intention of toppling the government in Managua. That would be illegal. Instead, the administration says the purpose of this not-so-secret war is to interrupt the flow of arms from Nicaragua to the Salvadoran guerrillas. And of course no one in the administration has conceded publicly that the U.S. is helping the anti-Sandinista guerrillas, who nonetheless have been described by the President as "freedom fighters."

But the Nicaraguan rebels themselves aren't so coy. They have boasted to American reporters of being the best armed guerrilla force in Latin America, thanks to the U.S. taxpayer, and they promise they'll eventually kick the Commies out of Managua.

Can they do it?

A Democratic member of the House Intelligence Committee claims that CIA Director William Casey has predicted the guerrillas have a good chance of success. Mr. Casey denies it, and several key members of Congress, including Representative Lee Hamilton of Indiana, can't recall the CIA chief making such a prediction.

This is an odd situation. In effect, the administration is saying that an army of freedom fighters—who may or may not be armed by the U.S.—has been dispatched to Nicaragua to "tie one for the Gipper." Winning isn't allowed under the rules. And the director of the CIA bristles at the suggestion that he even believes an inadvertent victory is likely.

This sort of nonsense is inevitable when the government of an open society like the United States tries to conduct a large-scale "covert" operation abroad. Everyone knows what's going on, and the official "no comments" become a joke. The joke reached the national television audience during a presidential press conference last week. A reporter noted that Mr. Reagan has described the Sandinista regime as "oppressive and inimical to our interests in the Western Hemisphere" and asked why the United States didn't openly support the Nicaraguan rebels. To the merriment of the White House press corps, and with a big grin of his own, Mr. Reagan answered, "Because we want to keep on obeying the laws of our country, which we are obeying."

A president who can laugh at himself is worth having around, but a president, who laughs at his ability to tiptoe past the law presents a few obvious problems. Even lawmakers who generally agree with Mr. Reagan's Central America policies must have winced when he made light of aid restrictions passed by Congress.

The Democratic-controlled House appears inclined to tighten those restrictions. In the Senate, however, the prevailing feeling seems to be that the anti-Sandinista guerrillas should be allowed to fight a while longer with U.S. support. That would give Mr. Reagan a few more chances to crack jokes about how he's obeying the law (wink, wink), and maybe the freedom fighters will even succeed in capturing Managua. Then the President could get back to what he enjoys best: lambasting the Soviet Union for meddling in other countries' affairs.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, June 2, 1983]

REAGAN, PUBLIC FAR APART ON CENTRAL AMERICA POLICY

The Reagan Administration and the American public seem headed in opposite directions on the sensitive question of U.S. involvement in Central America's wars. In a recent Washington Post-ABC News poll, for instance, respondents opposed the President's planned increase in military aid to El Salvador by a 3-to-1 margin. Yet all the signs in Washington point to an even more determined U.S. effort to defeat communism in the region by military means.

One such sign was the firing last weekend of Thomas O. Enders as the State Department's senior official on Latin American affairs. Mr. Enders, despite his considerable credentials as a hard-liner, is said to have favored a dual policy that included talking to Salvadoran guerrillas, as well as shooting at them. He also worried that the administration's approach to the Salvadoran conflict was drifting too far out of line with the prevailing views of Congress and the American people.

Public opinion polls and growing unease on Capitol Hill suggest that his concern was well founded. But the administration is pushing ahead anyway with plans to escalate the U.S. presence in this troubled region. One hundred additonal American military advisers will be dispatched this month to Honduras, to train Salvadoran troops. And the number of American advisers in El Salvador itself may soon be increased, despite the murder there last week of the deputy chief of the 55-member U.S. military contingent.

The Reagan administration also is continuing its drive to harass—and perhaps to topple—the leftist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. And now come reports that the CIA wanted to overthrow yet another leftist regime, this one in tiny Surinam, a former Dutch colony north of Brazil. That project evidently was scuttled several months ago only after congressional intelligence committees objected.

Here again, administration policy is out of step with public sentiment. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents to the Washington Post-ABC poll opposed "secret" U.S. efforts to overthrow the Nicaraguan regime, and 63 percent said there were no circumstances under which the United States should try to topple any Latin American government.

This isn't to suggest that foreign policy should bob like a cork on the waves of public opinion. But in a democracy, foreign policy—and domestic policy, too, for that matter—cannot succeed if the electorate isn't persuaded that its leaders are following a sensible course. Despite a televised speech to Congress and numerous statements in press conferences, Mr. Reagan evidently has failed to persuade most Americans that his policies in Central America will pay off.

Their skepticism is understandable. The war in El Salvador is going badly for the U.S.-supported government there, and most reports from Nicaragua indicate that raids by U.S.-backed rebels operating from Honduras have failed to produce the popular, anti-Sandinista uprising some in Washington had hoped.

Meanwhile, the economies of both countries deteriorate—with the exception of coffin-making, the region's growth industry of the '80s. Tough-minded policymakers in the White House don't flinch at the carnage and are convinced that the side with the most will and patience will triumph. But Americans are notoriously impatient people. Considering the costs and consequences of the long, grinding war in Vietnam, impatience now may even be a virtue.

[From the Boston Globe, June 3, 1983]

CONGRESS AND CENTRAL AMERICA

After two years of groping toward a military statement that would postpone the "loss" of El Salvador until after the 1984 elections, the Reagan Administration is panicking and lurching off the deep end. Sensing a defeat in the field, the President has apparently decided to escalate, a decision that can expand Central American violence indefinitely, but that cannot conceivably extract "victory" at a reasonable cost in American blood, treasure, reputation and self-respect.

Congressional critics must toughen their stand on this issue now or accept major responsibility for a still avoidable disaster.

With the purging of Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Enders and US Ambassador to El Salvador Deane Hinton, control of US policy has been concentrated in the hands of UN Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick and national security adviser William Clark.

Enders and Hinton, both foreign service professionals willing to implement almost any policy, lacked one quality essential to this Administration: the true-believer's faith that rightwing dogma will reshape reality. Eventually they concluded that compromise in El Salvador could be preferable to open-ended escalation. For this they were axed.

The Reagan policy can best be summarized as: not on our watch. Its corollary is: pin the blame on the Democrats.

The Administration's fondest wish would be to win a Thatcher-style war, but the politics of Central America do not remotely resemble last year's Falklands crisis. The only alternative—other than a negotiated peace—is expanding US involvement as quickly as possible. The barrier to that is Congress, which accurately reflects the overwhelming skepticism of the American

people, both about the nature of the threat in Central America and about the purported Reagan remedies. The escalation, therefore, must be stealthy.

With many congressional critics apparently stunned into silence, the Administration has moved quickly to deepen US military involvement. Reports now indicate plans to increase the 55-man force of military advisers in El Salvador as much as tenfold and to create a major base in Honduras; surveillance flights from Panama have begun training for strafing missions; a "white paper" rehashing "political-military" assertions about Cuban involvement has been reissued; Hinton and Enders, among the few officials with the experience and grit to confront Kirkpatrick from within, have been fired.

Meanwhile, US support for the "secret" war against Nicaragua continues, in defiance of the House Intelligence Committee, in violation of the UN and Organization of American States charters and in contempt of US law.

By ruling out a negotiated peace, the Reagan Administration is radicalizing Central America and will hand Cuba and the Soviet Union an advantage they could not possibly gain on their own.

Legislative critics must get their electoral jitters under control. If at this clear turning point in United States policy toward Central America they are Red-baited into silence by a "Who lost El Salvador?" campaign, they will share the blame, the disgrace and eventually the retribution of the voters.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 10, 1983]

CONGRESS MUST BREAK STEP ON CENTRAL AMERICA POLICY

Up to now, there has been one way that Central America has not seemed at all like Vietnam: There has been vigorous debate, within the administration, in the Congress, and in all sorts of public forums, including on campuses, about the United States' role—before that role has reached the point of no return.

In Vietnam, the United States was deep in the jungle before anyone knew it and tromping deeper without clear purpose until it lost its way and, finally, its will. It is not wandering—unsuspectingly, at least—into Central America.

Up to now, it has been an open-eyed venture. President Reagan tried to pull the wool over with his covert operation in Nicaragua—advertising it as a way to stop arms to Salvadoran guerrillas (while aiming it at toppling the anti-American Sandindista government).

The House Intelligence Committee didn't buy his bill of goods. In a rare public report, it said it was obvious the President was casting his lot—meaning U.S. military aid—with insurgents tainted by old ties to the regime of deposed dictator Anastasio Somoza.

And now by a vote of 20-14, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended cutting off all covert aid to those rebels—setting the stage for a full-blown floor fight over whether the Congress should tie the President's hands in broadening the regional conflict or give him free rein.

As that fight approaches, there is disturbing news on several fronts. Upset that his single-minded military adventurism was not thoroughly embraced by Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Thomas O. Enders and Ambassador Deane R. Hinton, Mr. Reagan has removed them. Among Mr. Enders' sins, it is reported, was his refusal to publicize a stale CIA report on Communist subversion in the Caribbean.

The President has a right to expect a coherent foreign policy, but an unchallenged one could put zealous anti-Soviet ideologues in the driver's seat. Information from the war zone quickly becomes propaganda when "team players" take charge.

Were earnest economic and social programs blossoming behind the United States' screen of military protection, there would perhaps be more validity to stay that course. But in El Salvador, for example, there is little encouragement on those fronts. Thousands of peasants thought to be eligible for land ownership, according to a study by that country's largest farmers union, are suddenly finding themselves evicted. And as U.S. military doctors are dispatched, there are charges that the rightist Salvadoran government—not the guerrillas—deepened the crisis in rural health care by closing down the country's only medical school.

Meanwhile the U.S. troops trickle in—a new contingent of 120 Green Beret trainers is about to leave for a U.S.-funded base in Honduras, bringing the U.S. complement there to 300.

This is not aimless wandering. The Congress knows full well where this sort of policy—open-ended and based on a military solution—leads. The House committees have shown their reluctance. It is now up to the full House and the Senate to turn off the funding before—as in Vietnam—the nation finds itself bogged down in a war that cannot be won with bullets.

[From the Boston Globe, June 11, 1983]

A SPEECH THAT MATTERS

For 40 minutes at the Harvard commencement Thursday, Carlos Fuentes turned the platform from which he spoke into the stage of history. He spoke at the right moment—when the United States government gives every sign of being poised to commit tragic errors in Central America that can stain our national heritage and convulse the hemisphere, perhaps for decades. This Mexican writer and diplomat proffered a rare gift, a speech that matters.

The Reagan Administration is waging an illegal, undeclared war against Nicaragua and slipping a steadily increasing flow of military personnel into the region. The US government supports a status quo that is morally and perhaps even militarily indefensible.

The Administration insists that Latin American turmoil is of "Marxist-Leninist" manufacture and, on principle, refuses to negotiate differences with the left in El Salvador, with the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua or with Fidel Castro in Cuba, who is labeled "the source." Yet by responding militarily, the White House is embarked on a course that can extend Nicaraguan and Salvadoran violence indefinitely and spread it throughout the region, but not end it.

"Is Fidel Castro some sort of superior Machiavelli whom no gringo negotiator can meet at a bargaining table without being bamboozled by him?" Fuentes asked at Harvard. "I don't believe it.

"The army continues to outwit everyone in El Salvador, including the United States. It announces elections after assassinating the political leadership of the opposition, then asks the opposition to come back and participate in these same hastily organized elections—as dead souls perhaps?"

Fuentes spoke not as a hostile critic but as a critical, anxious friend. He traced the history of unresolved tensions rooted in Latin culture that are finally being released and stressed the consequences of misinterpreting struggles to resolve ancient "family quarrels" as a sinister process that must be quashed by Washington lest it be controlled by Moscow.

His message above all was: Negotiate. Stop spurning the peace feelers from Sandinistas and Salvadoran leftists. Stop rejecting the good offices of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, France and Spain who in the past 18 months have made numerous efforts to sow the seeds of a political settlement. Curb the North American arrogance that makes many US policy makers believe, not only that the entire hemisphere belongs to this nation, but that they alone have the prescription for its ills.

Although by now it is clear where the Reagan Administration is heading, many in Congress have yet to speak out. Public opinion as measured in polls is said to run strongly against the Reagan policy, but because of fear of being branded "soft" or sanguine about an alleged Soviet menace, many potentially influential critics have not yet found their voices.

Sometimes in the course of human events words matter. The Harvard speech of Carlos Fuentes is a call to be heeded.

[From the Boston Globe, June 17, 1983]

FIGHT HARDBALL WITH HARDBALL

President Reagan ended his April 28 address to Congress on Central America with an appeal for bipartisan support—followed in the next and last breath with a partisan threat: "Who among us would wish to bear responsibility for failing to meet our shared obligation?"

Many Democrats sense the sickening slide toward regional war inherent in the deteriorating situation in El Salvador, the mounting tension on the Nicaraguan-Honduran border, and the steady escalation of the US military commitment, but still they are keeping a low profile. They foresee echoes of 1950s McCarthyism in the 1984 campaign and fear taking on the President too directly.

Although the House intelligence and Foreign Affairs Committees have both voted to cut funds for the intervention inside Nicaragua, they have tiptoed around evidence that the Administration has violated congressional stipulations that CIA money not be used to overthrow the Nicaraguan government or spark a border war, but solely to "interdict" alleged arms traffic to El Salvador.

The House Intelligence Committee reported plaintively in mid-May: "There are certainly a number of ways to interdict arms, but developing a sizeable military force and deploying it inside Nicaragua is one which strains credibility as an operation only to interdict arms." This was a wan understatement. Anti-Sandinista leaders have been making perfectly clear they care nothing about arms interdiction and everything about counterrevolution. It's equally clear they're dependent on US support.

The Democratic leadership hopes to stop US support for CIA activity inside Nicaragua by attaching a cut-off amendment to the 1984 Intelligence Authorization bill which pays for CIA operations starting Oct. 1. President Reagan would face the choice of accepting that amendment or shutting down the CIA, but obviously the Administration will respond fiercely.

To set the scene for that confrontation, Congress should fight hardball with hardball. Copious revelations about the covert war in Nicaragua provide an opening. There's self-evident reason to assume CIA operatives have participated in contra discussions of overthrowing the Nicaraguan government. If so, they have broken the law, and if their superiors knew about it, they have broken the law.

It's time for a serious probe. The House Intelligence Committee's oversight subcommittee has the power to initiate an investigation and to compel documents and testimony, just as was done, for example, after the Bay of Pigs invasion, the U2 incident or the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile.

In addition to being aggressive politics that will neutralize incipient McCarthyism, such a probe would be politically healthy. American confidence in our system of government is undermined when the executive branch defies Congress with impunity on a matter of war and peace. We are a more law-abiding people than Reagan Administration behavior suggests these days.

Congress should drive that point home.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1983]

THE REFUGEES ARE COMING!

For weeks, officials in Washington have been muttering darkly about a potential tidal wave. Unless the public supports more military spending to combat troublemaking communists in Central America, then watch out: hordes of poor refugees will start pouring in. Now, the muttering is no longer low-level or anonymous. It's coming straight from the President.

If the flood of Southeast Asian boat people was a problem, he says, just imagine what it will be like when the "feet people" start marching north from Central America. That's scare-mongering, and of a contradictory sort. The surest way to avoid a refugee tide is to keep it from arising in the first place. The present Reagan policy risks creating more refugees, not fewer.

Some of the portents emanate from the Army. Three weeks ago, The Washington Post reported that an unnamed general has been warning that so many Latin Americans will flee communism that we'd need to recall some troops from Europe to seal our southern border.

The State Department's Refugee Affairs office has been ringing a similar alarm. In a paper dated May 17, H. Eugene Douglas injected figures into the fears. It estimates the refugee potential at 2.33 million. Not 2 million, not 2½ million, but 2.33 million. Such precision means sophistication, and credibility, right? The figure, it turns out, is what you get if you make the dubious assumption that 10 percent of the region's population will take flight.

Such fanning of fears was unattractive at lower levels. But this week, President Reagan joined in. Speaking in Mississippi, he said, "We must not listen to those who would disarm our friends and allow Central America to be turned into a string of Marxist dictatorships. The result could be a tidal wave of refugees—and this time they'll be 'feet people' and not 'boat people'. . . ."

There is some basis for expecting new refugee pressure. Continuing violence has already pushed hundreds of thousands across one border or another. Mexico has just tightened its border against Salvadorans, Guatemalans and others, using the same logic that the United States uses against illegal migrants from Mexico. An accelerating flow of migrants to this country would strain our law enforcement—and conscience.

The surest way to avoid a refugee tide is prevention, and that means caring about more than military assistance. Arms alone would, if anything, increase the number of refugees. Which side do frightened people typically take? The side of safety. The longer the combat goes on, the more people who will be scared out of their wits, homes and countries.

To shout, "The refugees are coming!" is neither a humane refugee policy nor a persuasive agrument for Mr. Reagan's larger policy.

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1983]

THE "CONTRA" REVOLUTION WON'T WORK

If the Reagan Administration has a dream about Nicaragua, it is this: With modest American support, the foreign-based insurgencies may catch fire inside the country and topple its leftist regime. . . . If not, the junta may be forced to broaden its base, become less Marxist, more nonaligned. . . . If not that, maybe it will be drained by diversionary battles and kept from spreading revolution in Central America during President Reagan's watch.

For all its heavy cost in lives and dubious legality, this is a policy. And the skirmishing at Nicaragua's borders has powerfully concentrated the attentions of the Sandinistas in Managua. They know their geography and understand that if the war grows, they can expect only modest help from Havana and Moscow.

That alone may explain their signals for direct negotiation with the United States.

What about? Some Sandinistas say they are ready to satisfy American concern about the alleged flow of arms to El Salvador, and to allay our fears of Cuban or Soviet bases in Nicaragua. Perhaps, they'll even talk about democracy, which many hemisphere governments find deplorably lacking.

But in return, the Nicaraguans want recognition of their right to pursue an independent course, without harassment. Even to test these offers, therefore, the Administration would have to give up its dream that insurgents might capture the country.

The choice is between trying to cash in our bargaining chips and disappointing the forces we have hitherto encouraged—or going for broke.

There is nothing irredeemably immoral about backing the "contras." Our role in the war ought then to be open, with aims that can be measured. And the Latin opposition to interference would have to be met with the argument that the Sandinistas themselves had abundant foreign help in overthrowing the Somoza dictatorship.

The overwhelming argument against that course is practical: the "contras" cannot succeed. They have no propsect of being militarily strong enough. Even if they were, they are fatally burdened by the Yankee colossus on their backs.

The difference in Central America between getting help from the north and help from the south is not a matter of geography, but history. Having sponsored the right-wing dictatorships that have now spawned leftist revolution, it is too late for us to appear as only benign democrats. Similarly, it is too late in Nicaragua for former servants of the Somoza regime, no matter how honorable, to present themselves as democratic saviors.

The exiles we support fight with the conviction that Nicaragua seethes with unrest. But in the major cities, where the Sandinistas won their revolution, no unrest is evident.

And Nicaragua is not Guatemala, where the C.I.A. managed the overthrow of a leftist President Arbenz in 1954; he led a regime, not a revolution. Nor does the situation resemble Chile, where American meddling helped destabilize the elected Allende government in 1973; the Chilean army, crucially, was not of the left.

Overt intervention with the Marines did block leftists in the Dominican Republic in 1965 and is the only hemisphere intervention that paved the way for stable, democratic government. But Americans were able to seal off that island and find an effective partner in President Balaguer.

The apter precedent for Nicaragua is Cuba, and America's sponsorship of an ill-fated invasion by exiles in 1961. The Sandinistas, like Cuba's Fidelistas, are exploiting the invasion threat to excuse their failures and to solidify their rule.

If we still hope to alter the course of Nicaragua's revolution we need to learn what accepting it will buy. America's legitimate concerns involve hemisphere security and guarantees against foreign bases and alien arms. Perhaps the Sandinistas will not discuss these issues in good faith, even in return for guarantees of their own security. But it would be unforgivable not to test them before the Central American fire spreads.●

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON H.R. 2760 COVERT ACTION IN NICARAGUA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FOWLER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as the time draws near for the House to work its will on the issue of U.S. support of military intervention in Nicaragua, it is well to reflect on a conclusion drawn in 1975 by the Senate Select Committee To Study Government Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities. In its discussion of paramilitary programs, that committee observed:

> There are two principal criteria which determine the minimum success of paramilitary operations: (1) achievement of the policy goal; and (2) maintenance of deniability. If the first is not accomplished, the operation is a failure in any case; if the second is not accomplished, the paramilitary option offers few if any advantages over the option of overt military intervention. On balance, in these terms, the evidence points toward the failure of paramilitary activity as a technique of covert action.

The "covert" action operation in Nicaragua fails on both counts. Obviously, it is no longer covert and thus deniability can no longer be maintained. Nor has it achieved the stated policy goals of interdicting arms bound for El Salvador or turning the Sandinista revolution inward. These are the conclusions of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in its thoughtful report accompanying H.R. 2760 (H. Rept. 98-122, pt. 1).

I urge all of my colleagues to read the report, as well as the following pertinent editorial comments.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Apr. 28, 1983]

Ronald Reagan gave one of his most forceful presidential speeches last night before a joint session of Congress. It was an eloquent appeal for the $600 million in military and economic aid he wants for Central America.

But more than a well-written speech expressively presented is required to sell Congress and the nation on what strikes many as too much of a military approach to a problem far more complex than guerrilla warfare.

Central America may not be Vietnam for several good reasons. But, for some, Reagan's speech evoked haunting memories of past presidents standing before Congress' urging more of the same failed approach.

In short, there is reason to question both some of his stronger statements—including that "the national security of all the Americas is at stake," particularly in El Salvador—and his emphasis on military means to meet the challenge.

To doubt the president's approach is not to make light of communist activity in the region. The Soviet Union and its Caribbean proxies, Cuba and Nicaragua, seek to exploit instability. And the impounding of weapons hidden as medical supplies aboard Libyan air transports is another sign of outside involvement.

However, the communists and the international terrorists associated with them are able to find opportunities in Central America born of economic and social conditions that predate regional superpower rivalries.

The economic exploitation of landless poor and indigenous Indian tribes; systems of oligarchic political control; dangerous disparities between the few who are rich and the many who are poor, and abysmal human rights records—these are the realities of Central America that have allowed insurgencies to flourish.

Unless and until those deep-seated problems are dealt with, the Soviets and their supporters will continue to find fertile ground to tend.

Reagan's speech recognized some of this. He said he wants to bolster human rights efforts encourage economic development and allow "dialogue and negotiation."

But this administration's record in those areas is unimpressive. In El Salvador, abuses of human dignity continue at an alarming rate. Land reform has been stalled for nearly a year. And Washington has consistently rejected negotiation as a means of resolving El Salvador's woes.

Neither Congress nor the people would support a "sell-out" of Central America to the communists. But that is not what is at stake, despite the president's claims.

If our national interests were fully at risk, the president ought to be willing to commit American troops, and be ready to tell the Congress and the people just that. Instead, he got his biggest applause for saying U.S. troops would not be sent to Central America.

Indeed, the focus of America's assistance efforts must be on alleviating the conditions that allow guerrilla activity to thrive. It should not be on arming of regimes, present or exiled, that stand as symbols of continued repression.

Whether negotiations, the alternative approach advanced by congressional Democrats and others, will work in this situation is uncertain. It is a gamble involving elements that can be unstable and untrustworthy.

But it seems far less of a gamble than a military approach with some dubious allies and proven losers.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, Apr. 29, 1983]

No one in his right mind would argue with President Reagan when he says that Central America is vital to the interest of the United States. That position would apply specifically, also, to beleagured El Salvador and Nicaragua, two key nations in the region at the moment.

It was to secur the appropriations he wants for the defense of these two nations that Reagan addressed a joint session of Congress Wednesday night. What the president said about the vital nature of these two nations and all of Central and South America is correct. What was wrong with the speech was any real explanation of where we are going in both El Salvador and Nicaragua.

Congress appears on the verge of substantially reducing U.S. aid to the rightest government of El Salvador and of ending aid for supposedly covert operations against the leftist government of Nicaragua. Congress is so disposed because we do not appear to be winning in either country.

There seem to be endless reports out of El Salvador as to the violations of basic human rights on the part of government forces. There are seemingly valid reports of revolutionary forces operating throughout the nation with near impunity. Just yesterday, an impressive list of doctors released a report on their recent visit to El Salvador. The report characterized the health care delivery system as in total collapse, with up to three people sharing a single sick bed in many areas.

In Nicaragua, there appears to be no question that the U.S. is aiding revolutionary forces opposed to the Sandinista leftist regime there, on the grounds that Nicaragua is a funnel for the shipment of arms to Salvadoran guerrilla forces. But we are fighting a government in Nicaragua that appears from various reports to have greater loyalty from more of its citizens than does the government we are helping in El Salvador.

In Nicaragua, the government appears to be making progress in the unification of its nation. In El Salvador, the government appears barely able to sustain itself. If we are right, why is it that we seem to be on the losing side in each case?

Sen. Christopher Dodd of Connecticut responded to the Reagan speech for the Democrats. Among other things, he noted that governments were not so much the enemy or the foe in Central America as are such things as hunger, ill health, ignorance, persecution and other elements of a generally deprived quality of life.

That is what bothers us about the Reagan speech and the U.S. position in Central America. We seem to be hung up on ideology, on political labels, when the real struggle there is for human rights and dignity. We do not appear to have a clear vision of where we are really going in Central America or, if we did, how we would get there or how long it would take.

What we seem intent upon doing is pouring money into the region to support causes we perceive to be ideologically in accord with our own but which do not seem in practice, ever to quite rise to minimum levels of such ideology. Certainly, one cannot fault the president's intentions but his means lack any ring of conviction. His speech did not remove the growing doubts that engulf this country's fundamental pursuits in South America.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star and Tribune, Apr. 29, 1983]

In one respect, President Reagan's Wednesday-night address to a joint session of Congress sent critics of his Central American policy scurrying for cover. By resorting to a seldom-used and politically risky tactic—assembling Congress to hear a direct presidential appeal on a specific issue—Reagan convincingly demonstrated that his concern about the area, and communist expansionism there, is real.

Only the most hardened cynic could believe that the president would so commit his, and the nation's, prestige to a cause he doesn't hold dear. Thus Senator Christopher Dodd of Connecticut, in delivering the official Democratic response, felt constrained to assert that "all partiotic Americans" oppose the establishment of Marxist states and the introduction of Soviet military bases and offensive missiles in Central America and "are fully prepared to defend our security and the security of the Americas, if necessary, by military means."

As Reagan pointed out, the purpose of his meeting with Congress was not to resolve a crisis but to prevent one. But while few may now be willing to contest the seriousness of the Central American problem, the president failed to bring critics over to his view of what the problem is or how best to resolve it. Reagan believes that the region's troubles derive from a Marxist effort to destablize existing governments. His responses leans heavily toward military aid. Others contend that poverty and dictatorial regimes are the real villians. Their response emphasizes economic and political reform.

It would be naive to suggest that the problem isn't partly military or that U.S. military aid is unnecessary. If nothing else, the army of El Salvador must be professionalized if it is to protect rather than threaten its own people.

It's equally naive to believe that either El Salvador or Nicaragua are democracies waiting to happen, and that all it will take is some economic help and judicious non-intervention by Washington, Moscow and Havana. Skill in popular government does not come readily to countries with such long histories of political repression.

But economic aid and political reform are still the better bets for addressing Central American problems. And although Reagan made some significant bows in that direction, he continued in his speech to stress the military threat and to press for more U.S. military assistance in the area.

And while he pledged U.S. support for negotiations—"both among the countries of the region and within each country"—he offered no plan to take the initiative in arranging them. Yet as Dodd would later say, that is where U.S. involvement in Central America should begin, by using U.S. power and influences "to achieve an immediate cessation of hostilities in both El Salvador and Nicaragua" and "to work for negotiated political settlements," perhaps through such Latin American allies as Mexico, Panama, Venezuela and Columbia.

Reagan seems intent on pursuing a Central American policy base on warmaking rather than peacemaking. The situation

there is serious, but the course being pushed by the president seems more likely to make it worse than better.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Apr. 29, 1983]

Fruitful discussions are impossible with someone who pays no heed to what others say, persisting only in repeating the starting position—louder and more passionately but with no change in substance. This is how President Reagan is conducting U.S. policy in Central America.

Two years ago, the administration said that (1) Central America is vital to U.S. interests (certainly true) and (2) conflicts there must be viewed in East-West terms. If you accepted that it was indeed the bad-guy marxists vs. the good-guy democrats, it followed that the United States should jump in militarily to keep the enemy from the door.

If, instead, you saw Central American conflict as indigenous, born of years of oppression and landlessness, then U.S. military involvement was much harder to defend and the solution much more complicated.

Over the past several years, the messages from visitors to Central America have stirred deep concern in Congress and among the public about that original Reagan position.

The Salvadoran forces have behaved poorly in the field, killed tens of thousands of civilians, and seem unable to gain the advantage over a much smaller guerrilla force. Other nations have urged the United States to push the Salvadoran government into negotiations, but the Reagan administration rejects negotiation as forced power-sharing.

U.S. activity in Nicaragua, visitors have reported, cannot be excused as the simple interdiction of arms to Salvadoran guerrillas; the U.S. government supports those who would overthrow the Nicaraguan government. The forces backed by U.S. aid are largely supporters of the ousted—and infamously repressive—Somoza regime.

Reagan on Wednesday dismissed as propaganda these messages—from such varied sources as members of Congress on fact-finding tours led by the Central Intelligence Agency, journalists and former diplomats. Instead, he repeated his original message: The United States must stamp out communism in the Americas, and Congress and the nation must support his military effort to do so.

Reagan wasted no words, in addressing an unusual joint session of Congress, on the troubling questions of how his effort might prevail, why it has had such a sorry record so far or how long it might take to work.

He charged those who would question this blind policy with counseling "passivity, resignation and defeatism." That is both unfair and untrue. Those who question Reagan's policy seek an open, thoughful discussion of what is really at stake in Central America, what would be the most productive U.S. role there and what outcome the nation is hoping for.

That discussion, as Reagan showed by singing his same old tune on Wednesday, is something he is either unwilling or unable to engage in.

[From the Oregonian, Apr. 29, 1983]

President Reagan gave a masterful performance, delivering to Congress a well-honed, artfully constructed speech on Central American policies, arguing that American security is at stake. But he failed to offer any plan for settling the conflicts in El Salvador and Nicaragua or offer any new reasons that would end the deep national skepticism that his policy is the right one.

Aside from the fact the president was laying his personal prestige on the line in an unprecedented way, little was produced that should convince the American people that his military efforts have any chance of succeeding or will do more than escalate the bloodshed.

Instead of arms, the people of Central America need jobs, industry and economic support. Instead of more killing, they need a chance to live in peace. Such an end can come only from a massive effort by the administration to begin negotiations between belligerents. It must pull out all of the stops, as it often has done in the Middle East, using traveling negotiators, such as an equivalent of Philip Habib. The El Salvador government opposes any "middlemen" negotiators, but it is in no positon to set such conditions when it is seeking U.S. support.

Sen. Christopher Dodd, D-Conn., reacting for the Democrats to the president's full-court press on the Congress, argued eloquently that the power and influence of the United States should be used to end the fighting and get talks going. He contended that the current U.S. policy in Nicaragua weakens the very groups supporting a democratic society.

Military escalation In El Salvador, as proposed by the president, is the road to disaster. it cannot succeed because the people have no stomach for the military rulers and their daily death squads. Upping the military ante will only force the other side to raise its bets. There is scant evidence, however, that the Cubans and others helping the revolutionists are prepared to match the heavy economic aid America can afford.

The issue is not the cost of the arms the president wants, but the fact that the policy behind their use is a loser. This should encourage Congress to limit or reduce appropriation requests for more weapons.

The United States has a long history of being on the wrong side in Latin America. The president cannot rectify that record by parading promises of not sending in more U.S. soldiers or technical aids, because the people of this nation no longer trust government or presidential promises. American presidents are notorious for backing down on pledges to stay out of wars.

Pleading that the "national security of all the Americas is at stake in Central America," as Reagan did in his speech to the joint congressional session, is extravagant rhetoric, which even he did not back with factual scenarios.

That the tiny, poverty-stricken nations of the Caribbean are some kind of a national threat justifying the Reagan policy is not salable. The public was not with the president before the speech, and it should not be with him after it. They can clearly see he is being hypocritical when he proclaims El Salvador is making gains on the human rights fronts, or that a few more millions spent on arms can make a difference. The people know a dark, endless tunnel when they see one, and they know instinctively where Ronald Reagan, a dyed-in-red "confrontationalist," would take them. Congress should have no part of it.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Apr. 29, 1983]

Employing the best and worst of the skills that earned him the nickname "the Great Communicator," President Reagan went to Capitol Hill Wednesday to salvage his supplemental aid package for El Salvador. He gave Congress ample reason to continue questioning his goals for Central America.

The delivery was, to be sure, both forceful and colorful. He conjured up images of Nazi Germany and the Red menace and reminded us all that Central America is much nearer our shores than Indochina. In short, the address was a powerful call to arms.

Well, not really arms, the President and his apologists quickly added. "There is no thought of sending American combat troops to Central America; they are not needed—indeed, they have not been requested there," Mr. Reagan said in attempting to head off comparisons to developments early in the nation's Vietnam involvement.

Doubtless those who recall Lyndon Johnson's 1964 campaign pledge never to send American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do have the jitters. Indeed, the sweeping promises in the address, during which Mr. Reagan equated the survival of the disreputable government in San Salvador with democracy, should make every listener question what limits, if any, he would place on American military assistance.

Given the nature of Central America's turmoil, the speech was irrelevant. It sidestepped disturbing charges that the United States has encouraged insurgents who are trying to topple the government in Nicaragua. It did a minuet with the vision of negotiations but kicked them in the pants by emphasizing military solutions.

"This is a mind-boggling gamble that the President is taking," declared Sol Linowitz, the former U.S. special ambassador whose field is Latin America. "He has to in now. Anything less, in the eyes of the world, would be a humiliating defeat for the United States—and a humiliating defeat for him." Mr. Linowitz was co-chairman of a panel that recently urged a "many sided dialogue" to settle long-something issues in Central America.

The President's disdain for negotiations may still win him some points with the hard-liners who are his political allies. However, his demand for a military victory exposes a dangerously narrow attitude that ignores underlying social and economic sources of conflict. Sen. Christopher Dodd of Connecticut who offered a Democratic rebuttal to Mr. Reagan's speech, made that clear.

Things just aren't quite the way the President paints them. The Sandinista regime in Nicaragua derives its support more from nationalism than from its Marxism. Hostility against Washington is not founded upon disrespect for democracy but, instead, upon American enthusiasm for propping up dictators past and present who bolster landed interest at the expense of others. El Salvador may be making "progress" in political killings, but so far in 1983, nearly 1,300 noncombatants have been slain by government security forces, according to the Catholic archdiocess in San Salvador.

Small wonder that Congress is doubtful about Mr. Reagan's request for an additional $60 million this year in military aid for El Salvador. On Tuesday, a House subcommittee halved the request—citing the government's continued human rights violations and disdain for civil liberties as the reason.

So long as these outrages continue, Congress has a right to its doubts. And Mr. Reagan's claim that our efforts in Central America are to "support democracy, reform and human freedom" remains at odds with the reality of the situation there.

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, Apr. 29, 1983]

With its tone of moderation and its appeal to bipartisanship, President Reagan's address to Congress on El Salvador probably won some additional public support. But the address lacked an essential element, a program that offers a reasonable hope of attaining the goals for the region that every American supports.

The reason the President's policy toward Central America is in trouble and the reason Congress is so skeptical is that the policy has not worked in the past and seems unlikely to succeed in the future.

That's dangerous. When a President of the United States says, as Mr. Reagan did Wednesday night, that this country has "a vital interest, a moral duty and a solemn responsibility" in Central America, he had better have a means of protecting that vital interest. If he doesn't, and he believes his own words, then he has committed this nation's honor and resources to a very risky effort.

We believe the United States has both vital interests and ideological hopes in Central America. Our vital interests are that there be no Soviet bases in the region and that Soviet offensive weapons be kept out of the region. To protect those interests, we have in the past dealt with the Soviet Union and should do so in the future.

North Americans also have good wishes for Central America. We would hope that its people could enjoy the fruits of democratic self-government and the free enterprise system. We should help them reach those goals, but we should not confuse our hopes with our vital interests.

President Reagan sees the insurgency in El Salvador as inspired, financed and supplied by the Soviet Union, Cuba and Nicaragua. If those three nations did not exist, the insurgency probably would have come into being because for years in most of Central America selfish landowners and a corrupt military have exploited the poor. Most people in Central America desperately need change, but the king of problems they face cannot be solved by militiary aid to repressive governments.

Sen. Christopher J. Dodd, who spoke after Mr. Reagan, has figured out that the United States has spent more than $1-billion in El Salvador since the President took office—$140,000 for every guerrilla in that country. It would be cheaper to buy them out. No expenditure of U.S. dollars will work unless the United States and its allies can earn the support of those in El Salvador and other nations who see the guerrillas as offering them more hope for the future than the government.

At the insistence of the House of Representatives, Mr. Reagan agreed to appoint a special envory to Central America. The ambassador's assignment will be to help bring both sides in this conflict to the negotiating table.

If the President had selected a skilled negotiator respected by both sides for this assignment, and given that person sufficient authority, that would have been the most promising aspect of his address. His nomination instead of former Florida Sen. Richard Stone, who recently hired out as a registered foreign agent for the government of Guatamala, raises questions about the President's commitment to a negotiated settlement.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Apr. 29, 1983]

Set aside "passivity, resignation, defeatism," advised President Reagan in his address to a joint session of Congress. Rise to meet "this challenge to freedom and security in our hemisphere," he counseled lawmakers Wednesday night.

Congress does not suffer from passivity or defeatism, and it is insulting for the president to even imply that legislators don't care what happens in Central America. The substance of Mr. Reagan's message—unless we "defend" ourselves in El Salvador, we will have to fight communism in the U.S.A.—ought to induce outrage.

Instead, members of Congress gave him standing ovations.

Why? The president knows how to deliver a speech that arouses the red, white and blue in us. He is, after all, a professional actor.

Mr. Reagan tried to draw from the national reservoir of fear and patriotism. If Congress doesn't authorize what he wants, Soviet-style communism will implant itself in Central America, he warned. And what patriotic American wants that to happen?

There is another—more rational—side to the dilemma. Connecticut Sen. Christopher J. Dodd presented it well in his televised response to the president, on behalf of the Democrats: "We cannot afford to found so important a policy on ignorance—and the painful truth is that many of our highest officials seem to know as little about Central America in 1983 as we know about Indochina in 1963."

The truth about Central America is that the region has suffered for generations from the evils of poverty, disease and illiteracy—and subjugation by a small, feudal class. The United States, always reluctant to upset the status quo, still finds more evil in insurrection than in police state brutality.

So far in Mr. Reagan's presidency, Congress has authorized $700 million for El Salvador. But Mr. Reagan wants more. The president, as Mr. Dodd noted, wants to spend $140,000 in tax dollars for each of the 7,000 guerrillas our government claims are in El Salvador.

The insurgents would not be defeated if the United States spent $1 million per head. That's not how guerrillas are overcome. "Unless . . . oppressive conditions change, that region will continue to seethe with revolution . . .," said Sen. Dodd.

Thus far, the United States has not changed these conditions. On the contrary, Central America is probably where the United States has come closest to attempting to establish a permanent colonial overlordship. The Reagan administration's latest plan, to appoint a special envoy, is reminiscent of the old British viceroys who were instructed to keep the natives in line. No wonder, then, that even the Salvadoran Chamber of Commerce denounced the idea of a special envoy.

Mr. Reagan chose not to mention the 30,000 deaths in El Salvador, most of them at the hands of government forces. He said nothing about the growing number of political prisoners, about the Salvadoran government's defiant attitude toward U.S. requests for prosecution of the murderers of American citizens.

Congress should refuse to give Mr. Reagan more money to save the oligarchies in El Salvador and Guatemala and to topple the radicals in Nicaragua. Economic assistance yes, but not a cent more than has already been authorized for the military.

The American people would be better served if their president made all aid in the region contingent on unconditional peace negotiations among the warring factions. The pope has suggested such talks, as have the leaders of Mexico, Panama, Venezuela and Colombia. Why not Mr. Reagan? Why not, as Sen. Dodd said, have the United States move with the tide of history, rather than stand against it?

The tide of history is not communism. It is freedom from subjugation by megalomaniacs abroad and at home.●

INTRODUCTION OF "UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1983"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to make more retraining, education, and relocation assistance available to America's workers, without creating new costs and demands on the Federal budget. This new bill, the Unemployment Insurance and Adjustment Assistance Act of 1983, uses the established mechanisms of the unemployment insurance (UI) program and improves the operation of that $30-plus billion program by permitting workers to use a portion of the benefits they would otherwise have drawn on a week-by-week basis to fund retraining, relocation, and education services.

The idea for this bill is drawn from the trade adjustment assistance program and from a proposal submitted this winter by the President relating to employment vouchers—but corrects many of the shortcomings in that proposal, and contains new ideas on how to make the existing UI program more effective.

As our Nation's record unemployment drags on, it is clear that the Ways and Means Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation Subcommittee—on which I am privileged to serve as ranking majority member—will be holding additional hearings on UI legislation. It is my hope that the new ideas contained in this legislation can be considered at such future hearings.

I would like to discuss briefly the need for a change in UI and retraining policies, how this legislation would work, and what it would cost.

THE NEED FOR NEW RETRAINING ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, change is rapidly overwhelming the American economy. Just some 15 years ago, when the economy was much less sensitive to foreign trade and sustained growth made it easy for the unemployed to shift out of dead-end occupations and into new productive enterprises, people had little need for things like labor adjustment assistance.

Now they need it badly.

Because of the recent back-to-back recessions there is more chronic unemployment today than at any other time since the Great Depression. And, according to a study released by the Joint Economic Committee only a couple of weeks ago, people are remaining unemployed for far longer than any time since 1948.

These structurally and long-term unemployed are losing their homes and the assets that they have sometimes worked their entire lives to put together. They are falling victim to debt collectors as they fail to meet the payments they had every right to expect to be able to pay. Most of them have been left stranded without health insurance. And, this is particularly serious as more of these people are ravaged by health problems, even serious illness, brought on by the worry of having to survive, and to provide for their families. In fact, the death rate has been shown to increase with unemployment. Most suicide victims belong to the ranks of the unemployed. Crime increases. Many older workers lose hopes of retirement as they lose the benefits they would have collected if they had remained on the job. In a study of unemployed Ford autoworkers in New Jersey, half the workers still had no jobs after 2 years, and for those over age 40, the vast majority of them remained unemployed.

Now, there is a moderate recovery underway. However, what sets this recovery aside from previous ones is that the jobless are not being hired back into the economy, at least not in any significant numbers. Since last autumn, unemployment has exceeded 10 percent. Most economists expect it to remain at 9 to 10 percent through the end of the year, if not longer. If the history of recent recessions is any yardstick then there seems to be a very good chance that it will not be coming down much lower than this, even if the economy really picks up steam again. We are probably stuck at a new and higher plateau of joblessness and human suffering.

Some experts are saying that the U.S. economy may have already reached a natual or permanent unemployment rate of 6 to 9 percent. According to occupational forecasters who testified to Congress this April, by the year 2,000, we may consider an 8.5-percent unemployment rate perfectly acceptable—with 3.5 percent of the labor force constantly rotating out of dead-end jobs and retraining for new ones.

But even this prediction may be optimistic, if we do not quickly act to provide a national program for retraining and readjustment assistance for the unemployed.

As if the individual suffering is not outrageous enough, then consider, too, the havoc that his kind of unemployment is wreaking on the entire economy. According to Robert B. Reich, a leading advocate of industrial policy and author of "The Next American Frontier":

> Every 1-percent increase in the jobless rate costs roughly $75 billion in lost production of goods and services, $25 billion in lost taxes, and $5 billion in unemployment compensation.

Although this joblessness cuts across all occupations, most of it is concentrated in semiskilled and unskilled blue-collar occupations. During previous recessions, most of these people could count on being called back to their old jobs when the economy picked up again. Even though they were technically counted as unemployed, they enjoyed the kind of job security from recession to recession. They knew they would be hired back. This is no longer true. Over the last 3½ years, almost 3 million jobs have been lost in manufacturing industries. And, most of these workers will never be hired back.

Job loss has been blamed mostly on two things: Foreign trade competition and structural changes in the economy. Both are facts that we must learn to live with. Countries like Japan and West Germany have gained a competitive foothold in numerous markets for U.S. manufactured or processed goods. The introduction of new technologies and manufacturing processes, like microprocessors and robotics, have contributed to the loss of inumerable jobs. By 1990, General Motors has planned to have installed 20,000 robots on its production lines. According to Harley Shaiken, an MIT researcher, 40,000 GM jobs will be lost—about the current domestic employment at Chrysler Corp.

Business has always responded to foreign trade and new technology with a shifting of resources and new job opportunities for the dislocated worker. This is part of a process of natural industrial restructuring. But what makes the unemployment associated with it so much more of a problem today is the fact that it is occurring more rapidly than ever before. For most of this country's existence, foreign trade has played only a minor role in the economy. Today, its importance is growing by leaps and bounds each year. Change in the technology is occurring faster all the time. Representative ALBERT GORE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the House Committee on Science and Technology has said that "we are entering an era when few people will be able to count on the skills they learned in school to carry them through a lifetime of work." It is a reality that is becoming true for more of us each day.

The traditional remedies for dealing with unemployment have not trained people for new careers. Unemployment insurance (UI) is the main program for out-of-work Americans. But, while temporarily providing a very limited financial cushion—weekly subsistence—it does little else. Trade adjustment assistance, which is set to expire this year, has been poorly managed and reserved exclusively for the use of a very narrowly defined set of import-affected workers—and its provisions for retraining assistance have been little promoted or used. It deserves the name given to it by many workers—"funeral assistance." Even if continued, this has become a minor program because of budget cuts.

The UI provides just one type of income maintenance assistance for people. But, the main program for the jobless needs to be a more flexible type of assistance strategy, it it is going to meet the needs of workers in a changing economy. Too many Americans are languishing on UI benefits, without using the period of unemployment to obtain new skills to match today's and tomorrow's jobs. Too many job seekers are forced to stay at home, collecting the unemployment checks, because the money is barely enough to get by on, let alone fund job-hunting trips to areas that offer a better chance for finding a job. Money for educational courses which might lead to a new job is out of the question.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that is designed to help break the unemployment bottleneck. Titled the "Unemployment Insurance and Adjustment Assistance Act of 1983" (UI-AA), my proposal will improve the effectiveness of the existing UI program by allowing people the option of getting retrained for the skills that they need in today's economy and the chance to get to where the jobs are.

UI-AA is a flexible assistance strategy. It improves the flexibility of the existing UI program by allowing UI recipients the option of obtaining the cash value of any extended benefits available in their States, early on in their unemployment, to fund retraining, education, job search, and relocation expenses. Under this bill, soon after applying for regular UI benefits, the individual would be allowed to form a pool of capital out of any extended benefits he would have been eligible for—this includes both today's extended benefit program, the Federal supplemental compensation program, and any new programs beyond regular UI which may be enacted. This pool of capital can then be used, even while he continues to collect regular UI benefits, to pay some of the costs he will need to cover to become employed again.

HOW WILL UI-AA WORK?

It is really very simply. Under this legislation, unemployed workers will be allowed to trade in and obtain the

cash value of the various types of extended UI benefits available to them if they had remained unemployed throughout their eligibility for UI benefits. In return, three different types of adjustment assistance will be made available to them, either singly or in combination. These are: First, retraining assistance; second, education assistance; and third, job search and relocation assistance. Like the regular UI program, UI-AA will be administered by the State employment security agencies (SESA's). The unemployed individual will apply directly to the appropriate SESA, as he would for regular UI benefits, and he may do so at any time within 30 days of establishing eligibility for regular UI benefits.

RETRAINING ASSISTANCE

UI-AA may be used to refund a firm's cost in retraining a worker, as long as an offer of indefinite or reasonably permanent employment is made after retraining. The SESA's will develop and maintain lists of employers willing to participate in the program and refer applicants to appropriate employers. If an employer accepts an applicant for participation in its training program, and the training results in permanent employment, then the employer will be reimbursed for the cash value of any retraining provided. This reimbursement is made out of the applicant's UI-AA pool of capital and may not exceed the cash value of any extended benefits that would have been available to the participant. Further, to protect workers who are already on the job, employers will need to certify to the SESA that UI-AA hiring will not displace existing employees. By providing employers with payments to help cover the retraining costs, UI-AA will provide incentives for firms to train and make some of those who are hardest hit by unemployment. Since the worker will be receiving his regular UI benefits during the training period, the compensation agreements which normally occur between companies and trainees can be adjusted accordingly, thus providing another incentive to the firm to attempt retraining.

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Under UI-AA, the UI recipient can choose to trade in all or a portion of his pool of capital to pay for a SESA-approved educational program. At the same time that he is enrolled in an educational program, he may continue to receive his regular UI benefits. This will allow him to still cover his basic living expenses and, at the same time, dramatically improve his job marketability. The SESA's will provide referrals to approved educational programs.

JOB SEARCH AND RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

UI-AA can help pick up the tab for job search and relocation expenses incurred in trying to find a job outside of the normal commuting area. To pay for job search expenses, the SESA will need to determine that there are no reasonable job opportunities available to the unemployed worker in his commuting area. Relocation expenses will be allowed when it is necessary for the individual to relocate as a condition of exployment.

GROUP APPLICATIONS FOR ASSISTANCE

This is a feature that makes UI-AA especially attractive. Under this provision, communities, firms, and labor unions can take the leadership for developing plans to assist the unemployed. Basically, UI-AA provides a mechanism for establishing and accepting group applications for assistance. For example, a plant is going to be shut down because it is producing an outmoded product or noncompetitive product. The company knows that it has the equipment or capital resources to switch production to a different kind of product. However, the company also knows that it does not have the skilled work force to produce the new product. So, under normal circumstances, all or most of the plant's employees would lose their jobs. But, with UI-AA, the company can make a group application for assistance that, if accepted by the SESA, will provide for the retraining of the plant's work force and allow workers to be hired back immediately. Of course, individuals would not be bound to accept assistance under the group application and would preserve their rights to collect UI benefits and apply individually for UI-AA, if they chose to do so. Given the option of keeping their jobs, many workers would probably opt for group assistance.

Labor unions whole communities, or any governmental unit may also make group applications for assistance on behalf of the unemployed, or about-to-be unemployed. If a town in West Virginia, where 90 percent of the work force is engaged in coal mining, suddenly learns that the town's only coal mine is about to be shut down, an application can be made to fund job search and relocation expenses outside of the area, where jobs may be more plentiful. A local auto, steel, or textile workers union might design a training program to give unemployed members new industrial skills that will help them get jobs.

HOW MUCH WILL UI-AA COST

UI-AA can provide, depending on the State, up to a few thousand dollars to fund assistance for any one individual. That is a substantial amount, and should insure that the retraining or other adjustment assistance provided will be substantial—and not just another program to pay lipservice to the problem of unemployment. Even though we are talking about no small amount of money, little or no extra cost is involved. The same financing mechanism that pays for extended and other additional unemployment benefits and that determines the Federal/State share of cost will be used, becaused the UI-AA is operated through the UI program. And, because so many people are already using up all of their unemployement benefits without finding jobs, the costs will really be about the same. The same amount of money that is already being spent on extended types of UI benefits will be spent on extended benefits—and UI-AA. This legislation simply allows people to use those benefits that they would use anyway in new and creative ways.

COMPARISON WITH ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL

Earlier this year, the administration put forth a proposal to allow UI recipients to trade in their Federal supplemental compensation benefits for vouchers which employers could then use as tax credits if they hired the unemployed. There were a number of problems with this piece of legislation (H.R. 2149). Organized labor was opposed to it, and rightfully so, because it would not have prevented firms from laying off workers to hire new ones—and receive the accompanying tax credits. UI-AA specifically protects existing employees from being affected by the program in this way. Also, the administration proposal was a simple employment subsidy tied to a temporary plan to extend Federal supplemental compensation benefits. UI-AA is not. UI-AA is a permanent proposal to promote retraining and labor adjustment through the UI system for as long as any types of extended assistance are available. At current unemployment rates, that could well be a long time. So, UI-AA will be available as long as umemployment remains out of hand to put working cash in people's hands to get help, to get trained for new occupational skills, to get moved to where the jobs are located in this country.

The administration proposal contained a provision that would have allowed States to spend up to 2 percent of State UI tax receipts on retraining programs. Some States complained that they were already having trouble enough trying to fund regular UI benefits, let alone trying to take away some of that money to use for other purposes. My proposal will not assess extra burdens on the already overtaxed State UI funds. Federal and State funds that are already being spent on the various types of extended UI benefits will simply be transferred into new, constructive uses.

Currently, in the United States, there is no efficient means for shifting unemployed workers into economic sectors that are stable or can be expected to grow in the future. The results of such inaction are increasingly painful in a world that is changing everyday. We are locked into a global economy that will punish those who

do not innovate with poor economic performance, rising joblessness, and lower living standards. Most of our major trade competitors have major training and retraining programs. Among them, West Germany, Japan, France, and Sweden, are training people for new jobs, new occupations that are becoming important as restructuring takes place in their own economies. If America does not climb on the bandwagon, we will soon be left behind. As can be seen from the inroads that foreign trade is making in our economy, and particularly, the enormous displacement of workers that is occurring because of our own failure to compete, we are already being left behind.

UI-AA can provide enough assistance to help retrain people for many of the skills that are in demand right now. There is, today, a growing demand for skilled and semiskilled machine operators, computer programers, computer operators, assemblers, optical workers, and people who can maintain, repair, and service complex machinery and equipment. According to Reich:

> There are now about 1 million unfilled skilled and semiskilled jobs. America is already short an estimated 60,000 skilled machinists. * * * The average age of America's tool and diemakers is approaching 50 years; if present trends continue, within the next decade this vital reservoir of skills * * * threatens to dry up.

There are countless jobs that are now going unfilled because the unemployed lack the skills to obtain them. UI-AA can bridge that critical gap. It is an active response to the problems of unemployment. It can help get America back on its feet in the world economy. And, its time has come. Without it, we continue to slip into the lonely company of nations that have no destiny.●

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN ROSTENKOWSKI ON INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3475 TAX LAW SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, Hon. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., and I are introducing H.R. 3475, the Tax Law Simplification and Improvement Act of 1983. This legislation culminates months of effort by our congressional staff in identifying major problem areas in the law and developing proposed solutions in a collaborative process. The bill also contains a number of provisions which have been requested by the administration or suggested by others as needed improvements or simplifications to the structure of the tax law.

Mr. CONABLE and I wish to express our gratitude to those who worked on preparing this bill as well as to the staff of the Treasury Department for their assistance and to those groups such as the American Bar Association and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants that suggested areas for study, proposed solutions and deliberated with our staff to develop the product we are introducing today. We look forward to receiving additional recommendations for improving the provisions of the bill during its consideration in the months ahead.

At this point, I will generally summarize each title of the bill. A more detailed technical explanation follows which includes a description of each section.

Title I contains a major and long overdue revision of the estimated tax provisions for individuals. We believe these revisions will vastly simplify and rationalize the statutory provisions relating to estimated payments. We hope taxpayers will benefit from a more coherent and understandable set of rules in this area, given that over 8 million taxpayers now must make such payments.

Title II is the "domestic relations" title which includes revisions to the rules which govern the tax treatment of property transfers at divorce, alimony payments, and the dependency exemption for children of divorced parents as well as amendments to the so-called innocent spouse rules. The American Bar Association first urged the tax-writing committees and the Department of Treasury to address the problems with the present law provisions in the domestic relations area, particularly with regard to property transfers and alimony payments. The ABA also proposed detailed solutions to these problems, many of which are reflected in whole or in part in the proposals we are recommending.

Many of the tax-related problems experienced upon marital dissolution result from the application of differing State laws. On the question of property transfers, tax results differ depending on whether the State is a common law or community property State. Some States have enacted special statutes in an effort to overrule Federal law. Similarly, in distinguishing alimony from other types of payments, a determination of whether the payment is on account of a support obligation is made under State laws with varying results. Finally, under the present law dependency rules, the IRS is often the unwitting and unwilling party to a dispute between parents over who contributed more in support of the child.

The provisions proposed in the bill have several policy objectives but paramount is the goal of insuring comparable tax treatment to similarly situated taxpayers. Thus, the elements of present law which force a reliance on the vagaries of State and local law would be eliminated. Second, every effort is made to remove the IRS from disputes between spouses. Further, it is hoped that greater certainty is provided to the spouses, even those without expert counsel, as to the tax consequences of their decisions. In the main, we have attempted to achieve this goal by insuring that the parties will receive what they expect and not be surprised by unforeseen tax consequences. More objective rules are also used where possible. Finally, the innocent spouse rules would be liberalized and made more evenhanded by allowing relief in cases of similar inequity.

Title III of the bill represents an attempt to simplify and clarify the investment tax credit at-risk limitation added by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (ERTA). The current rule has posed significant administrative problems for the Treasury Department and taxpayers. Under the bill, the at-risk limitation would be modified so as to reduce a taxpayer's credit base by amounts of nonrecourse financing. Where nonrecourse debt provided by an unrelated commercial lender (or the Government) is not more than 80 percent of the credit basis, the at-risk limitation would not apply. Special rules are provided for basis or tax adjustments where taxpayers subsequently either increase or decrease amounts at-risk. Generally, in the case of partnerships or subchapter S corporations, nonrecourse determinations would be made at the partner or shareholder level. In the case of subchapter S corporations, however, recourse debt at the corporate level would retain its character at the shareholder level if the financing is related to property used by the corporation in an active trade or business with at least three full-time employees. The modified rule generally would apply to property placed in service after enactment. However, a taxpayer would be permitted to elect the rule as if it has been included as part of ERTA so long as all at-risk property within the ambit of ERTA is treated similarly.

Title IV contains two changes related to the estate tax provisions. One solves a longstanding difficulty related to charitable split interest transfers. As a permanent rule to replace the ad hoc extensions of time to amend the governing instruments of these trusts, the bill would permit reformation of charitable split interest instruments under certain conditions. Second, the law would be amended to better effectuate the original purpose of the alternative valuation provision of present law by permitting its use only where the basis of the estate and the estate tax liability are reduced as a result.

Title V would make several changes needed in provisions affecting foreign income and foreign taxpayers. These provisions include a much needed definition of "resident alien" to assist taxpayers and practitioners in determining when a U.S. tax liability is owed by aliens present in the United States for varying amounts of time. The ABA has been most helpful in directing our attention to this area and in assisting in the development of a proposal along with the Treasury Department. The proposal would also prevent married nonresident aliens from using the community property laws of their home country to split income for U.S. income tax purposes.

Several provisions are included to clarify and improve the foreign personal holding company rules. One change would better coordinate the foreign personal holding company rules with the controlled foreign corporation (CFC) rules of subpart F of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a CFC's income is taxed under subpart F to the extent that the subpart F income exceeds foreign personal holding company income. The bill would also clarify the attribution rules for purposes of determining ownership of a foreign personal holding company. Code section 1248 is amended to liberalize present law with regard to accumulated earnings and profits of a CFC, to prevent double counting of foreign tax credits, and to clarify rules applicable to indirect ownership of a CFC.

Finally, this title contains provisions to deal with a longstanding problem regarding so-called stapled stock. In several instances, U.S. corporations have attempted to avoid the subpart F rules and the antiboycott rules by splitting off their foreign operations and conducting them through separate corporations. In these cases, the stock of the two (or more) entities is "stapled" or "paired" so that a shareholder cannot trade the stock separately. The management of the two companies may be the same.

The bill would provide generally that where a foreign and a domestic corporation are stapled entities, the foreign corporation would be treated as domestic. In addition, stock in a domestic corporation which constitutes a stapled interest with respect to stock of another domestic corporation would be treated as owned by the latter corporation.

Title VI contains a number of minor provisions recommended by the Department of Treasury as changes that would simplify or improve their operations.

Title VII includes several noncontroversial changes requested by the Tax Court and a more substantive proposal designed to improve the representation of taxpayers involved in small cases before the court. Under the proposal, taxpayers could be represented in the Tax Court under the "small case procedure" by certified public accountants and enrolled agents authorized to practice before the IRS. However, the Tax Court would no longer be required to give a special examination to non-attorneys in order to permit such persons to practice before the Tax Court in regular cases.

Title VIII would simplify and rationalize the income tax credit provisions in the Internal Revenue Code. The credits would be grouped into logical categories and the various rules concerning limitations and carryovers would be conformed and simplified. The business credits would be combined into one credit, limited to 100 percent of the first $25,000 of tax liability and 85 percent of the remainder. A 3-year carryback and 15-year carryforward period is allowed. Substantive change would be made with respect to the present law limitation on the targeted jobs credit (which is 90 percent of tax liability), the alcohol fuels credit (which is 100 percent of tax liability but is ineligible for carrybacks), the business energy and R and D credits (which are 100 percent of tax liability) and the ESPO credit (which is 90 percent of tax liability).

Title IX repeals several obsolete provisions of the code. Specifically, code section 1251, relating to recapturing certain farm losses, and code sections 405 and 409, relating to retirement bonds, would be repealed.

REVENUE EFFECT

The technical exploration of the act follows:

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION OF THE TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1983

TITLE I. ESTIMATED TAX REVISIONS

Present Law

Under present law, individuals are required to pay estimated taxes on income that is not subject to withholding, under certain circumstances. An individual who fails to pay in full an installment of estimated tax on or before the due date could be subject to a civil penalty computed as a nondeductible interest charge under the rules of section 6621.

In general, there is no penalty for underpayment of estimated tax if the installment payments (including withholding) equal or exceed 80 percent (66⅔ percent for farmers and fishermen) of the tax due for the year. In addition, there are four exceptions to the civil penalty for failure by an individual to pay estimated tax in the proper amount. No penalty is imposed if: (1) total payments of estimated tax (withholding plus estimated tax payments) equal or exceed the amount shown as tax on the preceeding year's return, if a return showing liability for tax was filed for the preceding year and such preceding year was a taxable year of 12 months; (2) total estimated tax payments generally equal or exceed 80 percent (or, in certain cases 66⅔ percent) of the tax which would be due if the income already received during the current year were placed on an annualized basis; (3) total tax payments equal or exceed 90 percent of the tax which would be due on the income actually received from the beginning of the year to the end of the month before the month in which the installment was due, as if such months constituted the taxable year; or (4) total tax payments equal or exceed the tax based on the facts shown on the return for, and the law applicable to, the prior year's return, but computed under the current year's tax rates and exemptions.

Further, additional exceptions have been added in recent years. In TEFRA of 1982, an exception from the penalty was added for those who had no tax liability in the preceding year (if the individual was a U.S. citizen or resident for the year). In ERTA of 1981, an exception was provided where the tax due, after credits, is less than a minimal amount (e.g., $200 in 1982, $300 in 1983, $400 in 1984, and $500 in 1985 and thereafter).

In TEFRA, the requirement for a declaration of estimated tax was eliminated and a provision was added to clarify that installment payments of estimated tax are only required when the penalties would apply (that is, if payments don't equal or exceed 80 percent of the tax due for the current year).

Explanation of Provision

In general, estimated taxes for individuals would be simplified, clarified, and consolidated, as would the penalty for failure to make adequate installment payments of estimated tax. The law would be further clarified to establish that the amount of required payments is the lesser of 80 percent of the tax due as shown on the current year's return or 100 percent of last year's tax. An exception would be provided where the taxpayer can show that the installment payments made over the year were adequate for each quarter based on an annualized income concept (e.g., the income for quarter(s) to date, annualized for year). In determining the installment payments required based on the prior year's return, math errors and amended returns made before the due date for an installment would be taken into account.

The other present law exceptions would not be retained except the general exception, based on having a small amount of tax due not covered by withholding or where there was no tax liability at all in the preceding year. (Those eliminated would be: 1) last year's income at this year's tax rates and 2) assuming period to date is full taxable year, 90 percent of the tax is paid.) However, the Secretary of the Treasury would be permitted for the first time to waive the penalty for reasonable cause. It is intended that such waivers be granted only in extraordinary circumstances, such as destruction by fire or other casualty of the taxpayer's records and, in some cases, the death or serious illness of the taxpayer.

The installment due date for the second payment would be changed from June 15 to July 15 so that the payments would be quarterly except for the September 15 installment (4/15, 7/15, 9/15, 1/15).

Finally, the periods of underpayment for calculation of the penalty would be clarified and the penalty would be imposed only on the amount of underpayment.

TITLE II. DOMESTIC RELATIONS

A. Property settlements

Present Law

Under present law, the Supreme Court has ruled that a transfer of appreciated property to a spouse (or former spouse) in exchange for the release of martial claims results in the recognition of gain to the

transferor (*United States* v. *Davis* (370 U.S. 65 (1962)). The spouse receiving the property receives a basis in the asset transferred equal to its fair market value. These rules do not apply in the case of the equal division of community property, and the IRS has ruled that this rule does not apply to the partition of jointly held property. The tax treatment of divisions of property between spouses involving other various types of ownership under the different State laws is often unclear and has resulted in much litigation.

Explanation of Provision

The bill provides that the transfer of property to a spouse incident to a divorce would be treated, for income tax purposes, in the same manner as a gift. Thus, gain or loss would not be recognized to the transferor, and the transferee will receive the property at the transferor's basis. This rule would apply whether the transfer is for the relinquishment of marital rights, for cash or other property, for the assumption of liabilities or for other consideration. This rule will also apply in the case of transfers of property between spouses during marriage.

A transfer will be treated as incident to a divorce if the transfer occurs within one year after the parties cease to be married or is related to the divorce.

Where an annuity is transferred, or a beneficial interest in a trust is transferred or created, incident to divorce or separation, the transferee would be entitled to the usual annuity treatment, including recovery of the transferor's investment in the contract (under section 72), or the usual treatment as the beneficiary of a trust (by reason of section 682), notwithstanding that the annuity payments or payments by the trust qualify as alimony or otherwise discharge a support obligation. The transfer of a life insurance contract to a spouse incident to a divorce or separation generally would no longer result in the proceeds of the policy later being includible in income, since the policy would have a carryover basis and therefore the transfer for value rules (section 101(a)(2)) would not apply.

The bill would apply to transfers after the date the bill is enacted. However, it will not apply to transfers pursuant to instruments in effect before such date unless the parties elect to have these provisions apply.

B. Alimony

Present Law

Under present law, payments of alimony pursuant to a decree of divorce or separate maintenance, a written separation agreement or decree for support or maintenance are deductible by the payor and includible in the income of the recipient. The amount is deductible in computing adjusted gross income and thus is allowable whether or not the payor itemizes his or her deductions.

In order to be treated as alimony, a payment must meet several requirements. The payments must be in discharge of a legal obligation imposed upon or incurred by a spouse because of a family or marital relationship. It must be imposed under the decree of divorce or separate maintenance or under a written instrument incidnet to the divorce or separation, made under a written separation agreement, or required under a decree of support or maintenance.

Also, a payment must "periodic." A payment will not qualify as "periodic" if it discharges a principal sum, unless the sum may be paid over a period exceeding 10 years from the date of the divorce or separation decree, instrument or agreement. Then the annual amount treated as alimony cannot exceed 10 percent of the principal sum.

Payments which are fixed by the decree or agreement as child support are not treated as alimony and therefore are not deductible by the payor or includible in income of the recipient.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would amend the definition of alimony. The requirement that the payment must be made on account of a marital obligation imposed under local law would be repealed and the present law requirement that the payment be "periodic" would not be retained.

Under the bill, an alimony payment must meet several requirements. The payment must be made in cash and received by the payor's spouse (or former spouse). A payment may qualify as alimony if there is constructive receipt where a payment made to a third party is for the benefit of the spouse. The payment must be made under a decreee of divorce or separate maintenance or under a written instrument incident to the divorce, a written separation agreement, or a decree requiring support or maintenance payments. The parties could not be members of the same household at the time the payment is made. However, this provision is not intended to deny alimony treatment for any payment made shortly before the payor departs from payee spouse's household.

A payment would qualify as alimony only if the payor (or any person making a payment on behalf of the payor) has no liability to make any payment for any period following the death of the payee spouse. A provision for a substitute payment, such as an additional amount to be paid as child support after the death of the payee spouse, would prevent a corresponding amount of payments to the payee spouse from qualifying as alimony. Amounts payable under a life insurance contract on the life of the payee spouse would not be treated as a liability which would affect the status of other payments made by the payor spouse.

In order to prevent a one-time lump-sum payment (or similar payment) from being disguised as alimony, the bill would require, except in the case of a decree for support or maintenance, deductible payments to be one of a series of payments where it is reasonable to expect that at least one-half of the alimony payments will be made more than one year after the first payment is made.

Finally, no payment would qualify as alimony if the payment is for property transferred from the payee spouse. It is not intended that this rule would apply to the extent the payments are for the relinquishment of the payee spouse's martial rights or support rights under local law. In applying this rule, the fact that the payee spouse has otherwise made a net transfer of assets to the payor spouse would indicate that payments are for the transfer of property.

By clearly designating in a written agreement, the parties could provide that otherwise qualifying payments would not be treated as alimony for Federal income tax purposes.

A provision would be added to provide that the Internal Revenue Service may require the payor spouse to furnish on his or her tax return the name and social security number of the payee spouse, and that the payee must furnish that number to the payor. A $50 penalty could be assessed against any party for failure to comply with the applicable requirement.

These provisions would generally apply to divorce or support decrees and agreements executed after 1983. The provision would also apply with respect to the modification of a prior instrument where the modified instrument expressly so provides.

C. Estate and gift tax treatment of transfers of property in exchange for marital rights

Present Law

Under present law, transfers of property (other than certain terminable interests) between spouses are not subject to gift or estate taxes.

With several exceptions, transfers of property in satisfaction of marital or property rights to a former spouse are taxable gifts. A transfer of property between former spouses is not subject to gift tax if the transfer is pursuant to a written agreement entered into not more than two years prior to divorce and is in settlement of marital or property rights or to provide a reasonable allowance for the support of minor children (section 2516). In addition, property transfers ordered by a divorce court having the power to order the disposition of the property are not taxable gifts. Finally, the transfer of property in discharge of a former spouse's right to support is not a taxable gift.

For estate tax purposes, a claim of a former spouse based on the release of marital or property rights is not deductible in computing the taxable estate unless the claim is based on a court decree where the court had the power to determine the marital or property rights of the spouse. Also, a claim based on the release of support rights may be deductible.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would allow an estate tax deduction for claims arising under a written agreement in settlement of marital or property rights where the agreement would have qualified transfers as non-taxable for gift tax purposes (under section 2516). Thus, where the transferor dies prior to completing the transfers under the written agreement, no estate tax will be imposed with respect to the property transferred by the estate. This provision would apply in the case of decedents dying after the date of enactment of the bill.

D. Dependency exemption

Present Law

In the case of a child of divorced parents, present law contains both a general and a special rule with regard to claiming the dependency exemption. In general, the child is to be treated as the dependent of the parent having custody for the greater portion of the year. However, the other parent (*e.g.*, the "non-custodial" parent) may claim the exemption under the special rule if (i) the decree or agreement provides the exemption to the non-custodial parent and such parent provides at least $600 for support of the child or, in the alternative, (ii) the non-custodial parent provides $1,200 or more for support and the custodial parent cannot establish having provided more support.

These rules have been the source of many disputes between parents with regard to the amounts paid by the respective parties for support, disputes to which IRS has been an unhappy party. In a recent GAO survey, the support test for children of divorced parents was cited as one of eight major tax law issues causing complexity for taxpayers and the IRS. These disputes also form a major share of the Tax Court caseload involving domestic relations issues.

Explanation of Provision

The present law provisions would be substantially simplified and disputes with the IRS reduced by providing that the dependency exemption for the child of divorced or legally separated parents (or parents who live apart for the last six months of the year) shall be allocated to the custodial parent unless the custodial parent signs a written declaration that such parent will not claim the child as a dependent for the year. This statement must be attached to the tax return of the non-custodial parent claiming the exemption. Further, in these same situations, either parent would be allowed to include, for purposes of the medical deduction, medical expenses paid for the child by the parent (whether or not the child is technically a dependent of the taxpayer's).

Conforming and simplifying amendments would be made to Code sections 143(b) (married individuals living apart), 2(b) (head of household), 43(c) (earned income credit), and 44A (child care credit). In addition, two of these sections would be amended to provide rules that are consistent within these sections. Section 143 is amended to conform to the present rule in section 44A to the effect that one spouse must be absent from the household for the last six months of the year, rather than the entire year, for the couple to be considered unmarried. Section 2(b), conferring head of household status, would be amended to conform to the present rule in section 143 and section 44A that the household must be maintained as the principal place of abode for the child for more than one-half of the year, rather than for the entire year.

The provisions would generally apply to payments made in taxable years beginning after 1983. However, if the parents have entered into a qualified agreement prior to January 1, 1984, under which the noncustodial parent was allocated the exemption and such parent provides at least $600 for the child's support during the year, then the noncustodial parent may continue to claim the exemption.

E. Innocent spouse

Present Law

Under limited circumstances, a spouse may be relieved of liability for certain amounts of tax (including interest, penalties, and other amounts) due on a joint return. The circumstances are where gross income was omitted which is attributable to one spouse and which is in excess of 25 percent of the amount of gross income stated in the return. The other spouse must establish that he or she had no reason to know and did not know of the omission. Finally, taking into account whether the other spouse significantly benefitted from the items omitted and all other facts and circumstances, it is inequitable to hold the other spouse liable for the liability attributable to the omitted items. In determining to whom items of gross income are attributable, community property laws are disregarded.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would expand the present law innocent spouse provisions in order to relieve such spouses of income tax liability in more situations where such relief is warranted. For example, relief would be extended to all substantial understatements of tax due to the erroneous items of one spouse. Substantial understatement means one which exceeds 10 percent of the tax due or $500, whichever is less. Erroneous items include claims of deductions or credits for which there is no basis, as well as omissions from gross income. The significant benefit test of current law would be eliminated because of the difficulty of applying it in deductions and credit situations.

Similar relief would be afforded with respect to items of community property income where a spouse had no reason to know of such income.

The amendments would apply to all open tax years.

TITLE III. AT-RISK REVISIONS

Present Law

Under present law, the allowance of investment credits is subject to an at-risk limitation. The limitation applies to the same business activities and the same category of taxpayers that are subject to the loss limitation rules of section 465. The investment credit is not allowed for amounts invested in qualifying property to the extent the invested amounts are not at-risk, within the meaning of section 465(b). Accordingly, amounts generally are not considered at-risk if (1) the taxpayer is protected against the loss of the invested amount, (2) the amount was borrowed and the taxpayer is not personally liable for repayment of the debt, (3) the lender has an interest other than as a creditor in the business activity in which the property is used, or (4) the lender is a related party to the taxpayer. Amounts at-risk for qualifying property are only those amounts considered at-risk under section 46(c)(8)(B) that are directly attributable to investment in the property.

Present law contains two exceptions applicable where, under the general rule, amounts would be considered not at-risk. The exceptions apply with respect to property financed by certain third-party lenders and certain energy property. These two exceptions apply only to amounts otherwise considered not at-risk.

Under the first exception, amounts borrowed with respect to section 38 property (other than convertible debt) no later than the taxable year the property is placed in service generally will be considered at-risk if the taxpayer at all times has a minimum 20-percent at-risk investment in the property (determined without regard to the exception) and the amount borrowed is owed to either a qualified lender or a Federal, State, or local government.

Qualified lenders include banks, savings and loan institutions, credit unions, insurance companies, qualified pension trusts, and other persons actively and regularly engaged in the business of lending money. The lender must not be related to the taxpayer. In addition, the qualified lender may not be either a person who receives a fee with respect to the taxpayer's investment in the qualifying property (*e.g.*, a promoter) or a person related to such person, nor may the qualified lender be the person who sells the qualifying property to the taxpayer or a person related to such person.

Present law also contains a safe harbor rule for loans related to qualified energy property. This special safe harbor rule applies only to solar or wind energy property, recycling equipment, qualified hydroelectric generating property, biomass property, equipment for converting alternate substances into alcohol fuels, geothermal equipment, and ocean thermal energy equipment. In order to qualify under this safe harbor, the taxpayer must have a minimum of 25-percent at-risk investment in the property as determined under the general rule. In addition, any nonrecourse financing for the property (other than financing by a qualified lender that is considered at risk) must be a level payment loan. A level payment loan is a loan repaid in substantially equal installments. The installments must include both principal and interest and the principal portion must increase commensurate with the decrease in the interest portion.

In the case of a partnership, the investment credit at-risk rules do not apply to the partnership, but apply to each partner to whom the loss limitation rules of section 465 apply. Thus, the calculation of amounts at-risk is made by each partner to whom the at-risk rules apply. Property placed in service by a partnership is considered to have been placed in service by the partners. Determinations of whether the taxpayer has acquired property or borrowed money from a related person are made with respect to each partner. As a result of changes made by the Subchapter S Revision Act of 1982, similar rules apply in the case of an S corporation and its shareholders.

The investment credit recapture rules generally govern recapture upon the disposition (or cessation as qualifying property) of section 38 property. A special recaputure rule applies to dispositions of property that are subject to the special rules for certain energy property.

The at-risk limitation on the investment credit does not apply to property placed in service before February 19, 1981, or property placed in service on or after such date if the property was acquired by the taxpayer under a binding contract entered into before February 19, 1981.

Explanation of Provision

The provision would revise the at-risk limitation on the investment credit in Code section 46(c)(8). The revised limitation would reduce the credit base (or cost, in case of used property) of section 38 property by the nonqualified nonrecourse financing with respect to that property. The provision would apply with respect to property placed in service during the taxable year and use inactively subject to loss limitation under section 465.

Nonqualified nonrecourse financing would include any nonrecourse financing which is not qualified commercial financing. The provision would define qualified commercial financing as any financing with respect to property if (i) such property is acquired from an unrelated person, (ii) the amount of nonrecourse financing does not exceed 80 percent of the property's credit basis, and (iii) such financing is borrowed from a qualified person or represents a governmental loan. Qualified commerical financing would not include convertible debt. Further, a qualified person would mean any person actively and regularly engaged in the business of lending money and who is not related to the taxpayer, not a person from whom the taxpayer acquired the property, and not a person who receives a fee with respect to the taxpayer's investment in the property (e.g., a promoter).

The provision defines related person as defined in Code section 168(e)(4), which generally follows the section 267(b) and 707(b)(1) related party rules but substitutes a 10-percent threshold for the 50-percent common ownership or capital interest thresholds respectively.

The provision would include a general rule providing that in the case of partnerships or Subchapter S corporations, the determination of whether a partner's or shareholder's

allocable share of any financing is nonqualified nonrecourse financing shall be made at the partner or shareholder level. The determination of any partner's or shareholder's allocable share would be made in the same manner as the credit allowable by section 38. A special rule, however, would be provided for certain recourse financing of S corporations.

Under the special rule, an S corporation shareholder would be treated as liable for his allocable financing share if the financing is recourse at the corporate level and is provided with respect to qualified business property. For the purposes of this special rule, qualified business property means property used by the S corporation in an active trade or business which during the entire taxable year has at least 3 full-time employees substantially all of whose services are directly related to the corporation's business. Specifically excluded from the qualified property definition for the special rule would be master sound recordings or other tangible or intangible assets associated with literary, artistic or musical properties.

The provision would include rules for the treatment of subsequent increases and decreases in nonqualified nonrecourse financing. Generally, the provision would treat a decrease in nonqualified nonrecourse financing as additional qualified investment. Any such increase in a taxpayer's qualified investment would be deemed to be additional qualified investment made by the taxpayer in the year in which the property was placed in service. Any credit allowable as a result of an increase in qualified investment would be treated under the provision as earned during the taxable year of the causative decrease in nonrecourse financing. Similarly, for net increases in nonqualified nonrecourse financing, the tax with respect to the taxable year shall be increased by an amount equal to the decrease in credits allowed under section 38.

The provision would also include a number of technical conforming amendments to the special qualified energy property rules in section 46(c)(8)(F) and elsewhere.

The modification resulting from the provision generally would apply to property placed in service after the date of enactment in taxable years ending after such date. At the election of the taxpayer, the amendments made by the provision would apply as if included in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (ERTA). Any such election would apply to all property of the taxpayer to which the ERTA rules applied.

TITLE IV. ESTATE AND GIFT TAX PROVISIONS

A. Charitable split-interest transfers

Present Law

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 imposed new requirements that must be met in order for a charitable deduction to be allowed for income, gift, and estate tax purposes for the transfer of a split interest to charity (i.e., part charitable and part noncharitable). In the case of a remainder interest in trust, the interest passing to charity must be in either a charitable remainder annuity trust, a charitable remainder unitrust, or a pooled income fund. In the case of an "income" interest passing to charity (i.e., a charitable lead trust), the "income" interest must either be a guaranteed annuity or a fixed percentage of the fair market value of the trust (determined at least annually).

Certain exceptions to these new rules were provided in the case of wills executed, or property transferred in trust, on or before October 9, 1969, in order to allow a reasonable period of time to take the new rules into account. However, many persons created instruments which did not comply with these new requirements. As a result, Congress provided a limited rule, which was extended several times, that the governing instruments of charitable split-interest trusts could be amended to meet the new rules. The latest extension provided that instruments of both charitable lead trusts of charitable remainder trusts which were executed before December 31, 1979, could be amended or judicial proceedings to amend begun through December 31, 1981, in order to conform such instruments to the 1969 Act requirements for a charitable deduction to be allowed for income, gift, or estate tax purposes.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would provide a permanent rule permitting reformation of charitable split interest instruments which do not meet the statutory requirments in cases where the instrument evidences an intent to comply with the 1969 Act rules but fails for technical reasons. In addition, the bill would require that the actuarial values and durations of the charitable and noncharitable interests in the trust generally remain the same before and after the reformation. The bill would treat the premature death of an income beneficiary of a charitable remainder trust as the equivalent of reformation. The bill also would permit the period of limitations to be re-opened until December 31, 1985, to allow tax benefits to accrue for otherwise closed estates and provides an effective date which conforms to all of the prior provisions under the law which expired in 1981.

B. ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE ELECTION

Present Law

Under present law, the value of property included in the decendent's gross estate for Federal estate tax purposes generally is determined on the date of the decedent's death. However, the executor may elect to have values determined as of the alternative valuation date, which generally is the date six months after the date of the decendent's death. The alternate valuation date election was intended to lessen the impact of the estate tax when property values decline shortly after the decedent's death.

An heir's income tax basis in inherited property generally is equal to the estate tax value of the property. Under this rule, it is possible to increase the income tax basis of inherited property by electing alternate valuation in the typical case where the value of property has increased since the date of death. Moreover, this increased basis can be achieved under present law even where there are no additional estate taxes from electing alternate valuation. The opportunities to increase income tax basis by electing alternate valuation without adverse estate tax consequences are expanded by the increase in the unified credit and enactment of the unlimited marital deduction in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, since those changes increase the number of estates that have little or no estate tax liability regardless of whether they elect alternate valuation.

Under present law, the alternate valuation date election can be exercised by the executor only if the estate tax return is filed within the time prescribed by law (including extensions which are granted).

Explanation of Provision

Because use of the election for income tax planning purposes clearly is not the purpose of the alternate valuation provision, the bill would permit an alternate valuation election only where the basis of the gross estate and the estate tax liability of the electing estate are both reduced. The bill also allows the executor to elect alternate valuation on a late filed return (as well as a timely-filed return) as long as the late return is the first estate tax return. The bill would apply to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of the bill.

TITLE V. FOREIGN PROVISIONS

A. Definition of a resident alien

Present Law

Resident aliens are subject to U.S. tax on their worldwide income at the regular graduated rates. Nonresident aliens are subject to U.S. tax only to the extent their income is from U.S. sources or is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States. Certain passive U.S. source income of nonresident aliens is subject to tax at a flat 30 percent rate (unless the rate is reduced by treaty).

The Internal Revenue Code does not define the terms resident alien or nonresident alien. Treasury regulations define the term on the basis of the alien's intentions with regard to the length and nature of his stay in the United States. This rule is easy to manipulate and difficult to enforce.

In certain cases, individuals who earn U.S. source income may seek to minimize their U.S. tax liability by claiming that they are taxable on a fiscal year basis rather than a calendar year basis and thus allocating their U.S. income to more than one fiscal year if such an allocation is beneficial (e.g., they have income for only a part of each fiscal year).

Explanation of Provision

The bill would provide a definition of resident aliens for U.S. tax purposes. Aliens who do not meet this definition would be nonresident aliens. For income tax purposes, an individual would be considered a resident if the individual:

1. Is a lawful permanent resident of the United States at any time during the calendar year (the "green card test"),

2. Has an application for an immigrant visa pending at any time during the year and is physically present in the United States during at least 60 days, or

3. Is present in the United States for a substantial period to time—at least 183 days during a 3-year period weighted toward the present year (the "substantial presence test").[1]

If an individual were present in the United States for fewer than 183 days during the year and if the individual established that he had a closer connection with a foreign country than with the United States and had a tax home in that country for the year, the individual would not be subject to tax as a U.S. resident despite the substantial presence test. If an individual were present in the United States for 183 days or more, this "closer connections/tax home" exception would not apply.

[1]This substantial presence test would compare 183 days to the sum of (1) the days present during the current year, (2) two-thirds times the days present during the preceding year, and (3) one-third times the days present during the second preceding year.

In addition, certain individuals (e.g., diplomats, teachers, trainees, students) that meet the substantial presence test would be considered nonresident aliens unless the facts and circumstances indicate that they intend to reside permanently in the United States. Teachers and trainees generally could be exempt from the substantial presence test for only two of any six years, and students generally for only five years.

The bill would explicitly authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to require aliens who claim exemption from the substantial presence test to file statements explaining the basis for their exemption.

The bill would define presence during a day to be presence at any time during the day, but would exempt commuters from Canada and Mexico from this rule.

A taxpayer who has not established a taxable year for any period prior to the time he becomes taxable in the United States would be taxed on a calendar year basis. A taxpayer who establishes a fiscal year would determine residence on a calendar year basis, and he would be subject to tax as a resident for any portion of his fiscal year within a calendar year of residence.

These provisions would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1983.

B. Treatment of community property income of nonresident aliens

Present law

Under a progressive income tax such as that of the United States, less tax is imposed on lower incomes. Therefore, when married taxpayers split their income, they reduce their combined tax liability. Under Code section 879(a), if one member of a married couple is a U.S. citizen or resident while the other member is a nonresident alien, the couple may not generally reduce U.S. tax by use of community property laws to split their income. However, if both members of the couple are nonresident aliens from a community property country, they may be able to split the U.S. earned income of one spouse in order to reduce their U.S. tax liability. A comparable couple from a common law country could not split income in this manner.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would provide that a married couple both of whom are nonresident alien individuals may not use community property laws to split the U.S. earned income of one spouse for computing U.S. tax liability. The rules of Code section 879(a) are extended to such couples.

This provision would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1983.

C. Coordination of subpart F with foreign personal holding company provisions

Present Law

Congress enacted the foreign personal holding company rules in 1937 to prevent U.S. taxpayers from accumulating investment income tax-free in foreign "incorporated pocketbooks." In 1962, Congress imposed tax on the U.S. shareholders of incorporated tax haven companies by adding the Subpart F rules to the Internal Revenue Code. The Subpart F rules, as amended, impose tax on related party sales and services transactions through tax haven base companies, on insurance of U.S. risks, on investment of foreign earnings in U.S. property, on certain foreign oil-related income, and on certain passive income taxable under the 1937 rules as amended. In cases where there is overlap between the foreign personal holding company rules and the Subpart F rules, the foreign personal holding company rules take priority. That is, a taxpayer who generates any income that is taxable under the foreign personal holding company rules may avoid the Subpart F anti-tax haven rules that year under certain court decisions.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would repeal the rule that taxation under the foreign personal holding company rules precludes taxation under the Subpart F rules. The bill would provide that a controlled foreign corporation's income is taxed under Subpart F to the extent that it would be taxable under both Subpart F and the foreign personal holding company rules. In addition, the existence of foreign personal holding income would not preclude taxation of Subpart F income to the extent the Subpart F income is greater.

This provision would apply to taxable years of U.S. shareholders beginning after the date of enactment.

D. Foreign personal holding company attribution rules

Present Law

If five or fewer U.S. citizens or residents own at least half of the stock of a foreign corporation that has primarily passive income, that corporation will be a foreign personal holding company. In that case, the foreign corporation's shareholders who are U.S. citizens and residents must pay tax on the corporation's earnings.

The foreign personal holding company rules treat an individual as owning stock that is actually owned by certain other persons, such as family members. These rules apply even when the family members from whom the ownership is attributed are nonresident aliens. In addition, interposition of a foreign partnership holding company arguably allows avoidance of the foreign personal holding company rules.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would repeal the rules that attribute ownership of stock actually owned by a nonresident alien to the alien's U.S. blood relatives. In addition, the bill would prevent taxpayers from interposing foreign partnerships or other foreign entities between themselves and the foreign corporation to avoid the foreign personal holding company rules.

The provisions would apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 1983.

E. Ordinary income treatment on disposition of stock of certain foreign corporations (section 1248)

Present Law

When a U.S. person sells or exchanges stock of a controlled foreign corporation, some of his gain may be taxed as ordinary income, not as a capital gain (Code section 1248). The purpose of this rule is to deny capital gain treatment to income accumulated in foreign corporate solution. The gain is ordinary (dividend) income rather than capital gain only to the extent of earnings and profits (E&P) that were accumulated while the shareholder held the share and that were not previously taxed by the United States.

(i) Double counting.—When a U.S. person sells his interest in a controlled foreign corporation and recognizes dividend income on account of accumulated E&P, the E&P of the controlled foreign corporation does not lose its "taint" in the hands of the new owner. If the new owner receives a distribution from the controlled foreign corporation, the new owner is subject to tax at ordinary income rates on account of the E&P accumulated while the first owner owned the stock. In addition, the new owner may claim foreign tax credits for taxes imposed on the controlled foreign corporation that the first owner has already credited. This double credit could reduce U.S. tax on other foreign income of both owners of the controlled foreign corporation.

(ii) Indirect ownership.—Taxpayers may take the position that they can avoid ordinary income treatment on E&P of a controlled foreign corporation by a series of transactions between related parties. The first step in this series is the contribution of the stock in the corporation to the capital of a second controlled foreign corporation. The second step is the sale or exchange of the stock of the second corporation (which now owns the first corporation). Taxpayers may contend that the E&P of the first foreign corporation accumulated before the contribution of its stock to the second corporation is not subject to ordinary income treatment. The reason for this possible contention is a rule in the Code that may superficially indicate that E&P accumulated during direct ownership does not count when a U.S. person disposes of an interest held directly (as a second-tier subsidiary).

Explanation of Provisions

The two provisions described below would each apply to sales or exchanges of stock of controlled foreign corporations that occur after the date of enactment.

(i) Double counting.—The bill would provide that to the extent that accumulated E&P has previously characterized income as ordinary income, that same E&P would not again characterize income as ordinary income. In addition, foreign taxes of a controlled foreign corporation that one U.S. taxpayer has credited would not again be creditable.

(ii) Indirect ownership.—The bill would clarify current law to provide that E&P accumulated by a foreign corporation accumulated while controlled by U.S. owners is subject to ordinary income treatment whether its U.S. owners controlled it directly or indirectly.

F. Stapled stock

Present Law

Taxpayers have devised schemes for tax avoidance wherein the stock of two (or more) entities is "stapled" or "paired" so that a shareholder cannot trade the stock separately. Often, however, the management of the two entities is the same.

Foreign corporations whose shares are sufficiently dispersed among U.S. persons are not subject to the U.S. rules that (1) subject tax-haven type activities to tax or (2) discourage compliance with international boycotts. Widely held U.S. corporations have attempted to avoid these rules by splitting off their foreign operations and conducting them through separate corporations. The stock of the foreign and domestic corporations is stapled together.

In addition, stapling of stock of two or more domestic corporations could allow shareholders to benefit from multiple surtax exemptions and from multiple accumulated earnings tax credits. In addition, companies may split off certain investments into a separate company that will qualify for special tax treatment, such as Real Estate Investment Trust (REIT) or Regulated Investment Company (RIC) benefits.

This special treatment would not be available if the companies were consolidated.

In these examples, and potentially in any case where tax benefits among related parties are limited or where tax penalities may be imposed on related parties, companies might use stapled stock to appear to be unrelated.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would provide generally that where a foreign and a domestic corporation are stapled entities, the foreign corporation would be treated as domestic. The bill also would provide rules governing stapled stock of two or more domestic corporations. In determining controlled corporation status or stock ownership, stock in a corporation which constitutes a stapled interest with respect to stock of another corporation will be treated as owned by the latter corporation. All stapled entities would be treated as one in determining whether any one is a REIT or RIC. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury could prescribe regulations to prevent avoidance or evasion of Federal income tax through the use of stapled entities.

The bill would apply to entities 50 percent or more of the beneficial ownership of which could be transferred only in tandem with interests in another entity. This provision would take effect on the date of enactment of the bill. However, for interests stapled before the date of introduction, the amendment would not apply until January 1, 1985.

TITLE VI. MISCELLANEOUS TREASURY ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

A. Simplification of reporting requirements

Present Law

Under present law, the Department of the Treasury is required to report to the Congress regarding specific statutory provisions on an annual or other periodic basis. These reports include four tax policy reports in the international tax area. Treasury is required by statute to submit annual reports on both the Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC) and international boycott provisions. The Committee reports on the Tax Reform Act of 1976 also required an annual report on possessions corporations. An annual reporting requirement regarding provisions affecting Americans working abroad was amended by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 to place it on a four-year cycle.

Also, the Tax Reform Act of 1976 required the Department of the Treasury to publish annually information on the amount of tax paid by individual taxpayers with total incomes of $200,000 or more. The report presently includes tables using the following four income measurements: expanded income, adjusted gross income (AGI), AGI plus tax preference items (which are exclusions from gross income or deductions in arriving at AGI), and AGI less investment interest and expense (to the extent that it does not exceed investment income).

Preparation of these reports is time consuming and expensive. Summary data on these topics can be included in Statistics of Income (SOI) publications on a regular basis, enabling Congress and other groups to monitor these Code provisions and making frequent specific reports less necessary. The Treasury Department has expressed a commitment to insuring that all SOI studies, and in particular those in the international area, are completed in a timely fashion and are relevant for tax policy analyses.

Explanation of Provision

Several of the statutory reporting requirements would be simplified. The reports on DISC and Possessions Corporations would be placed on two-year cycles and the International Boycott report would be required for every four-year period. The high income taxpayer report would be simplified by reducing the number of income concepts to two, AGI and expanded income.

B. Removal of limitation on working capital fund

Present Law

Under present law, the Department of Treasury's Working Capital Fund is limited to $1 million. This Fund now provides for the financing of centralized, Departmentwide services such as printing procurement and reproduction, telephone, and teletype functions. The cost of inventories and equipment and other assets has increased significantly since the Fund was established in 1970, although the ceiling has not changed. Also, this arbitrary dollar limitation forces the Department to make business judgments in terms of the capital ceiling rather than what is most cost beneficial for the Department.

Explanation of Provision

The $1 million limitation on this Fund would be removed.

C. Increase in limitation on real property redemption revolving fund

Present Law

Under Internal Revenue Code section 7810, the revolving fund for the redemption of real property is limited to $1 million. This fund is used by the I.R.S. in exercising redemption rights upon sale of property on which the I.R.S. has a lien.

Redemption rights are exercised when the Service concludes that the sale price of such property is significantly below fair market value and that the sale price does not provide sufficient receipts to cover the government's lien, typically because other liens have greater priority. The I.R.S. undertakes to resell such property at a profit sufficient to cover the delinquent taxes, interest, and penalties of the taxpayer-lienor. Any excess profit is then available to the taxpayer and other creditors. In each instance, the Service attempts to obtain a 25-percent cash deposit from a prospective purchaser prior to making the redemption. Usually the redemption must occur within 120 days of the foreclosure sale.

This action can only be taken if there is a sufficient amount in the section 7810 revolving fund. The Fund is repaid upon subsequent sale of the property. The $1 million figure was set in 1966. Increases in the number of taxpayer delinquences, escalating real property values, and a greater frequency in foreclosures have repeatedly combined to temporarily drain the revolving fund. In addition, on several occasions the Service has been constrained to pass up redemptions requiring funds in excess of $1 million usually at the ultimate expense of the Treasury.

Explanation of Provision

The limitation on the real property redemption revolving fund would be increased to $10 million.

D. Secretary of Treasury's acceptance of gifts and bequests

Present Law

At present, the Department of the Treasury has authority to accept voluntary services in connection with the sale of public debt obligations (31 U.S.C. 77a). Also the Department has joint authority with the General Services Administration to accept gifts for the purpose of reducing the national debt (31 U.S.C. 901) and for defense purposes (50 U.S.C. 1151). However, the Secretary of the Treasury does not have general authority to accept gifts and bequests on a departmentwide basis to carry out departmental functions. The Comptroller General has ruled that agencies may not accept gifts and bequests for assisting them in carrying out governmental functions in the absence of specific authorization (36 Comp. Gen. 268). At present, there are numerous statutes authorizing various agencies to accept gifts in connection with their operations, e.g., the Department of Commerce (15 U.S.C. 1522), the Department of Transportation (49 U.S.C. 1657(m)), and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (42 U.S.C. 3535(k)). In addition, departmentwide gift authority is possessed by the Departments of Agriculture and State and numerous other agencies for the conduct of agency activities.

Explanation of Provision

The Secretary would be authorized to accept gifts and bequests of property for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department of Treasury. Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from sales of other property so received would be deposited in a separate fund of the Treasury to be disbursed upon the Secretary's order.

E. Repeal of stamp requirements

Present Law

Section 5205 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for the use of strip stamps, which are the paper strips placed over the neck and cap of distilled spirits containers. The stamps are printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing at a current cost of $1.6 million annually. The stamps are distributed to distillers and bottlers at no charge. Although section 5205 authorizes the use of alternate closure devices, Government-supplied stamps are the closure devices most frequently used.

For many years, strip stamps were numbered and generally controlled by Federal employees physically located at the distillers premises. The stamps were applied to containers after the Federal employees were satisfied that the spirits had been bottled in conformance with Federal laws and had determined the appropriate tax. However, the Distilled Spirits Tax Revision Act of 1979 (26 U.S.C. 5001 et. seq.), enacted in part to simplify and modernize the distilled spirits tax system, significantly changed the Federal regulation and taxation of distilled spirits. The act eliminated the need for the physical presence of Federal employees at distilled spirits plants to control certain operations, including the determination of taxes on distilled spirits before bottling. Consequently, strip stamps are now provided to distillers and placed on distilled spirits containers generally before the tax has been determined or paid.

In short, the strip stamp no longer signifies that the tax on the spirits has been paid or that the spirits have been lawfully bottled. The only practical purpose strip stamps now serve is to provide consumers some assurance that the bottled contents have not been tampered with. Such assurance can be provided equally well by alternative sealing devices provided by the distiller.

Explanation of Provision

The stamp requirements for distilled spirits would be repealed.

F. Extension of period for court review of jeopardy assessment

Present Law

Internal Revenue Code section 7429 provides for a court review of the reasonableness and propriety of the Government's action in making a jeopardy assessment. The Court is required to decide the matter within 20 days. However, section 7429 contains no provision to insure that the Government has been served with notice that the action has commenced. As a result, in some instances, the Government has not been served with the taxpayer's pleadings until shortly before the 20 days is about to expire and has not had time to adequately prepare its case.

Explanation of Provision

Code section 7429 would be amended to provide that if the Court determines that proper service was not made on the Secretary, the 20-day period for court determination would not begin to run until proper service is made on the Secretary.

TITLE VII. TAX COURT PROVISIONS

A. Representation

Present Law

Under present law, taxpayers using the "small case" procedure can appear pro se or be represented by an attorney. These are cases involving $5,000 or less, where more informal procedures are used but no appeal is permitted. In addition, because Code section 7452 provides that no qualified person shall be denied admission to practice before the Tax Court by reason of his failure to be a member of any profession, the Tax Court permits others to practice before the Court after passing a special exam. This exam covers the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rules of Practice and Procedures of the Tax Court, and the substantive tax law. Those who take the exam and successfully complete it, primarily accountants, may then represent taxpayers before the Court in both "small" and regular cases. However, in recent years a very small number of persons have applied to take the exam, and less than 10 percent have successfully passed it.

Explanation of Provision

This provision would permit taxpayers to be represented in the Tax Court under the "small case procedure" by certified public accountants and enrolled agents who are authorized to practice before the I.R.S., effective on the date of enactment. In addition, the Tax Court would no longer be required to give a special examination to non-attorneys in order to permit such persons to practice before the Tax Court, effective in 1984. Since the small case procedure is, by design, an informal one, this proposal would allow qualified accountants to represent taxpayers in small tax cases (without taking the Tax Court exam), but the exam would no longer be available to non-attorneys wishing to represent taxpayers in regular cases.

B. Survivor annunities

Present Law

Under the survivors annuity plan for Tax Court judges, the annuity payable to a surviving dependent child is based on the amount payable to a surviving spouse, subject to certain dollar limits. If a judge is survived by a spouse and a dependent child or children, the annuity payable to each such child is equal to one-half the annuity of the surviving spouse, but not to exceed the lesser of $900 per year divided by the number of such children or $360 per year. If a judge leaves no surviving spouse, but leaves a surviving dependent child or children, the annuity payable to each child is equal to the annuity to which a surviving spouse would have been entitled, but not to exceed $480 per year.

These maximum annuity amounts have not been changed since 1961, although the limits for annuities to surviving children of other federal judges have been increased.

Explanation of Provision

The maximum annuities receivable by dependent survivors of deceased Tax Court judges would be increased from $900 per year per family ($360 per child) to $4,644 per year per family ($1,548 per child). The comparable amounts for dependents with no surviving parent would also be increased. These maximum limits are equal to those currently in effect for other federal judges. These changes would be effective for annuities payable for months after the date of enactment.

C. Assignment of proceedings

Present Law

Section 7456(d) provides that the chief judge of the Tax Court may assign any declaratory judgment proceeding, any small tax case proceeding, and any other proceeding where the amount in dispute does not exceed $5,000 to be heard by the commissioners of the Court, and the Court may authorize a commissioner to make the decision of the Court with respect to any such proceeding.

Explanation of Provision

A technical change would be made in Code section 7456 to make clear that the chief judge may assign certain other proceedings to special trial judges for hearing and to write proposed opinions, subject to review and final decision by a Tax Court judge.

D. Special trial judges

Present Law

Code section 7456 authorizes the chief judge of the Tax Court to appoint "commissioners", who shall proceed under rules promulgated by the Court.

Explanation of Provisions

The title of "Commissioner" would be changed to Special Trial Judge, effective on the date of enactment.

E. Publicity of Tax Court proceedings

Present Law

Code section 7461 provides that all reports of the Tax Court and all evidence received by the court shall be open to public inspection, except that after its decision in a case has become final, the Court may permit the withdrawal of documents from the record or make such other disposition thereof as it deems advisable.

Rule 103(a), Tax Court Rules of Practice and Procedure, provides that the Court may make any order which justice requires to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense, including an order requiring that a deposition be placed under seal, that a trade secret or other information not be disclosed or be disclosed only in a designated way, or that documents or information be filed in sealed envelopes to be opened only as directed by the Court. Rule 103(a) was derived from Rule 26(c), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and is declarative of existing case law protecting trade secrets and other confidential commerical information from public disclosure.

Explanation of Provision

Section 7461 would be amended to make clear that the Tax Court may take action necessary to prevent the disclosure of trade secrets and other confidential information. The amendment would take effect on the date of enactment.

TITLE VIII. SIMPLIFICATION OF INCOME TAX CREDITS

Present Law

Present law provides a series of nonrefundable tax credits which are allowable to reduce a taxpayer's tax liability. The credits have been added to the Internal Revenue Code over the years on an ad hoc basis and the interrelationship among the various credits has never been rationalized. Thus, for example, the credits are allowable against tax in the chronological order they have been added to the Code, which may result in certain credits being unusable where no carryover is provided while a lower-numbered credit for which a carryover is provided was used up.

The various business credits are also usable in different chronological orders—the investment credits are used on a FIFO basis, and the other credits are used on current year first basis. The tax liability limitations for the different business credits vary. The investment tax credit (other than energy credit) limitation is 100 percent of the first $25,000 of tax and 85 percent of the tax is excess of $25,000. The targeted jobs credit is 90 percent of tax liability; the ESOP credit is 100 percent of the first $25,000 or tax liability and 90 percent of the tax in excess of $25,000. The remaining business credits, including the energy credit, are 199 percent of tax liability. The investment credit, targeted jobs credit, research activities credit, and ESOP credit have a 3-year carryback period and these credits plus the alcohol fuels credit have a 15-year carryforward period.

Explanation of Provisions

Under the bill, the personal credits—the dependent care credit, credit for elderly and disabled, residential energy credit and political contribution credit—would be allowable against tax before all other credits. Next the foreign tax credit, orphan drug credit, and fuel production credit would be allowable against tax under the conditions of present law.

The business credits—the investment tax credit (both the regular and the energy credits), targeted jobs credit, alcohol fuels credit, research credit, and ESPO credit—would be combined into one general business credit. This credit would be allowable against 100 percent of the first $25,000 of tax liability and 85 percent of the remaining tax liability. The credit would be used on a FIFO basis whith a 3-year carryback and 15-year carryforward period.

The bill would be effective for taxable years beginning after 1983.

TITLE IX. DEADWOOD PROVISIONS

A. Certain farm losses (section 1251)

Present Law

Code section 1251 was enacted in 1969 to prevent certain high income taxpayers from using farm losses to defer their non-farm income and then later obtaining capital gains on the disposition of their farm property. The Tax Reform Act of 1976 terminated these provisions with respect to farm losses incurred after 1975.

Explanation of Provision

The bill would repeal the provisions of section 1251, as deadwood, since they no longer serve a meaningful function. The repeal would be effective for taxable years beginning after 1983.

B. Qualified bond plans and individual retirement bonds

Present law

Under present law (section 405 of the Code), an employer plan to purchase and distribute U.S. bonds to his employees or their beneficiaries is deemed to be a qualified pension plan if the plan meets most of the requirements under section 401 (a) and (d) relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans. Contributions under the plan must be used solely to purchase bonds for employees. Qualified bond purchase plans are limited to investment in bonds issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act. The terms of such bonds provide for payment of interest only upon redemption, may be purchased only for an individual, cease to bear interest 5 years after death, are not transferable and may be redeemed prior to death only if the individual has attained age 59½ or becomes disabled. Contributions to a qualified bond purchase plan are deductible under section 404 in the same manner as qualified pension plan contributions under section 401. Present law provides an income exclusion and basis rules for beneficiaries of qualified bond purchase plans. In addition, rollovers of redemptions into individual retirement accounts or annuities are permitted.

Under Code section 409, individual taxpayers may utilize U.S. bonds issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act for the purpose of establishing and maintaining an individual retirement arrangement. Second Liberty Bond Act issues used for this purpose must provide for the payment of interest only on redemption (no interest is allowable if redeemed within 12 months of issue), cease to bear interest when the individual attains age 70½, and are not transferable. Section 409 bonds may pay interest up to 5 years after the death of the owner, but in no case beyond the date the owner would have attained age 70½. The registered owner of a section 409 bond may not contribute on behalf of any individual for the purchase of such bonds in excess of $2,000 for any taxable year.

Upon redemption, the entire proceeds of the retirement bond are included in gross income. Proceeds from the redemption of section 409 bonds may be excluded from gross income in certain instances when rolled over into an individual retirement account or annuity under section 408, a qualified trust under section 401(a), a qualified annuity plan, or a section 403(b) tax-sheltered annuity. Present law includes a 10-percent penalty tax on redemptions of a section 409 bond prior to the time the owner attains age 59½, unless the owner becomes disabled.

Explanation of Provision

Sections 405 and 409 would be repealed and technical and conforming changes would be made to other provisions of the Code. The provisions would be effective with respect to obligations issued after December 31, 1983. A special rule would provide that, notwithstanding the terms of any bond described in section 405(b), such bond may be redeemed at any time after the date of enactment.●

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI and I are introducing the Tax Law Simplification and Improvement Act of 1983. This legislation if the result of months of effort by our congressional staffs in identifying major problems areas in the law and developing proposed solutions in a collaborative process. The bill also contains a number of provisions which have been requested by the administration or suggested by others as needed improvements or simplifications to the structure of the tax law.

I wish to express my gratitude to those who worked on preparing this bill as well as to the staff of the Treasury Department for their assistance and to those groups, such as the American Bar Association and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, that suggested areas for study, proposes solutions and deliberated with our staff to develop the product we are introducing today. We look forward to receiving additional recommendations for improving the provisions of the bill during its consideration in the months ahead.

The bill consists of nine titles.

Title I contains a major and long overdue revision of the estimated tax provisions for individuals.

Title II is the "Domestic Relations" title which includes revisions to the rules which govern the tax treatment of property transfers at divorce, alimony payments, and the dependency exemption for children of divorced parents as well as amendments to the so-called innocent spouse rules.

Title III of the bill represents an attempt to simplify and clarify the investment tax credit at-risk limitation added by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (ERTA).

Title IV contains two changes related to the estate tax provisions.

Title V would make several changes needed in provisions affecting foreign income and foreign taxpayers, including a much needed definition of "resident alien" to assist taxpayers and practitioners in determining when a U.S. tax liability is owed by aliens residing in the United States for varying periods of time.

Title VI contains a number of minor provisions recommended by the Department of Treasury as changes that would simplify or improve their operations.

Title VII includes several noncontroversial changes requested by the Tax Court and a more substantive proposal designed to improve the representation of taxpayers involved in small cases before the court.

Title VIII would simplify and rationalize the income tax credit provisions in the Internal Revenue Code.

Title IX repeals several obsolete provisions of the code.

The statement of Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI today concerning the bill provides a more detailed explanation of the bill and a technical description of its provisions.●

VIETNAM VETERANS ART EXHIBIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, ABC's "Good Morning America" last November highlighted a Chicago art show entitled, "Vietnam: Reflexes and Reflections." Drawing exclusively from the art works and experiences of Vietnam combat veterans, this artistically acclaimed show first opened in Chicago to the largest crowds to attend any 1981 opening there.

It is a privilege for me to tell you that this extraordinary art exhibit will soon be on display in the Cannon Rotunda from Septmber 12 to 23. The exhibit was on display in the Senate Russell Building last week.

The exhibit was also on display at the Washington Project for the Arts gallery and, after leaving Washington, will be on tour through several States. I heartily encourage all Members and staff to view this marvelous exhibit. Following are two articles from the Stars and Stripes which describe the exhibit as well as a brief description of those artists who will have their work on display:

[From the Stars and Stripes, June 9, 1983]

VIETNAM VET ARTISTS BASK IN PRAISE

(By Dan McCurry)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A collection of the work of combat veterans of Vietnam, entitled "Vietnam: Reflexes and Reflections," opened this week in Washington, DC to an enthusiastic and thoughtful response from the Nation capital's discerning art community.

One of the largest opening night crowds in their 6-year history turned out in a Friday night drizzle to see this latest exhibition at the gallery of the Washington Project for the Arts.

Reaching beyond the confines of this city, WPA tapped the collections of the Vietnam Veterans Arts Group, a nationwide network of professional and part-time artists, all of whom saw combat during the war in Southeast Asia.

"Reflexes and Reflections" solidified the growing reputation of the VVAG's work which had already earned strong critical acclaim in its midwestern shows.

"Our patrons were often overwhelmed by the power of these pieces, and the artists' technical mastery," observed Helen Brunner, WPA's Program Director.

"The majority of our patrons are working professional artists or art lovers from the corporate world, and they were amazed by the quality of this exhibit and its immediacy," Brunner said.

Here was war, seen from the level of a fox hole, from the open doors of helicopters, in the severely damaged faces of women and children, and through the eyes of the men who survived its holocaust.

"No individual soldier saw it all," observed Frank Dahmer, an artist and West Virginia

farmer, "but in this major collection by the VVAG, we see the impact of that war integrated into a whole."

The show includes an impressive slide/sound presentation of the artists' time in Vietnam, collected by VVAG members from around the country.

When the television camera crews and reporters left, the opening night crowd became primarily a family affair, with artists greeting fellow vets with whom they had shared previous exhibits.

Others brought their wives to stand before a painting or photograph, relating, many for the first time, some incident reflected there which still interrupted their sleep.

Children played along the gallery floor, unmindful of the large stone sculptures over their heads, stopping occasionally to fix their eyes on some particular composition whose subject matter was duly registered for later questions.

The wheelchairs of paralyzed veterans were carried up the steep gallery stairs and maneuvered through the crowd to find old friends and familiar scenes in oil and ink.

Gold Star Mothers took time out from serving as hostesses to reflect on similar art works and stories from other wars.

"So many different impressions of the war, and so many still stay with you," reflected Imogene Cupp, whose son was killed in Vietnam. "After all these years, it still leaves me kind of touchy."

The artists themselves were sensitive to the suggestion that their works might be considered just an exhibit about the war. For them, it was a clear demonstration of the artistic development of a generation of some of the best new artists who had first been sent off to fight.

"I am an artist, a professional," emphasized John McManus, a Los Angeles sculptor whose work has received national attention. "I am a professional artist, not a professional veteran, And my work should be judged on that basis."

Their critics agreed. "I felt the hearts of these men," related Maude Barnett, an 80-year old Grand Rapids, MI mother of a WWII casualty. "I cried inside at their wonder and at the bafflement in so many pictures. And I saw the signs of hope."

A non-profit organization, VVAG raised the funds to ship their art to Washington, DC by holding a raffle in Chicago, It is their hope that the results of this extraordinary show will bring the funding necessary to keep the exhibit intact and circulating nationally in museums and galleries.

In the past 3 years, shows of the art of other Vietnam veterans have been held in New York, San Francisco, Minneapolis, Chicago and most recently during the New Mexico Memorial Day observances.

By far, the most successful were the Chicago openings of 1981 and 1982, from which VVAG was organized.

The Washington, DC, exhibit is sponsored by the *Stars and Stripes*, the National Endowment for the Arts, the DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities, the Friends and Patrons of the Washington Project for the Arts, the Gold Star Mothers of America and the Gold Star Wives of America.

Senators Alan Simpson, Mark Hatfield, Charles Percy and Congressmen Tom Daschle, Tom Downey, "Sonny" Montgomery, Dan Rostenkowski and Jamie Whitten, are also sponsoring the event which is scheduled to be exhibited in the Rotunda of the Senate's Russell Office Building June 20-24, and the House Cannon Office Building September 12-23, after it leaves the WPA gallery.

[From the Stars and Stripes, June 23, 1983]

SENATE LEADERS VIEW VETS' ART

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An exhibit of the Vietnam Veterans' Art Group was the focus of a week of intense interest on Capitol Hill with a showing of the Vietnam combat veterans' work in the Senate's Russell Rotunda gallery.

Crowds estimated by the Capitol Security police at 3,000-5,000 each day, reviewed the pieces of this outstandingly successful art group.

"Vietnam: Reflexes and Reflections" was the title of this exhibit which attracted 91 Senatorial sponsors in addition to the Stars and Stripes.

Despite a budget debate on the Senate floor, a number of Senators, their aides and committee staff members attended opening night ceremonies.

"Why should the Senate sponsor such an art show?," a reporter asked Sen. Charles Percy (R-IL).

"Because it was in this Senate," replied the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, "that we finally managed to stop that undeclared war in Vietnam,"

"The surest course on the path of peace," Percy wrote to his fellow senators, "must alway be guided through the still-fresh memories of the true face of war. This art work retains that vision for all of us."

The opening night's crowd included a cross section of Washington, DC's political and cultural leadership with representatives from all branches of the military services, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation, the Red Cross, the Veterans Administration, the White House, the Gold Star Mothers, and the Gold Star Wives.

While television cameras were focusing on individual artists, the overall collection received the professional attention of the staff from the Smithsonian Institution and the curators of the combat art collections of the Army, Navy and Marine Corps.

"The power of this work is often overwhelming," observed Sen. Alan Simpson (R-WY), Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee.

A long supporter of the art work of fellow Wyoming veteran and POW, Ted Gostas, Simpson encouraged other exhibits which "can be a magnet attracting those many veterans with fine artistic talents."

The President of the veterans' art group, Joe Fornelli, and executive director, Sondra Varco, recounted the group's phenomenal two-year success in creating a growing national network of artists around the country.

A larger collection of VVAG art remains on exhibit at the Washington Project for the Arts, 404 7th St. NW, Washington, DC, throughout the month of July.

Dr. Dan McCurry, coordinator of the Senate exhibition, reminded the opening night crowd that the questions of the Vietnam experience were again under debate as Congress develops a policy in Central America.

"Many of these art works show the tragedy and hopes of children caught in battle. In this art are the lessons of war," he said, "lessons which we all must teach to our own children."

Why this high-powered support for the veterans' art show? "The visual arts can certainly play a major role in the American citizen's understanding of any international disturbance," said Sen. Charles Percy.

"Policymakers, especially, need the benefit of those insights borne out of creative work done while in the midst of the pain and courage found in conflicts," Percy said.

In addition to the Capitol Hill exhibits, the artist's group will also feature a larger showing of their work at the downtown galleries of the Washington Project for the Arts. This exhibit will run from June 3 to July 31.

None of these exhibits were professional combat artists in Vietnam. They were issued bullets, not pallets for paint. So in their work, they used film or pencil, paints from coffee or roots, and sculpted with the metal from shell casings or with bamboo.

From these materials found in the field, these solders gave artistic shape to that war which was so profoundly reshaping their own lives.

Not surprisingly, the VVAG did not begin in an officer's mess or at a veterans' reunion. Rather, they came together, in 1981, in answer to notices placed in publications as diverse as "The New Art Examiner" and "Soldier of Fortune."

Since those earlier notices, and their successful Chicago showings, art work has continued to pour in to the VVAG office. Recent requests for inclusion in the Washington show have come from Australian veteran artists and from an Oklahoma group of "Native American" veterans, whose Vietnam art incorporates distinctively Indian styles.

Members of the VVAG come from all regions of the country. Some are full-time professional artists. The majority must pursue their art on the side. But each work and every artist shows the intensity of the Vietnam experience.

Dr. Dan C. McCurry, an artist and member of the group's advisory board, summed up this history: "These veterans were often injured twice, first on the battlefield and again in that war's political conflicts at home.

"Their art work, expressing these most significant events in their lives, was often hidden away. VVAG encourages veterans to search in their cellars, in their old suitcases, and in their souls for those creative works whose public presentation can now strengthen us all," McCurry said.

The importance of this exhibit lies not only in its artistic impact, but in the artist's sensitive handling of a very difficult period in American history. No war can equal Vietnam in the number of soldiers who carried cameras to record a reality not meant to fit into the evening news.

"Each time I look at these pieces, I get a sense of the humanity of our soldiers there," relates Sondra Varco, coordinator of the artists' group and mother of four children.

"These artists were struggling to remain human in the midst of incredible inhumanities, sometimes of their own doing," she said.

"We did not ask for a particular kind of art, but I was surprised at the many pictures of children and showing a clear affection for the individual Vietnamese. In other art pieces, the pain, terror, courage, and spirit of comradeship are unmistakable," Varco said.

The art world has been equally positive in its response. Curator of the Museum of Contemporary Art, Mary Jane Jacobs, praises "These honest works which speak powerfully of experience. Historically, it is imporant to re-encounter this chapter of American history in a fresh and insightful way."

"There is an important spiritual regeneration which is the true essence of the show," adds Dr. Francis A. Ruzick, head of the Art Dept. of the University of Georgia.

For the veteran artists, however, the major strength of their work is its ability to evoke the lessons and experiences of Vietnam. Richard Aztlan, Chicago police officer and a VVAG founder, sees the art show working much as did the Vietnam Veterans Memorial wall.

"I want this to be not only an art show," he said, "but also an opportunity for those who are not as artistically articulate to come with their families and show them what they have been through."

Slides of these works have been studies and critiqued in university and gallery art classes from coast to coast. They have been presented to groups as diverse as Sunday School classes, community centers, libraries, gallery clubs, and the Chicago Union League Club's membership of corporate and financial leaders.

But its impact is greatest with veterans' outreach centers. Dr. Leonard Porter, Team Leader and an artist at an outreach center, reports using the art extensively with veterans prior to counseling sessions.

"Many of the guys find it easier to open up through their art work," he said. "Then we can deal with their other hard issues."

Dr. Porter is accompanying several busloads of veterans to the Washington shows.

Following their exhibit in the Capital, the VVAG art is scheduled to be shown in Texas, Wisconsin and California. They would welcome invitations from museums, universities, and other groups.

Most importantly, this artists' network invites other veteran artists to submit slides of their own work for consideration for inclusion in the future VVAG shows.

A non-profit, volunteer organization, the Vietnam Veterans' Arts Group can be reached at 627 S. Hamlin, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068; telephone 312-823-3775; or 312-823-3325.

VIETNAM VETERANS ART GROUP, PARK RIDGE, ILL.

ARTIST MEMBERS

Robert Buono, Hammond, Ind. Professional sculptor working in multi-media. MFA from Art Institute of Chicago. Buono has had a number of one-man shows in Illinois and Indiana. Served in Vietnam from late 1966 to early 1968 with the Army's 9th Infantry Division and the 11th ACR.

Michael Boyett, Nacogdoches, Tex. Professional artist and sculpture. An original member of the VVAG, Boyett has had a number of one-man shows across the country. He is highly respected for lifelike sculpture. Served in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with the 9th Infantry Division.

Ned Brodbrick, Berwyn, Ill. Professional artist and freelance illustrator. One of the founding members of the VVAG, Brodbrick studied at the Art Academy of Chicago. He has had numerous shows in Illinois. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968 with 3d Marine Division.

Douglas Clifford, Newton, Mass. Director of Veterans Affairs in Boston. He was a combat photographer with the Air Force and has had extensive show of his photography. Served in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with the Air Force.

Russell Elder, DeKalb, Ill. Media professor at Northern Illinois University. Elder has had a number of one-man shows of photography and been published extensively. Served two tours in Vietnam, 1967 and 1968-1969, with the Navy.

Joseph Fornelli, Park Ridge, Ill. Professional artist working primarily in watercolor. Fornelli has been widely published and has paintings hanging in a number of museums. He has been featured on TV and has won numerous award. Fronelli was a founding member of the VVAG and is the current president of the group. Served in Vietnam from 1964 to 1965 with the Army's 501st Assault Helicopter Company.

Frank Dahmer, Princeton, W. Va. media consultant and retired army officer. Dahmer has won numerous awards for writing, photography and electronic production. His art is primarily watercolor and graphic prints. Served three tours in Vietnam, 1966, 1969, 1970 with the UARV Artillery, Task Force South and the 25th Infantry Division.

Michael Duffy, Denver, Colo. Professional artist working primarily in watercolor and oil Duffy has won numerous awards for his art work. Served in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with IIFFV Artillery.

Art Dockter, Fargo, N. Dak. Professional photographer. His works have been shown throughout Minnesota and North Dakota. Served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970 with the 1st Air Cavalry Division.

Randolph Evans, Chillothe, Ill. Professional artist working in oil portraits. Evans has had several one-man shows. Served in Vietnam during 1970 with the Armys 155th Aviation Company.

Thomas Gilbertson, Denver, Colo. Professional Artist. BFA and MFA from San Jose State University (Calif). an orginal member of VVAG, Gilbertson has had a number of one-man shows in Colo. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1970 with the Army.

Randolph Harmes, St. Peter, Minn. Professional artist working primarily in sculpture. Harmes had had a number of one-man shows in Minn. and Iowa. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968 with the Army.

Frank Howery, Kankakee, Ill. Electrician with art as a hobby. Shown only with the VVAG. Served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970 with the Air Force.

William Hoin, Lancaster, Pa. Professional artist working with multi-media and weaving. He has had a number of shows in Pennsylvania and Chicago. Teaches art. Served in Vietnam from 1963 to 1964 with the Army Security Agency.

Willian Hackwell, Chicago, Ill. Professional photographer. His work is social photography whose pictures tell the story of people's relationship with their environment. Hackwell has had numerous one-man shows of his work. Served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970 with the Air Force.

Meredith Jack, Houston, Tex. Professional sculptor and teacher at Lamar University, Beaumont. Tex. Jack has had numerous shows throughout the United States. Served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970 with the Army.

Wayne Kline, Albuquerque, N. Mex. Professional artist working primarily in graphic arts. MFA from Florida State University. Numerous one-man shows across the country. Served in Vietnam during 1968 with the Marines.

Karl Michel Atlanta, Ga. Professional artist working in pastels and watercolors. MFA from University of Georgia. Numerous one-man shows across the country. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1970 with 25th Infantry Division.

Kevin Kelley, Richmond, Va. Professional sculptor. MFA from Virginia Commonweath University. Kelley has had a number of shows in Virginia and surrounding states. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968 with the Army.

Jay Allen Kidwell, Kingman, Ariz. Professional sculptor and teacher at the Mohave College in Arizona. MFA from the University of Georgia. Kidwell has been shown extensively across the country. Served in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with the Navy.

Ulysses Marshall, Washington, D.C. Noted Washington artist working primarily in watercolor. Served in Vietnam during 1965 with the 173d Airborne Brigade.

Brian Maxfield, Dekalb, Ill. Professional artist and sculptor with a BFA from Northern Illinois University. Maxfield has had numerous shows in the northern midwest. Served in Vietnam during 1970 with the 101st Airmobile Division.

John Miller, Grand Canyon, Ariz. Professional sculptor of a number of well known bronzes. Miller has had a number of exhibitions of his work. Served in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with the 173d Airborne Brigade.

Grady Myers, Boise, Idaho. Editorial cartoonist with the Idaho Statesman. In addition to newspaper work, Myers has done animated film work that has received wide acclaim. Served in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with the 4th Infantry Division.

James N. McJunkin, Austin, Tex. Professional photographer with numerous exhibits under his belt. His book, "Visions of Vietnam," will be published in the fall of 1983. Served in Vietnam from 1970 to 1971 with 1st Signal Brigade.

John D. McManus, Los Angeles, Calif. Professional sculptor with a number of works on disply throughout Calif. McManus is presently artist in residence at Santa Monica College. Served two tours in Vietnam 1966-1968 with the 1st Signal Brigade.

Josef Metz, Chicago, Ill. Professional artist working primarily in oil. Metz has had a number of shows around the world. Served in Vietnam 1969 to 1970 with the 1st Infantry Division.

Gary Newman, Wood Dale, Ill. Bank president with photography as a hobby. Newman has exhibited his photos and lectured extensively. Served in Vietnam during 1970 with the 1st Aviation Brigade.

Richard Olsen, Athens, Ga. Professional artist and professor at the University of Georgia. He was one of the original members of the VVAG and had the earliest war time service of the members. Extensively shown. Served in Vietnam from 1962 to 1963 with the 33d Transportation Company (early air assault company).

John Plunkett, Brooklyn, N.Y. Professional artist whose work has been shown extensively on the east coast. MFA from Rhode Island School of Design. Served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970 with the 25th Infantry Division.

Neil H. Pollack, Wilmette, Ill. Goldsmith and jewelry designer. Pollack does woodcarving and photography and has extensively shown his work. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1969 with 1st Logistical Command.

Leonard Porter, St. Anne, Ill. Doctor of psychology with the Government. Porter has pursued art as a hobby and uses it extensively in his profession for therapy. Served in Vietnam during 1969 with the Army.

Michael Page, Richmond, Va. Professional sculptor and student in advanced art. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968 with 1st Infantry Division.

Scott Neistadt, Dubois, Wyo. Rancher with an art hobby. His work is primarily in

pen and ink. Served in Vietnam during 1968 with the Navy.

John Shimashita, Crestwood, Ill. Television media specialist. Has done extensive still photography shown only with the VVAG. Served in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with the Army.

Karl Clark, Springfield, Ill. Prisoner in Vienna, Illinois. His work is done in pencil (all he has) and is taking the time to develop his talent. Served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970 with the Army.

J. Michael Rumery, Houston, Tex. Professional artist. He works both in painting and sculpture. Shown extensively in Texas. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1969 with the 173d Airborne Brigade.

Dale Samuelson, Chicago, Ill. Professional artist. He has had several shows of his multi-media works. One of the founding members of the VVAG and present vice president of the group. Served in Vietnam during 1968 with the Marines.

Charles Shobe, Bakerton, W. Va. Professional artist. He has had several one man shows of his work. Served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968 with the Marines.

Michael Helbing, Indianapolis, Ind. Professional artist with numerous shows and exhibitions. Served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970 with 1st Infantry Division.

Richard Yohnka, Clifton, Ill. Professional artist and teacher. MFA from Northern Illinois University. His work is well known throughout the midwest. Served in Vietnam from 1971 to 1972 with the 101st Airmobile Division.●

SPACE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVINE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing along with six of my colleagues, a concurrent resolution, which has been introduced in the Senate by Senators MATSUNAGA and PELL, to express the sense of Congress that the President should initiate talks with the Soviet Union to explore new cooperative East-West ventures in space. Our two countries have a successful history of working together in planetary exploration, space biology, and joint manned and unmanned missions. These cooperative projects have not only expanded our knowledge of outer space, but have created a continuous and open line of communication between ourselves and the Soviets.

At a time when both countries are working toward deployment of antisatellite and other space-related weapons, it is absolutely imperative that we continue to maintain an open dialog with the Soviets regarding future space policy. I am interested in seeing the United States and the Soviet Union pursue a new kind of space policy, one which focuses on the cooperative exploration and exploitation of space, rather than a military course which escalates a new arms race, and undermines prospects for successful arms control negotiations.

This resolution calls on the United States and the Soviet Union to renew the 1972 Treaty on Space Cooperation for peaceful purposes. This 5-year agreement was first negotiated and signed by President Nixon in 1972, and was renewed by President Carter in 1977. Regrettably, the Reagan administration allowed the treaty to expire last year.

Mutual ventures in space offer unique opportunities for the United States and the U.S.S.R. Greater direct contact between the two nations eases real and perceived tensions. Rather than fuel misguided competition between the two nations, joint space activities focus attention on peaceful missions where the scientific interests of both countries. Given the costs of planetary missions and space exploration in general, space cooperation makes sense. In preventing duplication of experimentation, space cooperation can enhance the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of our own space program. Additionally, both countries benefit scientifically from shared information. Renewing this treaty would in no way hamper our ability to continue to work separately on our own space projects. The 1972 space cooperation treaty makes no specific reference to information that must be shared by both countries. The fact that the Soviets were more secretive about their space activities than we are, suggests to me that the United States would have much to gain as a result of increased sharing of space information.

International space cooperation is now more important than ever. In addition to the two space powers, most of West European countries, Russia's allies in Eastern Europe, China, Japan, and India are all advancing in space exploration and experimentation. Space systems now apply to such varied uses as communications, meteorology, the study of Earth resources, and oceanography. There is probably no nation in the world that is not affected by some aspect of space science. As the United States and the U.S.S.R. are still the leaders in space, it is important that the two countries develop a more open relationship, and inform one another more completely about their respective space programs.

When Congress created NASA in 1958, it authorized that agency to pursue policies to foster greater international cooperation and peaceful application of knowledge gathered through joint space ventures. Joint cooperation between the United States and U.S.S.R. culminated in 1975 when three American astronauts in an Apollo spacecraft linked up in Earth orbit with two Soviet cosmonauts in a Soyuz spacecraft. Born out of the 1972 space cooperation treaty, the Apollo-Soyuz mission was a great international success on many fronts.

Scientists from both nations were thrust into a multiyear working relationship which called for constant communication, and an open sharing of ideas, equipment, manpower, and technology. In 1973, the Soviets admitted for the first time an American delegation to the previously top secret Soviet mission control center for the purpose of coordinating communications and tracking. The following year, American astronauts visited the Soviet launch site at Tyuratam and Soviet cosmonauts trained in Houston. Before the project was concluded, the Soviets and Americans had negotiated and signed 133 documents, an unprecedented achievement.

It should be noted that the Apollo-Soyuz mission had its share of practical immediate scientific benefits. During the mission, the two nations successfully demonstrated new technology for international space rescue capabilities. The Soviet-American docking also had a more special, enduring significance.

In describing the potential benefits of the project, NASA in 1975 pointed out that "in perspective, the most important result of this international manned mission may be the mutual confidence and trust it creates—confidence and trust that may be significant not just for what people working together may accomplish in space, but also for what peoples working together may achieve on earth."

While the success of the Apollo-Soyuz mission was made possible by the period of détente in the early 1970's, the success of the rendezvous encouraged both nations to enter into new agreements designed to enhance their working relationship in outer space. A new Soviet-American agreement was concluded in May 1977 which established the basis for space cooperation in the post Apollo-Soyuz period.

In 1977, the Soviet Academy of Sciences and NASA agreed to study the "Objectives, Feasibility and Means of Accomplishing Joint Experimental Flights of a Long-Duration," utilizing the long orbital capacity of the Salyut space station and the reusable shuttle space vehicle. The two nations also pledged to continue cooperation in a wide range of space science and space applications activities and agreed to resolve problems of international law on the peaceful use of space. For the next several years, the United States and U.S.S.R. continued to make important gains in space cooperation. For example, American scientists provided radar maps of Venus produced by a Pioneer spacecraft to help Soviet scientists select landing sites. In return, the Soviets shared data from these missions with American scientists. There has also been significant cooperation and continuing exchange

of data with the Soviets regarding various biological experiments. Three satellites carrying test animals were sent into space by Russians in 1975, 1977, 1979. The United States participated in these missions by providing the experiments and received in return the results of the experiments. Because the United States did not have a biosatellite program, and therefore could benefit at minimum cost from the Soviet life sciences program, American participation in this program was especially beneficial.

As a result of increased political tensions between ourselves and the Soviets, recent official space cooperation between the two nations has been greatly curtailed. Discussion of future cooperation in the field of planetary science were canceled last year by the Reagan administration. Working groups established under the 1972 space cooperation agreement to arrange for joint ventures in space meteorology, environmental studies, lunar and planetary exploration, and space biology and medicine have disbanded. Instead, the two space powers have begun to enter the most threatening and destabilizing period in the history of space development.

The Soviet Union has already developed an antisatellite weapon. The Soviet ASAT system has only limited capability and can only strike targets in low Earth orbit, and therefore is not a direct threat to our military communications satellites at this time. However, Soviet development of an ASAT weapon has prompted the United States to begin testing a much more versatile and accurate ASAT system. The American ASAT system is small and will be carried on F-15 jets. As a result the Soviets will have great difficulty determining the number of ASAT's in our inventory, and predicting where and when they will be launched.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that full deployment of an American ASAT system will launch an arms race in space. This new phase of arms competition is particularly dangerous and destabilizing because the weapons involved already threaten our reconnaissance satellites and may eventually threaten the nerve centers of our strategic nuclear arsenal—the early warning, and communications satellites that alone can insure that an accident or miscalculation does not deteriorate into global holocaust. Unless we guarantee the protection of our satellites, international weapons verification will become less credible, and the move toward meaningful arms control will be less feasible.

Rather than engage in a costly and destabilizing space arms race, the two space powers should attempt to work more closely together. In the immediate sense, space cooperation can provide both countries with valuable, new scientific information at a reduced cost. Ultimately, it is my hope that once we and the Soviets begin to address officially the notion of cooperation in space, our attention will be drawn to our mutual interests and the need to protect them. We will not begin to ease tensions with the Soviets until we begin to work with them. If we are committed to preserving peace, then we must find an alternative to the present military course of space development. The alternative not only serves the interests of the two space powers, but all of mankind.●

LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT BAIL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to implement bail reform to allow judges, when making decisions regarding pretrial detention, to consider the danger the accused may pose to society.

As my colleagues may be aware, the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime strongly recommended reforming Federal bail practices that are dictated by the Bail Reform Act of 1966. This act has been criticized for its liberal regulations allowing the release of persons accused of crimes and its stringent requirements for judges making decisions regarding defendants. Under current law, judges are permitted only to consider whether or not the accused is likely to appear at his trial when deciding to grant or deny bail.

There is wide support for the concept of permitting judges to consider the potential threat the accused may pose to society. It is the responsibility of legislators to provide the tools that the court system needs to protect the safety of citizens. This legislative proposal recognizes that there is a problem of criminal recidivism, and there is documentation of accused criminals who are released prior to their trials committing other criminal acts. If the judge denies bail, the defendant would be detained for a relatively short time before his trial, as guaranteed under the Speedy Trial Act of 1974.

I urge my colleagues to joint me in supporting this legislative initiative.●

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON 1983 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

(Mr. JONES of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. I am submitting to the RECORD a letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending and revenues for fiscal year 1983.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1983.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending. Pursuant to Committee Rule 10, I am herewith transmitting the status report under H. Con. Res. 91, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1984. This report reflects the resolution of June 23, 1983, and the current CBO estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues based on all completed action on spending and revenue measures as of the close of legislative business.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JAMES R. JONES,
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1983 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 91

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF JUNE 29, 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level	877,200	807,400	604,300
Current level	865,128	805,560	604,400
Amount under ceiling	12,072	1,840	
Amount over floor			100

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds $12,072 million for fiscal year 1983, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 91 to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds $1,840 million in outlays for fiscal year 1983, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 91 to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that exceeds $100 million for fiscal year 1983, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 91.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1983.

Hon. JAMES R. JONES,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Purusant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311(b) of the

Congressional Budget Act, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays and estimated revenues in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the 1983 budget H. Con. Res. 91). This report for fiscal year 1983 is tabulated as of close of business June 28, 1983, and is based on our estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues using the assumptions and estimates consistent with H. Con. Res. 91.

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
1. Enacted	864,283	804,549	604,400
2. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action	845	1,012	
3. Continuing resolution authority			
4. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses			
Current level	865,128	805,560	604,400
Second Budget Resolution, revised, H. Con. Res. 91	877,200	807,400	604,300
Current level is:			
Over resolution by			100
Under resolution by	12,072	1,840	

Sincerely,

JAMES BLUM
(For Alice M. Rivlin, Director.)

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1983, AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JUNE 28, 1983

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
I. Enacted:		
Permanent appropriations and trust funds	476,492	469,033
Enacted previous session	484,011	465,953
Offsetting receipts	−133,407	−133,407
Enacted this session:		
Economic Development Authorization deferral disapproval, H. Res. 74		5
DOE Strategic Petroleum Reserve deferral disapproval, H. Res. 80		6
1983 supplemental jobs bill, P.L. 98–8	15,736	7,336
Offsetting receipts	−5,159	−5,159
Social Security Act Amendments of 1983, P.L. 98–21	26,610	731
MX missile approval, S. Con. Res. 26		50
Total, enacted	864,283	804,549
II. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action:		
Advances to Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund	615	615
Offsetting receipts	−615	−615
Payment to Civil Service Retirement	342	342
Offsetting receipts	−342	−342
Civilian agency pay raises	791	902
Black Lung Disability Trust Fund	54	54
Mass Transportation Capital Fund		55
Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund	220	220
Offsetting receipts	−220	−220
Payment to Social Security Trust Fund	1,180	1,180
Offsetting receipts	−1,180	−1,180
Total	845	1,012
III. Continuing resolution authority		
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses		
Total, current level as of June 28, 1983	865,128	805,560
Second budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 91	877,200	807,400
Amount remaining:		
Over ceiling		
Under ceiling	12,072	1,840

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. BYRON (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NIELSON of Utah) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CORCORAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FISH, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FOWLER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DASCHLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVINE of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on July 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DYSON, during debate on House Concurrent Resolution 126, today.

Mr. SIMON, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,569.75.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NIELSON of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska.

Mr. PORTER.

Mrs. JOHNSON.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. GOODLING in two instances.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. CHENEY.

Mr. STUMP.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. DANNEMEYER.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. MCEWEN in two instances.

Mr. WEBER.

Mr. MCKERNAN.

Mr. PARRIS.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. RUDD in two instances.

Mr. WHITTAKER.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan in five instances.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. PANETTA.

Mr. MCDONALD.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. MCNULTY.

Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.

Mr. GORE.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. LEVITAS in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in four instances.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. MCHUGH.

Mr. WIRTH.

Mr. WON PAT.

Mr. VENTO in three instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. SIMON.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, 98th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, July 11, 1983.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, the House adjourned until Monday, July 11, 1983, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1472. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to continue to authorize reimbursement for expenses incurred by certain members of the uniformed services who are deprived of their quarters aboard ship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1473. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Treasury Department's review of the annual audit of the Student Loan Marketing Association for the calendar year 1982, pursuant to section 439(k) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1474. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the quarterly report on foreign military sales as of March 31, 1983, pursuant to section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1475. A letter from the Acting Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1476. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreement, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1477. A letter from the Acting Comptroller of the United States, transmitting a list of reports issued or released by the General Accounting Office during May 1983, pursuant to section 234 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1478. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the Commission's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1981, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1479. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the court's judgment order in case No. 87-D, *The McDermitt Paiute Shoshone Tribe* v. *The United States*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2509; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1480. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the operational continuity of the Office of the General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority during a vacancy in the position of the General Counsel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1481. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10 and title 14, United States Code, to authorize the President, in time of war and national emergency, to prescribe a course of instruction of not less than 3 years at the U.S. Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, and to appoint graduates from the U.S. Military, Naval, Air Force, and Coast Guard Academies as commissioned officers without Senate confirmation; jointly, to the Committees, on Armed Services and Merchant Marine Fisheries.

1482. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Office of Personnel Management's system of internal controls of the civil service retirement and disability fund (AFMD-83-19, June 28, 1983); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of June 27, 1983]

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1519. A bill to revise and reform the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-115, Pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

[Omitted from the Record of June 28, 1983]

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1510. A bill to revise and reform the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-115, Pt. III). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 1510. A bill to revise and reform the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-115, Pt. IV). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 30, 1983]

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3021. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a program of grants to States to provide health care benefits for the unemployed, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-236, Pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 3324. A bill to authorize appropriations for grants to the Close Up Foundation and for certain law-related education programs (Rept. No. 98-286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1234. A bill to establish domestic content requirements for motor vehicles sold or distributed in interstate commerce in the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98-287, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 3474. A bill to establish national standards for construction and siting of artificial reefs in the waters of the United States in order to enchance fishery resources and fishing opportunities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Works and Transportation, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify and improve the tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER:

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to promote competitiveness in the motor vehicle aftermarket and to preserve consumer freedom of choice to select parts and service of the consumer's own choosing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER (for himself, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. BLILEY):

H.R. 3477. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the requirement that State implementation plans provide for periodic inspection and testing of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

H.R. 3478. A bill to authorize the presentation on behalf of the Congress of a specially struck bronze medal to the families of American personnel missing or otherwise unaccounted for in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 3479. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to exempt newspapers from the prohibition against depositing in letter boxes mailable matter on which no postage has been paid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3480. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disregard tax-exempt interest in computing the amount of social security benefits included in income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 3481. A bill to establish a Department of Trade and Industry as an executive department of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RODINO, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mrs. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 3482. A bill to amend title VIII of the act commonly called the Civil Rights Act of 1968, to revise the procedures for the enforcement of fair housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 3483. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide incentive grants in order to encourage States to adopt and enforce laws requiring the proper use of child restraint systems by children in motor vehicles, to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the issuance of a Federal motor vehicle safety standard, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRADISON:

H.R. 3484. A bill to amend the Federal Financing Bank Act of 1973 with respect to the budget treatment of the Federal Financing Bank; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ROE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BONKER and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 3485. A bill to provide employment opportunities to long-term unemployed individuals in high unemployment areas in projects to repair and renovate vitally needed community facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 3486. A bill to promote maritime safety on the high seas and navigable waters of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 3487. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that one-half of the amounts paid by a self-employed taxpayer for his or her health insurance premiums will be allowed as a business deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONALD:

H.R. 3488. A bill requiring U.S. persons who conduct business or control enterprises in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Albania, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Bulgaria, North Korea, Laos, or the People's Democratic Republic of Yeman to comply with certain fair employment principles, prohibiting any new loans by U.S. financial or lending institutions to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Albania, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Bulgaria, North Korea, Laos, or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen or to corporations or other entities owned or controlled by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Vietnam, Yougoslavia, Albania, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Bulgaria, North Korea, Laos, or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and prohibiting the importation of products or produce grown, manufactured, or assembled in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Albania, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Bulgaria, North Korea, Laos, or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Banking, Finance and Urban Affaris; and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 3489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the Federal unemployment tax payments made with respect to deceased employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of produced film rents for purposes of the personal holding company tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 3491. A bill to amend chapter 207 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to detention of defendants before trial in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON) (by request):

H.R. 3492. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to order members of the Retired Reserve with over 20 years of continuous active duty and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve to active duty under the same conditions as are applicable to retired members of the regular components; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3493. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that companies of the Corps of Cadets of the U.S. Military Academy may be commanded by commissioned officers of the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, as well as by commissioned officers of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3494. A bill to repeal section 4351(b) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the reexamination and readmission of cadets of the U.S. Military Academy who fail to pass a required examination; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3495. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to extend the period of time during which all elements of a National Guard unit must complete a training assembly; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RATCHFORD:

H.R. 3496. A bill to make certain repairs on a bridge on Interstate Route 95 in Greenwich, Conn., eligible for emergency relief under title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3497. A bill to defer proposed amendment to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 3498. A bill to provide assistance to victims of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 3499. A bill to impose a moratorium on certain acquisitions and on the commencement of new activities by depository institutions and depository holding companies; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. PRITCHARD):

H.R. 3500. A bill to establish the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe Exchange Commission to provide additional financial support for exchange programs between the United States and the Soviet Union and countries of Eastern Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3501. A bill to assist unemployed individuals in obtaining permanent employment by providing such individuals an option under which they will receive retraining, education, and relocation assistance in lieu of certain extended or other additional unemployment compensation benefits; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. SYNAR (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FISH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SHARP, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BRITT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HILER, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 3502. A bill to amend the patent law to restore the term of the patent grant for the period of time that nonpatent regulatory requirements prevent the marketing of a patented product; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 3503. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to simplify certain reporting requirements imposed on persons seeking to acquire control of an insured bank; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for one-House vetoes of executive branch rules and regulations issued pursuant to acts of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution designating the week of July 17 through July 23, 1983, as "Sutter Community Hospitals Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution requesting the President to negotiate the creation of a United States-People's Republic of China student exchange for understanding program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. BARNES, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. WINN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. MICA, and Mr. LEVINE of California):

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of U.S. diplomatic relations with the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVINE of California (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. GORE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. MINETA):

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should initiate talks with the Government of the Soviet Union, and with other governments interested in space activities, to explore the opportunities for cooperative East-West ventures in space, as an

alternative to an arms race in space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 255. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that Dr. Willard Libby, inventor of the diffusion barrier, should receive, posthumously, the Presidential Medal of Freedom; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE (for himself, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. RITTER):

H. Res. 256. Resolution disapproving the President's recommendation to extend certain waiver authority under the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Romania; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE:

H. Res. 257. Resolution disapproving the President's recommendation to extend certain waiver authority under the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Hungary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 258. Resolution disapproving the President's recommendation to extend certain waiver authority under the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

203. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, relative to the present ratio of aid to Turkey and Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

204. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York relative to passage of H.R. 1242 and S. 1000; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. RICHARDSON introduced a bill (H.R. 3504) for the relief of Antonio Torres; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 108: Mr. GRADISON.

H.R. 220: Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 516: Mr. CORCORAN.

H.R. 656: Mr. DIXON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 679: Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. CHAPPELL.

H.R. 895: Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ROE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GORE, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. PATTERSON.

H.R. 898: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 904: Mr. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 905: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.R. 953: Mr. COUGHLIN and Mr. BATES.

H.R. 965: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DAUB, Mr. KOGOVSEK, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.R. 1015: Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 1016: Mr. WISE and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1027: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1029: Mr. LEVINE of California and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1030: Mr. BATES, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1146: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1256: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1341: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1397: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. WISE, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 1543: Mrs. BURTON of California.

H.R. 1587: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1604: Mr. BRITT.

H.R. 1616: Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 1776: Mr. REGULA, Mr. LEATH of Texas, and Mr. PATTERSON.

H.R. 1920: Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1943: Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1955: Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 1959: Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1976: Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. BONKER.

H.R. 1984: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OLIN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. BRITT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 2053: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 2073: Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. PASHAYAN.

H.R. 2088: Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 2097: Mr. GRAY.

H.R. 2099: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2100: Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 2125: Mr. HARRISON.

H.R. 2126: Mr. BRITT.

H.R. 2127: Mr. CORRADA.

H.R. 2242: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 2374: Mr. CORRADA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. FLIPPO.

H.R. 2406: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 2432: Mrs. COLLINS and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2468: Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. COATS, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. SABO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 2651: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 2652: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 2809: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, and Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 2841: Mr. SEIBERLING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ALBOSTA, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 2869: Mr. AKAKA.

H.R. 2928: Mr. PASHAYAN.

H.R. 2949: Mr. WINN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COATS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 2977: Mr. WOLF and Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

H.R. 3009: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. ROE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATES, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3010: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARNES Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. ROE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATES, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 3024: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 3046: Mr. PRICE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PASHAYAN, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

H.R. 3072: Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 3091: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FORSYTHE, and Mr. SMITH of Florida,

H.R. 3137: Mr. KOGOVSEK and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 3141: Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. WIRTH, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 3176: Mr. GRAY.

H.R. 3192: Mr. MARRIOTT.

H.R. 3254: Mr. STOKES, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 3264: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SIMON, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3314: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 3321: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GREGG, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NICH-

OLS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. MACK, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HANCE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. WHITTAKER, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LENT, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. HUTTO.

H.R. 3354: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GRAY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MOORE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MINISH, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 3371: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3392: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 3433: Mr. PEASE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. GORE, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.J. Res. 1: Mrs. BURTON of California.

H.J. Res. 71: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.J. Res. 153: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. OLIN.

H.J. Res. 225: Mr. TRAXLER.

H.J. Res. 228: Mr. WEISS, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BRITT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. HOPKINS.

H.J. Res. 273: Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

H.J. Res. 295: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRITT, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, and Mr. WON PAT.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. ADDABBO, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H. Res. 160: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GOODLING.

H. Res. 190: Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. COEHLO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H. Res. 191: Mr. GRAY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

155. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, San Antonio, Tex., relative to the budget of the National Institutes of Health; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 10

By Mr. LAFALCE:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.)

—Page 49, after line 8, insert the following:

"(c) No assistance may be provided under this title for projects intended to facilitate the relocation of industrial or commercial plants or facilities from one area to another, unless the Secretary finds that such relocation would not significantly and adversely affect unemployment in, or the economic base of, the area from which the industrial or commercial plant or facility would be leaving.".

—Page 60, after line 21, insert the following:

"(e)(1) The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and such other departments and agencies as the Secretary considers appropriate, shall conduct a study—

"(A) regarding the financing needs for the construction, repair, and rehabilitation of public facilities in order to improve the condition of such facilities so that such facilities can adequately meet present levels of service;

"(B) regarding the ability of State and local governments, including special public authorities which own or operate public facilities, to meet such financing needs;

"(C) to determine—

"(i) the present level of financing for public facilities;

"(ii) the types of financing used to meet such financing needs;

"(iii) those obstacles which affect the ability of State and local governments to meet such financing needs;

"(iv) the access, or lack of access, of State and local governments to the private credit market;

"(v) the ability of the private credit market to absorb such financing needs on a taxable or tax-exempt basis;

"(vi) the extent to which debt limitations affect the ability of State and local governments to meet such financing needs, including a survey of such debt limitation factors with respect to each State; and

"(vii) the ability of State and local governments to increase taxes, or impose or increase user fees, in order to meet such financing needs; and

"(D) regarding such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate in order to assist the Congress in determining the total financing needs necessary to improve such public facilities.

"(2)(A) The Secretary shall transmit to each House of the Congress an interim report not later than June 30, 1984, and shall transmit a final report to each House of the Congress not later than December 31, 1984.

"(B) The final report shall contain a detailed statement on the findings and conclusions of the Secretary, together with the Secretary's recommendations for such legislative or administrative actions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'public facilities' shall only include the following: non-Federal aid roads and bridges; water supply and distribution systems; sewer systems; solid waste disposal systems; and transportation facilities which represent an element of local, State, area, or regional economic development, such as airports, ports, waterways, and docks.".

—Page 62, strike out line 4 and all that follows through line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Of sums authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) not to exceed $13,000,000 in the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and not to exceed $15,000,000 in each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1985, and September 30, 1986, shall be available for purposes of subsections (a) through (d) of section 202; and

"(2) not to exceed $2,000,000 in the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, shall be available until expended for purposes of section 202(e).".

—Page 64, line 6, strike out the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", except that the term 'Indian tribe' shall also include those bodies, authorities, organizations, entities, or groups not recognized by the Secretary of the Interior, if—

"(A) such body, authority, organization, entity, or group is recognized, as of May 5, 1983, as a tribe or other similar appropriate entity by the State in which it is located and such State, as of May 5, 1983, holds land in trust of behalf of such tribe or other similar appropriate entity; and

"(B) the project or assistance involved will be located on such land held in trust or on tribal land;".

H.R. 2760

By Mr. MICA:

—On page 2, strike out line 20 and all that follows through line 10 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) This section shall take effect upon the date prescribed in the classified annex to the report of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives to accompany H.R. 2760 (98th Congress), but in no event earlier than October 1, 1983, unless before that effective date the President, after consultation with the Congress, has submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate in writing a new plan providing for the interdiction of arms being shipped from or through Nicaragua to forces hostile to the Government of El Salvador. In formulating such a plan, the President shall consider whether it would be useful to pursue direct bilateral

negotiations between the United States and the Government of Nicaragua; multilateral negotiations among selected Western Hemispheric countries; involving the Organization of American States, the United Nations, or any other nation or nations in a diplomatic or peacekeeping role; involving other countries in the process of arms interdiction using United States military supplies and training; and any other policy that will stop the shipment of arms from Nicaragua to El Salvador. The plan submitted pursuant to this subsection shall cease to be implemented and the prohibitions contained in subsection (a) shall take effect if—

"(1) the Government of Nicaragua has, by formal action, agreed that it will cease all its activities involving the furnishing of arms, personnel, training, command and control facilities, or logistical support for military or paramilitary operations in or against any country in Central America or the Caribbean, and the Government of Nicaragua has reaffirmed the commitments made by the Government of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua to the Organization of American States in July 1979; and

"(2) the cessation of such activities, and the reaffirmation of such commitments, has been verified by the 'Contadora Group' consisting of Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia, or by the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, or by the President of the United States in a report to the Congress.".

Page 5, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) Central America is of vital importance to the interests and long-term security of the United States;

(2) the social and economic crisis facing Central America arise in large part from long histories of poverty, social injustice, and lack of economic opportunity;

(3) military solutions alone, including the activities permitted by this Act, are inadequate to deal with the challenge the United States faces in Central America, and efforts to resist Communist insurgency will be unsuccessful unless the serious social and economic injustices and human rights abuses of the region are addressed;

(4) respected leadership from all sectors of American society and from all regions should be drawn on in the making of United States policy toward Central America; and

(5) an effective United States policy for Central America requires the understanding and support of the America people.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should convene a national bipartisan commission to address the serious long-term problems of security, poverty, and democratic development in Central America, as well as the immediate conditions in the region, and to help build the necessary national consensus on a comprehensive United States policy for the region; and

(2) such commission should—

(A) be composed of distinguished leaders of government, business, labor, education, and the Hispanic and religious communities;

(B) consult with governmental and other leaders of Central America, invite their views, and receive their recommendations on the policies which would best assist them in their long-range security needs and economic development; and

(C) report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

—On page 2, strike out line 20 and all that follows through line 10 on page 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) This section shall take effect upon the date prescribed in the classified annex to the report of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives to accompany H.R. 2760 (98th Congress), but in no event earlier than October 1, 1983, unless before that effective date the President, after consultation with the Congress, has submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate in writing a new plan providing for the interdiction of arms being shipped from or through Nicaragua to forces hostile to the Government of El Salvador. The plan submitted pursuant to this subsection shall cease to be implemented and the prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall take effect if—

"(1) the Government of Nicaragua has, by formal action, agreed that it will cease all its activities involving the furnishing of arms, personnel, training, command and control facilities, or logistical support for military or paramilitary operations in or against any country in Central America or the Caribbean, and the Government of Nicaragua has reaffirmed the commitments made by the Government of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua to the Organization of American States in July 1979; and

"(2) the cessation of such activities, and the reaffirmation of such commitments, has been verified by the 'Contadora Group' consisting of Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia, or by the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, or by the President of the United States in a report to the Congress.".

—Page 5, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) Central America is of vital importance to the interests and long-term security of the United States;

(2) the social and economic crisis facing Central America arise in large part from long histories of poverty, social injustice, and lack of economic opportunity;

(3) military solutions alone, including the activities permitted by this Act, are inadequate to deal with the challenge the United States faces in Central America, and efforts to resist Communist insurgency will be unsuccessful unless the serious social and economic injustices and human rights abuses of the region are addressed;

(4) respected leadership from all sectors of American society and from all regions should be drawn on in the making of United States policy toward Central America; and

(5) an effective United States policy for Central America requires the understanding and support of the American people.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should convene a national bipartisan commission to address the serious long-term problems of security, poverty, and democratic development in Central America, as well as the immediate conditions in the region, and to help build the necessary national consensus on a comprehensive United States policy for the region; and

(2) such commission should—

(A) be composed of distinguished leaders of government, business, labor, education, and the Hispanic and religious communities;

(B) consult with governmental and other leaders of Central America, invite their views, and receive their recommendations on the policies which would best assist them in their long-range security needs and economic development; and

(C) report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2969

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado:

—Page 69, after line 18, add the following new section:

BENEFITS FOR WIDOWS OF CERTAIN RETIRED RESERVISTS

SEC. 1043. (a) The Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity to any individual who is the surviving spouse or a dependent child of a member or former member of the uniformed services who—

(1) died during the period beginning on September 21, 1972, and ending on September 30, 1978; and

(2) at the time of his death would have been eligible for retired pay under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, but for the fact that he was under 60 years of age.

(b) An annuity under subsection (a) shall be paid under the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, in the same manner as if the member or former member had died after September 30, 1980, and had elected under section 1448(a)(2)(B) of such title to participate in the Survivor Benefit Plan established by such subchapter and had made a designation under section 1448(e) of such title to provide an annuity to become effective on the first day after his death.

(c) If an individual entitled to an annuity under this section is also entitled to an annuity under subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, based upon a subsequent marriage, the individual may not receive both annuities but must elect which to receive.

(d) As used in this section:

(1) The term "uniformed services" means the Armed Forces and the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service and of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) The term "surviving spouse" has the meaning given the terms "widow" and "widower" in section 1447 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The term "dependent child" has the meaning given such term in section 1447 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) The term "Secretary concerned" has the meaning given such term in section 101(8) of title 10, United States Code, and includes the Secretary of Commerce, with respect to matters concerning the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with respect to matters concerning the Public Health Service.

(e) This section shall apply to annuity payments payable for months after August 1984. No benefit shall accrue to any person by virtue of the enactment of this section for any period before September 1, 1984.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INVENTORY SIMPLIFICATION AND REFORM TAX ACT OF 1983

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our Nation's inventory intensive businesses, I am introducing H.R. 3464, the Inventory Simplification and Reform Tax Act of 1983. The bill, which is a refined version of the measure introduced last Congress, is designed to provide business with a modest degree of tax simplification and equity.

In specific, H.R. 3464 provides for a dramatic change in the tax treatment of business inventories. It is a balanced package of relief designed to help all sizes and types of firms. Joining me today in introducing the bill in the House are Representatives DORGAN, LYLE WILLIAMS, MITCHELL, MCDADE, and CHRISTOPHER SMITH. Senators GEORGE J. MITCHELL and DAVE DURENBERGER are also introducing the companion measure in the Senate.

INVENTORY ACCOUNTING REFORM AND THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY TAX ACT OF 1981

During the 1981 tax debate and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Tax, Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities, I testified before the Ways and Means Committee on the need to provide a coordinated package of tax relief for small business. I stressed that each industrial sector had its own unique capital formation needs and, thus, not all businesses benefited to the same degree from a given tax relief measure. For example, while inventory reform is viewed as an important means of increasing the internal cash flow of small wholesalers and retailers, the adminstration call for accelerated depreciation reform focused on the needs of capital intensive businesses.

As reflected by the so-called accelerated cost recovery system (ACRS), the administration's position on depreciation reform was ultimately adopted and included in the Economic Recovery Tax Act (ERTA) of 1981. In contrast, ERTA only began the road toward tax equity for our Nation's inventory-intensive businesses. This is evidenced by the fact that ERTA mandated the Department of Treasury to complete an inventory tax simplification study and analysis by December 31, 1982.

Since the 1981 legislation, the pendulum and debate over tax policy has shifted dramatically. Members of Congress are now calling for tax equity and the need to close tax loopholes. I fully support this notion. However, we will never achieve true reform without providing our inventory intensive businesses with a modest measure of tax relief and equity. In essence, inventory tax reform should be considered an integral component of the current tax policy debate.

ROOT OF THE PROBLEM—THE COMPLEXITY AND UNCERTAINTY OF THE LAW AND REGULATIONS

The tax regulations provide that a taxpayer must keep an inventory in every case in which the production, purchase, or sale of merchandise is an income-producing factor. In general, the regulations also require a business to use the accrual method of accounting with respect to its purchases and sales of inventories.

Of the two accrual methods for determining the cost of items in the closing inventory, the most widely used is the first-in, first-out (FIFO) method. The preferred method is the last-in, first-out (LIFO) method, as it lessens taxable income in periods of high rates of inflation.

Small business does not use LIFO. However, based on 1978 IRS statistics on corporations, only 2.5 percent of all wholesalers and 1.5 percent of all retailers use LIFO.

PERCENTAGE OF CORPORATIONS USING LIFO IN 1976 AND 1978 [1]

Type of business	Total returns filed for year	Number using LIFO	Percentage using LIFO
Manufacturers:			
1976	212,333	7,720	3.64
1978	223,471	8,478	3.79
Wholesalers:			
1976	226,875	5,698	2.51
1978	254,682	6,323	2.48
Retailers:			
1976	407,666	5,219	1.28
1978	465,920	6,763	1.45

[1] 1976 corporation statistics, Statistics Division, IRS, August 1980 and 1978–79 Statistics of Income, Corporation Income Tax Returns, Internal Revenue Service Pub. 16 (5–82).

In particular, some businesses are not even reporting inventories. For example, 25.5 percent of all retailers filing corporate returns in 1978 did not report any inventory to the IRS. Additionally, 37 percent of all corporate wholesalers and 29.1 percent of all corporate manufacturers did not report any inventory for that year.[2] These statistics could be interpreted to suggest that many small businesses have difficulty maintaining business records for inventory purposes. To help this type of business, one provision of my bill permits specified small businesses to use the case receipts and disbursements method—cash method—of accounting. In essence, it is the simplest of all accounting methods.

[2] 1978–79 Statistics of Income, Corporation Income Tax Returns, Internal Revenue Service Pub. 16.

Mr. Speaker, besides cash accounting, H.R. 3464 provides our Nation's inventory intensive firms with a dramatic simplification of the LIFO inventory method. It also permits businesses to write down excess or obsolete inventory over a 5-year period. In summary, my bill will help elicit discussion of a most important issue for our Nation's businesses. I include the following:

INVENTORY SIMPLIFICATION AND REFORM TAX ACT OF 1981—SUMMARY OF BILL

Section 1. Title of Bill.

Section 2. Repeal of LIFO Conformity Requirement.

Under the present law, a business electing LIFO must keep its financial statements and its tax statements the same. In other words, it cannot use FIFO for financial purposes and at the same time, use LIFO for tax purposes.

This bill would revoke the LIFO conformity requirement.

Section 3. Alleviating the Initial Penalty Associated With the LIFO Election.

If a business wants to elect LIFO, it is required to restore to cost over a three year period inventory writedowns taken in prior years. To alleviate this severe cash drain for the business, it would be permitted to restore inventory writedowns over a ten year period.

Section 4. Simplification of Inventory Pooling Requirements.

Subsection (a): Certain small businesses permitted to use one pool.

The bill would permit businesses with average gross receipts of less than $8 million to use one pool for LIFO.

Subsection (b): Principles for establishing inventory pools.

Wholesalers and retailers (not electing the preceding subsection) would be permitted to pool their goods based on either of the following methods:

1. According to the general expenditure categories of consumer goods described in the CPI Detailed Report; or

2. Based on groupings that are ordinarily and customarily used in their industry.

Section 5. Permitting Businesses to Use Regularly Published Government Price Indexes.

This bill permits any business electing LIFO to use an index based on general categories from the Consumer Price Index or the Producers Price Index.

Section 6. Permitting business to use certain internal indexes, without showing

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

other methods are unsuitable or impractical.

The tax regulations place certain limitations on the type of internal price index a business may use for LIFO.

For businesses wanting to continue to use internal price indexes under LIFO, this bill would broaden the choice of internal indexes. This provision would permit many businesses to use the link chain method of indexing.

Section 7. Computation of LIFO Recapture Amount.

Section 403(b) of the Crude Oil Windfall Profits Tax Act of 1980 requires a corporation to recapture its LIFO benefit as ordinary income in certain specified situations. In general, this recapture occurs when a corporation distributes its LIFO inventory in a partial or complete liquidation of the business.

The bill would generally place limitations on the amount of the LIFO benefit which is recaptured for tax purposes. There would be recapture of the LIFO benefit only to the extent the corporation's product line prices increased at a greater rate than consumer prices. This provision shall apply to distributions and dispositions adopted after December 31, 1982.

Section 8. Cash Receipts and Disbursements Method (Cash Method) of Accounting.

A business may elect the cash method if its gross receipts are less than $2 million and if it meets the active participation test. In general, an active participant is someone who is actively involved in management and whose principal business activity is such trade or business. Further, the cash method business would not be permitted to purchase inventories at the end of the year in excess of its reasonable needs.

Section 9. Treatment of Excess or Obsolete Inventory.

In general, the current tax only permits a business to writedown its excess or obsolete inventory in certain narrowly defined situations. Often, these narrowly defined situations do not reflect the reality of current business practices.

The bill provides an objective standard for businesses in the treatment of the value of its excess inventory. It generally permits a business to reduce the value of its excess inventory over a five year period.●

MX MISSILE

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the upcoming consideration of MX missile funding after the July Fourth work period, I would like to offer for the consideration of my colleagues a letter in opposition to the MX from the environmental group Greenpeace.

GREENPEACE U.S.A.,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1983.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Greenpeace U.S.A., a national environmental organization with more than 280,000 supporters, emphatically opposes the further testing, development, and deployment of the MX missile.

The overwhelming vote by the House of Represenatatives last December rejecting the Densepack basing mode for the MX, was a significant acknowledgement that the era of land-based ICBM's was drawing to an end. MX missiles based in existing Minuteman silos, the basing mode now advocated by the President, is no more supportable—and is probably even less so—than Densepack.

In 1981, President Reagan called for deployment of the MX in Minuteman silos as an interim measure until agreement could be reached for a more permanent basing arrangement. Congress rejected this proposal then, and should do so now. Senator John Tower said during the 1981 debate:

"By stuffing the MX's into fixed silos, we're creating just so many more sitting ducks for the Russians to shoot at . . . It's of little use to us unless the Soviets are convinced it can survive an attack."

We are distressed that Congress recently reversed its decision of last December, releasing $625 million for testing and development of the MX. The MX will not enhance our national security and thus should be stopped now before production of this dangerous weapon begins.

Sincerely,

ERIC M. FERSHT,
Director, Disarmament Campaign.●

CLARIFICATION OF VOTE IN FAVOR OF REPRESENTATIVE CONTE'S GARRISON DIVERSION MOTION

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of setting forth a comprehensive record of my positions I want to indicate the basis of my vote in favor of the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) to instruct the House conferees on the energy and water development appropriation bill to insist that the compromise measure reflect the House position on the Garrison Diversion project.

Representative CONTE's motion deserved support because I believe House conferees negotiating with Senate conferees on any legislative disagreement should be expected to represent the sense of their House colleagues. Funding for the North Dakota diversion project was rejected last December in this Chamber by a 100-vote margin; this year's appropriations bill also includes no funding for Garrison. House conferees therefore have no basis for support of such funding in conference.

However, my support for the Conte motion should not be interpreted as a vote in opposition to funding phase 1 of the Garrison Diversion project.

The Federal Government made a promise to the people of North Dakota in the 1940's that it would build a diversion project in exchange for 500,000 acres of prime land the Government wanted to take from North Dakota and permanently flood in order to create a hydroelectric power dam. The Federal Government got its dam, the the Garrison Dam, but the people of North Dakota never received their end of the bargain. Because I believe Congress is wrong to renege on that commitment, I have historically supported phase 1 of the project.

Nothing will do more to destroy the relationship between the American people and their Government, than a violation by the Government of promises solemnly made.●

A CHILD'S VIEW OF THE SOVIET UNION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we were all gratified to see the release of the Vashchenko family from the Soviet Union. But there are still many infringements of human rights still taking place. I commend to my colleagues' attention this poignant column from the Denver Post by Lillian Hoffman, cochairman of the Colorado Committee of Concern for Soviet Jewry.

The column follows:

SOME SOVIET YOUNGSTERS TO LOOK UP, SAMANTHA

In late April, a great deal of media coverage was given to 10-year-old Samantha Smith of Manchester, Maine, who had written a letter to Yuri Andropov.

The Soviet leader's reply was, in Samantha's words, proof that he was not as grim a man as she had imagined. He invited her to visit the Soviet Union so she can meet children her age and "see for yourself . . . everybody stands for peace and friendship among nations."

We think that Samantha Smith should accept this invitation to tour the Soviet Union. Perhaps she could see some of the children who cannot come to the U.S. to see her. She should ask to meet the following Soviet youngsters:

Dorina Paritsky, whose father, Alexander, was sent to prison for three years for "anti-Soviet slander." He had been running an unofficial university for refuseniks (those denied an exit visa) who were not permitted to go to regular universities. Paritsky was put in a punishment cell for refusing to lift heavy logs after he had suffered a heart attack. Dorina has just returned from a month in the hospital; her illness was brought on, in part, by nervous tension due to her father's incarceration.

Jewish children in Leningrad, who were going to attend a *Purimspiel* (a play celebrating the Jewish holiday of Purim). As they reached the apartment where the play was held, they found it sealed off by 25 militiamen. Ten children against 25 men.

Anna, the 14-year-old daughter of Alexie Murzhenko. Murzhenko, a Christian, was sentenced in 1970 to 14 years in prison for attempting to leave the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, he is now suffering from advanced tuberculosis.

Pentecostal Christian children in Chernogorsk, Siberia, who in April 1982 were sever-

ly beaten by the KGB when they tried to hold a peaceful demonstration. And because their parents were out of money, the children were forced to forage for food in the garbage heaps. They are members of the Vashchenko family, some of whom had found refuge in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow in 1978.

Marina Tiemkin, who was 13 years old in 1973 when she was kidnapped and taken to a youth camp for "re-education." Marina had asked to leave the Soviet Union with her father, Alexander, now living in Israel. Alexander has not heard from Marina for several years. There have been countless cases of separation of families, some for as long as 12 years.

Jewish children, who face a massive "anti-Zionist" campaign. Pedogogika, the Soviet state publishing house, has announced the issue of a book entitled, "The Poison of Zionism," intended for pupils of "more advanced age." The announcement made in Moscow recently, suggest that the subject of anti-Zionism is becoming required reading for Soviet pupils in the 12-to-18 age group.

Evgeny Ozerov of Leningrad, cousin of a Denver Jewish family, is deaf. His parents have not let him learn sign language because of the taunts of his schoolmates. A brilliant student despite his handicap, he has stopped wearing his hearing aid to school because the children pull it out and stamp on it. He and his parents are considered traitors because of their desire to leave the Soviet Union.

Jewish boys, who are prevented from having a Bar Mitzvah. Jews are the only nationality of more than 100 nationality groups who have been denied their constitutionally guaranteed rights—to study their culture and religion, to study Hebrew, to gather together to conduct cultural seminars or celebrate their holidays.

If Samantha is allowed to visit these children, who are among thousands who have been denied the right to leave, she will understand the reality of Soviet life. She will realize that Andropov's signature on her letter promising peace is not any more binding than Soviet signatures on international agreements on human rights, and most recently on the third basket of the Helsinki Accords.

This latest agreement signed by the Soviets, and violated by them time and again, guarantees the right of citizens who wish to leave to do so and for the reunification of families.

Hopefully, Samantha will address these issues in future letters to her new friend, Yuri Andropov.●

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would proclaim March 20, 1984, as National Agriculture Day for next year. As chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I am pleased to present this resolution with the cosponsorship of Hon. EDWARD R. MADIGAN of Illinois, the ranking minority member of our committee.

Farm and city people together have been celebrating National Agriculture Day with a wide and encouraging variety of events for more than a decade. Every year since 1981, the celebrations have been carried out with the added support of laws enacted annually by the Congress and proclamations issued under those laws by the President.

A large number of our colleagues in the House have already joined us as cosponsors of the 1984 resolution. I hope and expect that in the very near future, we will again be joined by enough to make up a majority of the House. This will be a fitting and welcome demonstration of the fact that this body understands and appreciates what a healthy agricultural economy means to the welfare of all Americans.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that these last few years have been difficult ones for the farmers and ranchers of our country. Like many other Americans, they have been going through an economic wringer of great severity. Like other Americans, they hope for better times in the future, and they hope for the understanding of their fellow Americans as they try to recover from the impact of economic blows that have put many farmers out of business.

Is there a good reason for the Nation in general to treat the farm sector as an asset to us all?

I believe there is. I believe that if American farmers were not as productive as they are, if American agriculture was not as efficient as it has become, the American people would be far worse off than they are today. For example, Agriculture Department studies show that the average consumer spends a smaller percentage of his or her disposable income on food today than 20 years ago. Other studies show that these gains have come in a time when consumers were continuing to increase their demand for services associated with prepared foods—a trend that has resulted in reducing the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar from about 38 cents two decades ago to about 37 cents last year.

For the money we spend, we get the best, safest and most varied selection of goods in the world. And we get that food and fiber supply with a regularity and dependability that makes many Americans take it for granted.

Once in a while, however, we should stop taking this abundance for granted. If it were suddenly interrupted, the consequences would be serious and dramatic. I believe we need to remind ourselves and our countrymen that there is also drama of a high order in the fact that American farmers and ranchers, and those who work with them on the land are giving us the ability to sustain not only life, but a rising standard of living—and they are making it possible for less fortunate people to get adequate diets as well.

There is another facet to this observance. Farmers and ranchers today make up only a very small percentage of our people. But in a broader sense, a great many Americans are involved in agriculture. The men and women who work in farm supply industries, in processing farm products and in distributing and selling them—they are all part of agriculture, and there are many millions of them. They, too, have a stake in the observance of National Agriculture Day.

Finally, we should remember that agriculture is a bulwark of our national economy. Agricultural exports are down this year, partly because of the world recession. But they still make up a major segment of our participation in international trade and a basic element in the health of the overall economy.

The sum of all these facts is that American agriculture, while most citizens do not have much personal contact with farms and ranches, is basic to the welfare of all of us as individuals and all of us collectively, as a nation. That is why I hope Members will again join in cosponsoring and passing our resolution to designate next year's National Agriculture Day.●

COMMISSIONING CEREMONY FOR U.S.S. "FLORIDA"

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on June 18 at Groton, Conn. The Trident submarine U.S.S. *Florida* was duly commissioned and the principal address on that occasion was made by Florida's able and greatly revered U.S. Senator PAULA HAWKINS. I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of her speech, filled as it is with wisdom and comments appropriate and helpful to us all:

I am deeply honored to represent the people of the great state of Florida at the commissioning of this new vessel—U.S.S. *Florida*.

As the daughter of a career Navy man, I have vivid memories of attending commissioning ceremonies as a young child with my father. Even then, I could sense the importance of such events. So this opportunity to participate in this ceremony today carries a very personal significance for me.

U.S.S. *Florida* is a vessel whose awesome capabilities will be a vital force for the preservation of peace and the American way of life.

Obviously our nation's defenses have travelled a long way since the name Florida graced the bow of a sidewheel steamer.

It is appropriate that the first vessel to bear the name Florida in 50 years be one of the importance of this Trident submarine. Speaking for the people of the state of Florida, we are honored to have such a namesake.

This new ballistic missile submarine will be one of the most important elements in the defense of the United States and the free world. The nuclear triad composed of land-based I.C.B.M.s, submarine-based I.C.B.M.s and bombers has formed the basis for preventing nuclear war for over thirty years. Of these, our sea-based deterrent has steadily gained in importance. American submarines have long been known for their technological sophistication, and the trident program carries on that impressive tradition. The result is a significant increase in the effectiveness of our sea-based ballistic missile forces, enhancing an already potent force for peace.

I am certain that there is not a man, woman or child here today that would not rejoice at the opportunity to dismantle the armed forces of the world including our own, and to redirect defense spending into programs that could increase the well-being of our society. I would welcome the day when, in the words of the Biblical prophet, Isaiah, we could "beat our swords into plowshares." This is a dream buried deep in the heart of man, and a hope toward which we must continually strive. Furthermore, I believe that we must be willing to take risks for peace, that we must be willing to put forward Herculean efforts to decrease the chance of war. In that regard, we can not be naive. We can not gamble with the lives and freedom of the people we serve. History tells us why. In the last two thousand three hundred years of recorded events, there have been only two hundred and seventy years of peace. It is sad to say, but the record for peace is not good. For every year of peace, we have had ten years of war. My father fought in a war, and so has my husband, and I am determined to expend every effort to see that neither my children nor their children ever have to take up arms against another man. Yet we can not—we must not—turn a blind eye towards the lesson of history. To ignore this lesson, I believe will invite the very disaster we seek to avoid.

Many people mistake the purpose for weapons such as that we are commissioning here today. We call them warships and yet their very purpose is to preserve the peace. Nothing illustrates this better than to examine the mission of this boat. That mission is solely to deter war. I am sure that Secretary Lehman, Captain Powell and every individual who serves onboard this boat would all agree that if the missiles aboard *Florida* are ever fired, they will have failed in their mission, not succeeded. But make no mistake, the missiles and ships such as U.S.S. *Florida* are vital not only to preserving the peace but also preserving our freedom and our way of life so that we have something worthwhile to pass on to our children. We can not afford, for what ever reason, to ignore the threat nor the intentions of any hostile nation. The Soviet military buildup has continued unabated, in the last ten years. The Soviets continue to outnumber us in a number of critical areas such as manpower, artillery, tanks, tactical aircraft, surface ships, and submarines. The Soviet Army continues to occupy Afghanistan. Soviet repression of the Solidarity movement in Poland has succeeded in stifling the voice of freedom and liberty there. The Soviets or their proxies continue to station troops throughout the Middle East and Africa. The Soviet Politburo has allowed its Vietnamese allies to run amok in Cambodia bringing suffering to the Cambodian people and destruction in their society. In other parts of the Far East, hundreds of thousands have been slaughtered in the name of communism. The Soviet and Cuban influence in Latin American affairs had wreaked havoc by spreading revolution throughout the Caribbean, our own backyard.

We ignore lessons of history at our own peril. While we must remain alert for pronouncements from the Kremlin that might reflect a change of purpose, we must not be fooled as Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain was fooled by Adolph Hilter at Munich, 1938. We must watch carefully to see if Soviet actions echo their words.

In an age of thermonuclear weapons, the issues of war and peace take on a very special significance. We are now at an unprecedented point in history.

The technical capability of destroying nations within a matter of minutes does exist. This is a terrifying prospect, and one which has led men and women of sound mind to wish that nuclear weapons had never been invented. The genie, however, cannot be put back into the bottle. That's why it is so vital that we continue to search for ways to deal with the realities that confront us. Until we are able to sit down with those who threaten us and eliminate the weapons of mass destruction I believe that we owe it to ourselves and future generations to maintain the military strength of our armed forces. Only strength will deter war. Those who think that military strength causes war should remember the words of Carl Vinson who served as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. He said, "The pacifist will tell you that military and naval strength cause war. Such a statement is about as logical as one which declares that crime can be abolished by destroying our police forces, that disease can be eradicated by abolishing our hospitals and that fires can be eliminated by abandoning our fire departments." I believe that Carl Vinson was right and that we as a nation cannot be foolhardy when it comes to the question of military strength. We must maintain the strength of our armed forces to convince any nation that it cannot win in an attack against the United States.

There are several key elements maintaining the necessary strength to deter military conflict. Without a doubt the most important is people. It's not missiles, or ships, or tanks, or any of the other things that we so commonly think of as a measure of a nation's military strength. The key to this nation's survival of the feedom and way of life that we hold so dear is—people. It's steelworkers, housewives, and businessmen. It's doctors, sailors, and farmers. It's lawyers, truckers and dockyard workers. It's all the people who comprise our great land, who share in its freedom and contribute to its bounty. It is they who are our frontline of defense. It is their vision, and their hope that form the foundation of our nation's strength. And I believe it is a solid foundation. As long as any potential foe is convinced of the will of the American people to defend their liberty and freedom, no country will dare aggression.

This invaluable service rendered the nation by our men in uniform and those civilians who participate in operation of the day to day defenses of our country should not go unrecognized. Without the men and women who have made and are making sacrifices in the service of their country we would be a nation without any means of defending itself. All too often we take the men and women in uniform for granted. As the daughter of a career Navy man, I know what sacrifices are necessary, and I know of the real impact that these sacrifices have on individuals and their families. From my heart I would like all of those men and women in the Armed Services to know how much I appreciate their service and their efforts. I know that I express the gratitude of both the people of Florida and all Americans in thanking our military personnel both active and retired. I also want to take time to mention and recognize the men and women who have labored to fashion this great vessel. The product of your toil and skill will serve as a valuable addition to the efforts to maintain peace.

As a free people we know we must be eternally vigilant. Furthermore we must remember that we live in a dangerous world, a world filled with violence and conflict between nations, a world which respects strength and tramples weakness. We are therefore bound both by moral obligation, history and our Constitution to promote the peace and prosperity of our people. The first and most solemn obligation of our government must always be to provide for the defense of all Americans. Educated and uneducated, rich and poor, black and white—all benefit from the peace and protection provided by our nation's defenses. Without our freedom and liberty all else is meaningless. I want to say in closing that: Today is a proud day for Florida. Today is a proud day for the United States. Today is a proud day for the free world.

IS THE PRESIDENT A PART-TIME STUDENT?

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, while there is little doubt that our Nation's educational system has its share of problems, I am disturbed by the President's conclusion that one of those problems is excessive Federal interference. Over the last two decades the Federal Government has taken critical steps to assure equal access to education for members of our society with special needs—the minorities, the disabled and the disadvantaged.

During the past several weeks education has become the President's newfound interest. It is evident, however, that although the President preaches "the basics," he does not practice them. A little more reading and a little better arithmetic and the President would recognize that the Federal programs he so casually criticizes are essential components of our Nation's educational system.

If he has any doubt, the President would be well advised to consult the States and local governments. But if the President does not have the opportunity to speak with educators, I commend him and my colleagues to an article which recently appeared in the National Journal:

[From the National Journal, June 6, 1983]

AN "F" FOR FACTS

(By Rochelle L. Stanfield)

It's a beguiling point of view: that the quality of our public schools began going down when federal aid to education began going up. What makes it so appealing to President Reagan is that it offers the easiest solution to today's educational problems: if the federal government does less, the schools will do better.

A recent flood of reports painting a grim picture of elementary and secondary education has given the President his opportunity. Probably the most devastating criticism came from Reagan's excellence commission, whose report, "A Nation at Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform," concluded that "the educational foundations of our society are being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future." Critics particularly deplore the students drift away from tough science and mathematics courses.

The President has pounced on this report to support his goal of a dramatically reduced federal role in education. While the quality of education was declining over the past two decades, Reagan said in his April 30 radio broadcast, "the federal presence in education grew and grew. Parental control over local schools shrank. Bureaucracy ballooned until accountability seemed lost."

At his May 17 news conference, Reagan responded to a question about the decline by saying, "I think you can make a case that [education] began to deteriorate when the federal government started interfering in education." And on May 21, Reagan told the graduating class of Seton Hall University in New Jersey that the nation will not get its money's worth out of elementary and secondary education until "we reverse some of the dangerous trends of recent years. And that means restoring parents and local government to their rightful role in the educational process."

As political rhetoric, that might be fine. But it is not so fine as a reflection of the history of federal education policy.

The so-called federal intrusion into elementary and secondary education has been limited almost exclusively to enforcement of civil rights laws—access to equal education for minorities and the handicapped—and federal aid to help give the disadvantaged an equal educational footing. It has had nothing to do with the education of the average kid—the focus of most of the recent concern.

Most of the "intrusion" in the civil rights area resulted from court mandates that school districts provide all children with their constitutional rights. Most of the money whose growth Reagan so roundly disparages goes to the disadvantaged and handicapped—$4.5 billion of the $6.5 billion for elementary, secondary and vocational education in fiscal 1983—and the regulations that govern its use have been applied over the years after school districts failed to use the funds properly.

Not even Reagan's Education Secretary, Terrel H. Bell, denies the great success achieved by those programs. "I can testify to this committee that our Title I programs [for the disadvantaged] are successful," Bell told the House Education and Labor Committee in May 1981.

Surveys by the National Assessment of Educational Progress in 1970, 1974 and 1979 showed that minority and poor urban children were narrowing the reading and math gap with all other students. Most education experts say Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act was the major reason.

Other statistics show the over-all success of the federal "intrusion." Between 1970 and 1980, while the proportion of high school dropouts rose from 8 per cent to 8.8 per cent for all 16- and 17-year-olds, it dropped for black youths from 12.8 per cent to 6.9 per cent. Between April 1960 and March 1981, the median amount of school for the 25-to-29-year-old population rose slightly from 12.3 12.8 years, while blacks and other nonwhite races nearly caught up, jumping from 10.8 to 12.7 years, according to the National Center for Education Statistics.

The President may want to do away with this federal intrusion, but the National Commission on Excellence in Education does not. It specifically called on the federal government to "help meet the needs of key groups of students such as . . . the socioeconomically disadvantaged, minority and language minority students and the handicapped" and to protect "constitutional and civil rights for students and school personnel."

What about the average kids who opted for "the history of movie making" instead of chemistry? They have never been the concern of the federal government. With almost no exceptions, their schooling has been financed, governed and regulated by state and local governments. Over the years, the states let high school science and math requirements slip, for example, while the local school districts let teachers' salaries lag behind competing professions. There is plenty of blame to heap on them.

Reagan calls for a return of parent and local government power in education. It has always been there. In fact, part of the problem has been that state and local voters—including parents—mounted the property tax revolts in the 1970s that denied schools the financing they needed to keep up.

The excellence commission, along with other recent groups studying educational reform, recommend a variety of steps to reverse the slide. They are corrently addressed to state and local governments, where the responsibility lies. Among the recommendations are more stringent graduation requirements, longer school days and school years and more competitive, market-sensitive salaries for teachers. Most states have initiated educational reforms or are looking into the problem this year.

The problem is the cost. Graduation requirements can be changed with the stroke of a pen, but almost everything else requires cash. Denis P. Doyle, director of education policy studies for the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, conservatively estimates a $13.5 billion price tag just to extend the school day to seven hours and the school year to 11 months and to pay teachers enough to make the profession attractive in the market place. Do Reagan and the commission members really expect the states and localities, already drowning in red ink, to come up with that kind of money?●

REFUGEE SUCCESS STORIES

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the huge influx of refugees in 1980 brought disruptions and hardships to the Miami area. Nevertheless, south Florida made a tremendous effort to absorb these new arrivals.

Many of these persons have put much hard work into their efforts to become productive members of our society and to maintain their vision of the American dream. The individuals described in the following newspaper articles show that those who struggle to be here, as well as those who are fortunate enough to have been born here in the United States, can have freedom and a better life.

The articles follow:

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 23, 1982]

REFUGEE WORKS TO BE FREE OF CHARITY

(By Marcia Cummings)

At $5 an hour, Janet Jean Baptiste is not getting rich—but he is making more money than he ever earned before.

Haitian refugee Baptiste cleans offices from 7 p.m. to 3:30 a.m., five days a week, at a Coconut Grove boat yard.

For Baptiste, who rides a bicycle from his rented room in the Grove to his job, his employment is a big step up from Oct. 26, 1981.

That was the date Baptiste, 22, landed on Miami Beach in a waterlogged boat. He was one of 33 persons aboard. Another 30 originally in the boat had drowned en route.

The Haitian expatriate and pilgrim was detained at the Krome Avenue Detention Center.

"I left Haiti because there were a few things I didn't like," said Baptiste through an interpreter. "I was having a lot of problems with the government."

Krome wasn't much of a welcome to America, he added.

"If one doesn't comply with the rules, then others are made to suffer," Baptiste said. "I went through a lot at the camp."

He was released in August under the sponsorship of the United Methodist Churches and the United Methodist Committee for Relief (UMCOR).

For awhile, Baptiste lived with friends in Florida City.

Church members from Kerr Memorial, Cutler Ridge, Perrine-Peters and Leisure City United Methodist churches in South Dade became his guardian angels. They helped him meet his immediate needs: learning English and finding work, shelter, transportation, food and clothing.

Francis Monson and Charlie Alvarez of Cutler Ridge United Methodist, 20740 Old Cutler Rd., found Baptiste a job at the boat yard.

"We needed a janitor," said Alvarez, production manager at the firm. "Since our church was helping to sponsor him, I figured I would give him a chance. So far he's doing well. He does his work, minds his own business and is always smiling."

"It is competitive, but I could not do this kind of work in Haiti," Baptiste said.

Baptiste's new life still is unsettled as he waits to learn if a federal judge will deny political asylum to Miami's Haitians. The status of the area's Haitian refugees is pending in U.S. federal court.

But Baptiste hopes for the best.

Last week, he received his first U.S. paycheck and immediately planned to open a bank account.

"We discussed what he was going to do with his money," said Lucille Bates, coordinator of the UMCOR's Haitian Resettlement Program. "He kept some for his food and rent and is saving the rest. He's making more money than I do. I think it's great."

Baptiste is one of 20 Haitians sponsored by UMCOR. Each Haitian is supervised directly by one Methodist church. The churches are as far south as Florida City and as far north as Delray Beach.

UNCOR gave each refugee a resettlement grant of $120 and provides a weekly maintenance check of $37.50.

Program sponsors also ensure that each refugee has an attorney and reports weekly to the resettlement center at Grace United Methodist, 6501 N. Miami Ave.

"Right now the program is a success because they are all reporting every Sunday," explained Bates, who supervises the weekly check-in.

Each of the 20 men is quizzed on address changes, any arrests, job hunting and food or clothing needs.

While they waited their turn Sunday in the small library of Grace Methodist, the Haitians chatted quietly at first, then became animated as old friends filed in and volunteers served punch and cookies.

At the desk, they listened carefully to the weekly questions asked in Creole by interpreters.

After reporting, the men received their checks. Those who needed food were given bags of beans and rice. Those who needed clothing were directed to a nearby table.

Louis Jacque Paul, sponsored by the Kendall United Methodist Church, 7600 SW 104th St., eagerly inspected a Winn-Dixie bag filled with shirts, shoes and trousers given him. He is working part time at a Holiday Inn.

Baptiste didn't need food or clothing Sunday. He is working full time now. He also is studying English.

"I hope to accomplish something good for myself in this country," he said.

[From the Miami Herald, June 15, 1982]

2 REFUGEES SET PACE FOR OTHERS

(By Nery Ynclan)

Two years ago, they were 10-year-old refugees who spoke no English, had no friends and faced an uncertain future in their new homeland.

On Monday, Maria Medina and Alina Pagan walked across the stage of South Miami Elementary School to accept awards from their school, the School Board and the city of Hialeah.

The girls had made the academic honor roll. They got A's and B's in all eight subjects, competing in regular classes.

"I was shocked and surprised and happy," said Maria, who came to the United States with her parents during the Mariel boatlift. "In my country there is no freedom. You have to study politics all the time. Here, I learn about everything."

"They are really an example to all of us," said Hialeah Mayor Raul Martinez, who presented the girls plaques from the city at the annual awards assembly.

"I was a refugee 22 years ago and I had the opprotunity to join the mainstream," he added.

School principal Helen Stolte said, "They competed for grades against all the other students and still made honor roll."

Dade schools are filled with thousands of refugee children from Cuba, Nicaragua, Haiti and other Latin countries. They enter a program that teaches them English quickly while helping them not to fall behind in other subject areas.

Stolte said that Alina, from Nicaragua, and Maria are examples of how the program is working.

Their parents have picked up bits of English from the two girls, who stress to them that a new country and a new life means they, too, should master the new language.

"I teach my parents how to say certain things they need to know," Alina said. "You can't go around life with a translator to speak for you."●

HONORING CARLOS J. GARCIA

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay honor to Attorney Carlos J. Garcia, an outstanding man dedicated to serving the people of East Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, and our Nation.

On July 8, 1983, Carlos Garcia is being recognized by the East Los Angeles Community Union. They do this because of his long service as one of its pioneers, earliest professional staff, legal director, and later general counsel.

Carlos was born in Los Angeles on February 13, 1937. The eldest child of Lucia and Moises Garcia, he attended local public schools in East Los Angeles. A graduate of the University of California in 1959, he went on to the University of San Fernando Valley Law School. He is a member of the California State Bar and is authorized to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, Carlos was raised as a Mormon and as a youth was sent to Brazil by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. His missionary duties included the administration of church units in addition to his normal missionary work. Through his work with the Brazilian people, he learned the Portuguese language to compliment his existing fluency in Spanish.

Carlos Garcia's service to his church, community, and family is exemplary. He works diligently as a seminary instructor and is a bishop responsible for 800 members. He has served in important leadership positions, most notably as the chairman of the Mexican-American Programs Foundation, chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Housing Committee for East Los Angeles and as the treasurer of the Ad Hoc Committee to Incorporate East Los Angeles.

He started his early student work as a social case worker for the County of Los Angeles, later becoming a hearing examiner for the city of Los Angeles. In 1967, the State of California assigned him as a rehabilitation counselor working with prison inmates prior to their release. The role as a professional rehabilitation counselor was tailored for Carlos and he later won appointment as a city commissioner to the Human Relations Commission.

Apart from his civic, church, and community endeavors, Carlos has been a devoted son, husband, and caring father. He married Nancy Berkemeyer and they have raised five children: Brenton, Theron, Camille, Dalan, and Arlan.

Mr. Speaker, if East Los Angeles is synonymous with Carlos Garcia it is because he has given so much of his life and work to benefit the community where he was born and raised. He is retiring from TELACU and will continue to follow his legal profession. I know he will continue to feel compassion for his community.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me and the people of East Los Angeles in wishing Carlos Garcia success and happiness in all his future endeavors.●

CALVIN COOLIDGE: A GREAT LEADER FOR DEMOCRACY AND PROSPERITY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the best educated and most underrated Presidents of this century is Calvin Coolidge. He knew a remarkable amount of American and colonial history, and probably understood the principles of the Declaration of Independence and democracy better than any American since Abraham Lincoln.

On economic policy, Calvin Coolidge instituted a series of radical tax cuts for all taxpayers, generating a period of unparalled prosperity for the entire country.

Even Calvin Coolidge's strongest opponents agreed he had complete and utter integrity and restored confidence in Government after the scandals of the Harding administration.

I commend to my colleagues the following pearls of wisdom from President Coolidge's philosophy, thoughtfully reprinted by Marvin Stone, editor of U.S. News & World Report. I can think of no better way to celebrate Calvin Coolidge's birthday than to read and learn from the ideas of one of our greatest Presidents.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. COOLIDGE

(By Marvin Stone)

Once again, we mark Independence Day by recalling the good sense of our 30th President (1923-29). Calvin Coolidge was born on July 4, 1872—the only President with such a distinction. "Silent Cal" may have had his detractors, but the Vermonter's philosophy has worn well through the years. A sampling from the record:

No person was ever honored for what he received. Honor has been the reward for what he gave.

Americans have not fully realized their ideals. There are imperfections. But the ideal is right. It is everlastingly right. What our country needs is the moral power to hold to it.

It is of infinite importance to demonstate that legislation is used not for the benefit of the legislator, but of the public.

Nothing in the world can take the place of persistence. Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men of talent. Genius will not . . . the world is full of educated derelicts. Persistence and determination alone are omnipotent. The slogan "press on" has solved and always will solve the problems of the human race.

The benefit of one is the benefit of all, and the neglect of one is the neglect of all.

Don't expect to build up the weak by pulling down the strong.

There is no dignity quite so impressive, and no independence quite so important, as living within your means.

It has always seemed to me that common sense is the real solvent for the nation's problems at all times—common sense and hard work.

Ultimately, property rights and personal rights are the same thing. The one cannot be preserved if the other be violated.

The meaning of America is not to be found in a life without toil. Freedom is not only bought with a great price; it is maintained by unremitting effort.

Men do not make laws. They do but discover them. Laws must be justified by something more than the will of the majority. They must rest on the eternal foundation of righteousness.

Large profits mean large payrolls.

Industry, thrift, and self-control are not sought because they create wealth, but because they create character.

There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime.

Prosperity is only an instrument to be used, not a deity to be worshipped.

The world has had enough of the curse of hatred and selfishness, of destruction and war. It has had enough of the wrong use of material power. For the healing of the nations there must be good will and charity, confidence and peace. The time has come for a more practical use of moral power, and more reliance on the principle that right makes its own might.

If you see 10 troubles coming down the road, you can be sure that nine will run into the ditch before they reach you.●

OPPOSITION TO THE MX MISSILE

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks ahead, the House will be again called on to make an important decision regarding the MX missile. As we approach a vote authorizing the MX for fiscal year 1984, I think it is vitally important that Members of this body realize the extent of the opposition to the MX among the American people. The following statement by the American Baptist Churches of the United States briefly, but cogently, summarizes the case against the MX. I commend the statement for the attention of all my colleagues.

OPPOSITION TO THE MX MISSILE

The American Baptist Churches USA opposes the MX missile, because it destabilizes the current international military balance and needlessly escalates the arms race. If the MX is deployed, it will have a negative impact on the peace and security of both our country and the Soviet Union. It is a superpowerful, superaccurate, first-strike weapon which does nothing but provoke the Soviets to build their own first-strike weapons.

The MX is not needed by the United States as a bargaining chip. The MX is not needed to modernize the U.S. nuclear forces, nor is it needed to close an imaginary window of vulnerability. The MX is not an appropriate means by which the U.S. can show its resolve to defend itself against attack. The MX is not an effective counter to recent Soviet adventurism. The MX will give the citizens of the United States and the entire world a new chapter in the vicious upward spiral of the arms race, leading to new fears and new threats of destruction. We do not need this missile.●

STATEMENT BY THE COALITION FOR A NEW FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY IN OPPOSITION TO PRODUCTION OF THE MX MISSILE

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement by the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy in opposition to the MX missile, a position I fully support:

The Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy, on behalf of its 51 member organizations, strongly opposes the beginning of production of the MX missile.

For many years, MX advocates justified the program as needed to overcome the growing vulnerability of the U.S. land-based missile force. With that rationale a thing of the past, now the program is being continued as part of an arms control regimen which we believe cannot possibly succeed, and which, in any event, should not be allowed to justify production of a weapon which has no military rationale.

The recent letter by Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director Kenneth Adelman to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, shows how unreasonable the new case for the MX really is. As Senator JOHN TOWER once put it, the MX "is of little use unless the Soviets are convinced that it can survive an attack. Without that, the Russians will have no incentive to start serious arms control talks."

We wonder how serious this administration is about arms control, when it antes up the MX, which by this analysis is virtually worthless, as a bargaining chip equal in value to the entire Soviet force of modern ICBM's.

We see no possibility that construction of the MX will make it easier to negotiate the kind of agreement needed to stablize the strategic balance. On the contrary, production of the first-strike MX missile, together with development of other hard-target-destroying weapons, will only add to the distrust driving the arms race into a new and much more dangerous phase.

Richard Healey, Executive Director; Robert W. Tiller, American Baptist Churches, Coalition Co-Chair; Nancy Sylvester, IHM NETWORK, Coalition Co-Chair.●

LATEST SOVIET HYPOCRISY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues this editorial printed on Monday, June 20, 1983, in the Oxnard Press-Courier. This is yet another prime example of the constant harassment and racial discrimination and oppression by the Soviets against its Jewish population.

LATEST SOVIET HYPOCRISY

It is hypocritical enough that the Soviet Union's new Anti-Zionist Committee contends that few, if any, Soviet Jews still wish to emigrate.

But during a recent press conference in Moscow, the newest official Soviet government committee also asserted there is no discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union.

The committee's mendacity is preposterous. The whole world knows how the Soviet government oppresses Jews.

In recent years, young Jews have been largely excluded from the country's leading colleges and universities. Many who applied to emigrate have been demoted or fired from their jobs. Others have been stripped of academic degrees.

Far from not wanting to leave, at least 300,000 of the country's 1.8 million Jews had written to relatives abroad by 1979 for invitations to emigrate. Such invitations are required for permission to leave the country. The number of Jews allowed to depart, however, dropped from a high of 51,000 in 1979 to less than 2,700 last year.

Moreover, Russian authorities now intercept and refuse to deliver all invitations to emigrate mailed from abroad.

Ironically, the Kremlin's latest campaign against Jewish emigration comes as representatives of the Soviet bloc and the West meet in Madrid to monitor the Helsinki Act on human rights. This is the 1975 accord in which the West ratified East Bloc postwar boundaries in exchange for Russian agreement to respect human rights, including the right to emigrate.

The Anti-Zionist Committee is just one example of how the Kremlin pays lip service to the Helsinki Act while making a mockery of human rights. While maintaining an invasion of Afghanistan abroad, the Soviets have jailed or exiled all avowed human rights activists and other dissidents within the country.

The Western nations should continue to insist in Madrid that the Kremlin honor its agreement to permit free emigration and other civil liberties for Jews and, indeed, all people in the Soviet Union.●

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY—A TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S FARM FAMILIES

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. DE LA GARZA of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have introduced a resolution requesting the President to proclaim March 20, 1984, as National Agriculture Day. We are joined in cosponsorship by our fellow committee members and we hope that our other colleagues in this body will join in support.

It is appropriate that we call attention to the accomplishments of American farmers and ranchers, to that small but essential percentage of our population who produce the food, fiber, and forest products on which we all depend.

Agriculture is indeed a basic business of the Nation's economy—food provider to the Nation and much of the world, the Nation's biggest industry and largest employer.

In a nation whose progress has been geared to its productivity, the American farmer has emerged as a world class champion. Today's farmer produces enough for himself and 77 other persons, including the needy and hungry in many of the world's have-not countries.

At the turn of the century, farming was powered by muscle power—horse, mule, and human muscle—and one farmer produced only enough food and fiber for himself and six other persons. In the early 1900's, mechanization on the farm began to take important shape. As more tractors, harvesters, trucks, and automobiles were purchased by farmers, more acres which had been needed to produce the feed for working farm livestock were released for food production.

With the development of farm mechanization came also the development of agricultural research, technology, and the farmer's know-how. Better seeds, better feeds, better breeds became the hallmarks of the farmer's progress.

And as the farmer's production increased, less manpower was needed on the farm. More people found it possible and profitable to leave the farm and take up other pursuits that helped provide the goods and services for a growing population. The unparalleled productive capacity of American agriculture has truly become the envy of the world—and our Nation's greatest asset.

Agriculture today is an essential part of the long continuum of progress that has helped make America great. And it is the purpose of the resolution we have introduced today to provide for national recognition of that fact.●

CYPRESS CENTURIONS AWARDS NIGHT

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the achievements of the Cypress High School Class of 1983 Award recipients.

These students are being honored for their academic excellence in a university preparatory curriculum, exceptional contribution to school and/or community, superior achievement in a specific curriculum, and exemplary leadership among peers.

Mr. Speaker, to properly honor the Cypress High School Award recipients, I would like to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of these outstanding students:

Eric Aguirre, Paul Anh, Robert Allman, Joanne Amash, John Anderson, Michael Appleby, Adela Augsburger, William Augsburger, Robert Baba, Tahirk Baloch, Robin Balowitz, Philip Bardowell, Beth Barger, Kenny B. Batdorf, Terri L. Blake, Benjamin Boer, Dawn Brennan, Sharon Brown, Kristin L. Burgess, Sean Byerly, Dwayne A. Carrington, Clara Choe, Cindy Chio, Lori J. Cleave.

Michelle Colletti, Rhonda L. Corgard, Robin L. Cox, Cathy Craven, Cora Croce, Steven D. Daly, Jeff Dangaran, Leslie Davis, Brian S. Dean, Colette M. Dern, William T. DeRouchey, Mark DiMaggio, John Donaldson, Wendy Ellerston, Joseph W. Eustaguio, Rose V. Feliciano, Danyelle E. Frakes, Susan Fulbright, Jayne Garrett, Mark Gellerman, Rick Gessay, Glenn P. Getler, Patti Goclowski, Brenda Godsey.

Daksha Gorajia, Alex Gianette, Ariana Graff, Jon Harb, Suzanne Hawkins, Kathleen Hays, Gary Henderson, Sona Herbertson, David Higgins, Nass Hikida, Greg Hill, Bihn Hong, Quyen Hong, Van Hong, Colin Howell, Sheri Inouye, Graciela Jesperson, Anne Johanson, Cynthia Jones, David Keough, Laura Lampert, Patrice Langevin, Anita Lem, Deborah Levine.

Amy Liedahl, Kenneth Lin, Byron Lindros, Scott Lippon, Jeff Lowery, Lisa Lowy, Paul Lynch, Lina Ma, Gary Mah, Sanja Malis, Steve Martin, Leslie Margetich, Laura Marmitt, Diane Marsalla, Obert McCarter, Tracey McDonough, Lauren McKenna, Cornelia McMurray, David Meldrum, David S. Miller, Auesha Mirza, Allen Mon, Kevin Mon, Scott Montanja, Kevin Morello, Kim Moyer, Marlene Murcia, Scott Murphy, Kathryn Noyes, Viola Ng, Joe Nguyen, Khanh K. Nguyen, Dale Ohashi, Maria Ohmoto, Patty Ohmoto, Julie Orton, Kenneth W. Owens, Traci Paul, Shannon Peterson, Kim Amh Pham, Thuy T. Pham, Kevin E. Pollock.

Timothy S. Powers, Robert Puskas, Ron Ramirez, Michael Roberts, Matthew Rocke, Susan Rogers, Beverly Rodriguez, Rosalia I. Rodriguez, Kirby Rollins, Steven Ross, Dennis Rudolph, Loretta Salcido, Ricki Scholl, Suzi Sharum, Janiece S. Shelton, Paul Shirts, Tammy Shrigley, Tammie J. Siefert, Steven Slick, Etan Swenson, Karen L. Summers, Alex Takagi, Krista C. Taylor, Inger C. Thompson, Lorraine Terpening, Corrine Terres, Dee Tidwell, Khai Tran, Thanh Tran, Thuhang Tran, Thunh Tran, Toan Tran, Adel Truisi, Anthony Tubbs, Dale Turner, Teresa Valis, Robert Walker, Shellie Walker, Eric A. Watanabe, Wendy L. Weinberg, Thomas Wickenhisser, Kenneth L. Wong, and Jannette Yang.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saluting these outstanding young people for their worthwhile achievements. These students have not only instilled pride in their school, but in their families and community as well.●

CAPTIVE NATIONS VIGIL COMMITTEE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically support the fine efforts of the Captive Nations Vigil Committee. As all of my colleagues know, the committee is organizing a commemoration of those people who have lost their freedom and independence over the years to Communist totalitarianism. The commemoration will begin on July 1, and will end on July 2 at the end of a 24-hour "Chronology of Betrayal," during which a chronological history of those nations which have fallen under Communist domination will be read. In addition, a participant will read the names of the many victims of communism in those lands. In addition, testimony will be given by those who have witnessed Communist atrocities in their homelands.

I congratulate the fine efforts of the committee and I am proud to rise with my colleagues and compatriots throughout this great land in voicing our strong support, unwavering admiration, and sympathy for those nations suffering under the grip of communism.

It is appropriate that the committee is paying special homage to those men and women of many nations who do not enjoy the independence, liberty, and human rights accorded to us in democratic nations around the world. Years ago, most Americans thought only of Eastern Europe when they thought of repression and human rights violations. This year, the violations of human freedom cover the front pages of our newspapers and Americans need no reminders of the reality of communism today. The horror of life in many countries is constantly before us. News of the deprivation of human rights in the Soviet Union and other nations comes to us with every morning's newspaper.

The suppression of human rights—freedom of thoughts, conscience, religion, and self-determination—is prevalent in many nations. It has spread from Eastern Europe to Afghanistan, and from Southeast Asia to Cuba. Through terror and deceit, the Communists have been ruthless in their efforts to control the captive peoples in these lands. Yet the hunger for freedom cannot be destroyed. It will not be destroyed by those oppressive regimes. Let us always remember that, though the struggle for freedom is painful, it is a battle well worth pursuing and a war that will be won. At this very moment, our Nation is assisting the struggling democracies in Central America and is trying to provide economic assistance to foster political stability in those beleaguered nations so that democracy can bloom. Who would want America to stand by and watch our nearby allies be slowly but surely added to the list of captive nations.

Our President's recent remarks and programs give me encouragement that the battle for freedom will be won. Unlike many past Presidents, President Reagan is vitally interested in the issue of captive nations and has made a personal commitment to this vital question. During this very period when the forces of communism are aggressively reaching out to entice more countries into their grasp, President Reagan is doing all that he can to spread the word to friend and foe alike that our Nation will not stand idly by and watch formerly free nations fall victim to communism.

I was recently encouraged by the President's efforts to dispatch Vice President BUSH to Europe to establish and talk about the International Democrat Union, an organization which will carry on the work of promoting democracy.

We should all be proud of our democratic and open system and should not be shy about telling democracy's story to the rest of the world. If we fail to accept this challenge, more countries will surely be added to the already long list of captive nations. With the importance of their mission in mind, I salute the efforts of the Captive Nations Vigil Committee and wish them well in their endeavors.●

STATEMENT FROM NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION ON MX MISSILES

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with our colleagues a statement from the National Education Association (NEA) concerning the upcoming vote on procurement funds for the first 27 MX missiles. While I believe we need a well-trained and well-equipped defense, I share the NEA's concern about the production of excessive nuclear weaponry which can only result in a continuing and escalating arms race.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1983.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The House of Representatives is expected to vote soon after the July 4th recess on funding authorization for the first 27 MX missiles. This is an issue of overriding importance for the future direction of our country's national security and arms control policies.

Halting funds for production will not jeopardize our national security. Production, however, will result in another dangerous escalation of the arms race by both sides.

NEA strongly urges you to oppose any funds for production or development of the MX missile and to support the Bennett/Mavroules amendment which would delete $2.5 billion for production of the first 27 missiles.

Sincerely,

LINDA TARR-WHELAN,
Director of Government Relations.●

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE ADOPTS RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ETHIOPIAN JEWS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, last month the New York State Legislature adopted a resolution, introduced by Senator Manfred Ohrenstein, calling upon the United States to assist this ancient Jewish community. Because of the importance of this issue, I insert this resolution in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Similar legislation is currently before the House. I recently introduced House Concurrent Resolution 107, which expresses the concern of the Congress for the plight of the Jewish community in Ethiopia. I hope that other Members will join the 48 Members who have already cosponsored this resolution.

The Ethiopian Jewish community has survived centuries of conversion attempts by missionaries, and harassment and persecution by various regimes.

Freedom of religion is officially recognized in Ethiopia. However, according to the State Department's "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1982," the Falasha, meaning "stranger or landless one," have suffered from obstacles to the practice of their religion, and other severe discrimination.

The Falasha are also among the 800,000 Ethiopians hard hit by the severe drought, Ethiopia's worst since 1973, that has swept the northern parts of the country.

As a result of their ongoing difficulties in Ethiopia, many of the Falasha have sought to emigrate so that they might live in freedom and practice their religion without interference. Unfortunately, the Ethiopian Government frowns upon emigration. Despite these restrictions, several thousand Ethiopian Jews have fled over the borders to neighboring countries where they live as refugees.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and congratulate New York State Senator Manfred Ohrenstein and his colleagues for passing this resolution. Mr. Ohrenstein has long been a champion of humanitarian causes, and his resolution in support of the Ethiopian Jews eloquently asserts the importance of providing assistance to this long-suffering people.

RESOLUTION

(Legislative resolution calling upon the Government of the United States, through its President, its State Department and its Congress, to extend the help of its diplomatic offices to the Ethiopian Jews by negotiating with the several countries where they now live to permit them to depart for other hospitable shores of their own choosing)

Whereas, The Ethiopian Jews are amongst the oldest continuous Jewish communities in existence, their history extending back for three thousand years; and

Whereas, From heights of power and influence in that African country, they were finally defeated in battle and forever after experienced only poverty, landlessness, political impotency, religious persecution and discrimination; and

Whereas, Once numbering nearly one million, their present census has been radically reduced to only twenty thousand, of which several thousand are suffering bitterly as helpless refugees in another county in the Horn of Africa; and

Whereas, They have daily prayed for centuries that they might be able to live in peace and security amongst their kinsmen in other lands; and

Whereas, The United States has always been a haven for the persecuted and downtrodden of other countries, immigrants who after arrival have contributed significantly to the development of this great land; and

Whereas, This ancient group is in danger of actual physical extinction unless immediate large scale assistance is forthcoming

from a generous and powerful country like the United States; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body does hereby call upon the Government of the United States, through its President, its State Department and its Congress, to extend its diplomatic offices to this helpless group of people by negotiating with the several countries where they are now living to permit them to depart for such other hospitable shores of their own choosing; and by providing whatever assistance is necessary in the form of a significant number of visas, grants for travel and maintenance, and aid in their absorption in this country, if such is required; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the entire New York State Congressional Delegation, and to such other individuals and organizations that can assist in this lifesaving mission.●

DIVEST IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, I would like to urge my colleagues to consider the merits of a debate sweeping universities across the country regarding American investment in South Africa. There seems to be a growing ground swell of support for U.S. divestiture.

I would like to commend to my colleagues the following New York Times op-ed piece, "No, Instead Divest," of June 24, 1983 by Harvard professors Michael Joseph Smith and Stanley Hoffmann, who argue first, that foreign investment in South Africa does not increase U.S. leverage over South Africa's internal policies; second that American investment does not necessarily benefit black workers and third that continued investment in South Africa runs the risk of condoning, perhaps even strengthening, injustice.

I would urge each member to read this article, to consider its message not only to American universities, but especially to ourselves as legislators who will be considering next month various proposals that review our Nation's ties to South Africa.

. . . No, Instead Divest

(By Michael Joseph Smith and Stanley Hoffmann)

Cambridge, Mass.—Why should American universities divest from companies that do business in South Africa? The most powerful reason is the character of the South African regime: No government since Nazi Germany has been so infected with an official ideology of racial supremacy.

Repression in South Africa is institutionalized throughout society. Blacks are systematically denied the most basic human rights. Philosophers often disagree about whether these basic human rights are essentially civil and political in character or social and economic, but in South Africa, the issue does not arise: The majority population of blacks, Asians and the people of mixed race known as colored lives under a minority regime that forcibly prevents them—with all the trappings of legality—from exercising both their political and economic rights. In short, South Africa is a uniquely malign, racist police state for which the sanction of corporate withdrawal is appropriate.

Of course, many of those who favor continued investment and business-as-usual with South Africa disapprove of apartheid. The problem is how best to demonstrate our disapproval and affirm our commitment to the values of universal human dignity that are at the heart of all institutions devoted to the pursuit of learning and truth. Opponents of divestiture argue, first, that it is ineffective; second, that it is costly; third, that it may even make things worse for those most oppressed; and fourth, that divestiture amounts to naive moralism. Harvard University's president, Derek Bok, for example, recently said proponents of divestiture are "counseling us to run from evil rather than work to overcome it. . . . Realistically, there is little that a university in the United States can do to overcome the evils and injustices in a land far removed from our own."

We respectfully disagree. Universities in particular have a special responsibility to act in accordance with the values upon which they are founded, and that responsibility may entail taking a clear and unambiguous stand for what is right—even if its effects are not immediate. The movement to abolish the slave trade and prohibit slavery in early 19th century Britain is instructive here: Had its leaders been guided by considerations of immediate effectiveness and cost, their campaign would have died at birth. On some basic issues, doing the right thing is important in itself. On apartheid, universities should be leading, not apologizing.

Of course, many argue that shareholder resolutions to require adherence to the voluntary code devised by the Rev. Leon Sullivan, a Baptist minister, for businesses operating in South Africa are more effective than divestiture and withdrawal. But even if such efforts aimed at promoting "change from within" were lasting and sincere—a dubious assumption, at best—they have obviously failed to make the slightest dent in the overall system of apartheid. If anything, the situation in which 250,000 people are arrested each year for violations of restrictive racial codes has become worse.

Concerning the financial cost of divestiture, we appreciate the problem but believe it to be overstated. No one is asking universities to dump all their stock at a loss tomorrow. What matters is establishing the principle of divestiture as a goal.

Will divestiture exacerbate conditions among black workers? In certain cases it might—but very major black leader and group has nevertheless called for corporate withdrawal. As Bishop Desmond Tutu, General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches, has said, "We ask our friends to apply economic pressure . . . . Our last chance for peaceful change lies in the international community applying political, diplomatic and especially economic pressure."

Moreover, it is doubtful that foreign investment has improved the position of black workers. The gap between white and black wages is widening, and employment opportunities remain vastly unequal. More and more, the assertion that American investment helps poor blacks smacks of questionable rationalization.

Finally, proponents of divestitute are charged with seeking an unattainable moral purity. Certainly the danger of ineffectual moralism exists—and as teachers of ethics in international relations we are well aware of its pitfalls. But there is also a danger of justifying present policies of investment: pious hypocrisy or the (however reluctant) condoning of evil.

We believe it is not naive, but moral, to divest. Divestiture means more than washing our hands of the guilt of association. It is a constructive act designed to put pressure on an evil system and demonstrate in the clearest way possible that American universities are committed to the fundamental value of our common humanity.●

HONORING THE EAST LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY UNION 1981-82 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, Senator Robert Kennedy when serving as a U.S. Senator from New York, set into motion legislation that was to have far-reaching effects for poor people in America. He was the prime mover of title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act. Title VII authorized the U.S. Government to assist qualified urban and rural communities in answering unattended socio-economic problems through a community-controlled organization.

Early in 1968, the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) and the United Auto Workers (UAW) had joined together with other concerned unionists and community residents to improve the quality of life of the largest Mexican-American barrio in the United States. This became the mandate for the East Los Angeles Community Union (TELACU).

Supported by title VII designation as a community development corporation, it forged boldly ahead designing and setting strategies for resolving chronic unemployment, substandard housing, needed transportation, inadequate health care, and a myriad of other issues.

Mr. Speaker, the most notable aspect of this undertaking was that from the very inception of TELACU, its board of directors—made up of some of its original pioneers and community residents—were the driving force behind the plan to rebuild the face of East Los Angeles. Today, they direct and authorize venture strategies in an effort to create community income and job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, TELACU stands out today as a model community-controlled organization. Known throughout the United States and the world as

an example of how low-income Americans working through great adversity, hard work, democratic principles, and commitment to their community can indeed succeed.

Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1983, TELACU will honor many of its early founders and 1980-81 board members. I have the honor to submit to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, the names, posts, and dates of service of the TELACU board members. They are to be commended for having accepted a challenge at a time in history that was bleak and dark for poor people. Today, there is light and optimism and they leave a legacy for others to follow with pride and to emulate with honor.

THE EAST LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY UNION BOARD OF DIRECTORS, 1981-82

Joe L. Gonzalez, Chairman, 1/1/81 to 10/5/82.

Dolores Carrillo, Interim Chair Secretary, 10/5/82 to 12/31/82 and 1/1/81 to 10/5/82.

Mauricio Terrazas, 1st Vice Chair, 1/1/81 to 10/26/82.

Jay Candelaria, 2nd Vice Chair, 1/1/81 to 12/31/82.

George Solis, Treasurer, 1/1/81 to 12/31/82.

Jose Elizondo, Member, 1/1/81 to 12/31/82.

Carlos G. Garcia, Member, 1/1/81 to 12/31/82.

Pilar Hernandez, Member, 1/1/81 to 12/31/82.

David C. Lizarraga, Member, 6/23/81 to 12/31/82.

Gordon Moreno, Member, 1/1/81 to 12/31/82.

Antonio Parocua, Member, 1/1/81 to 4/19/82.

Hank Gonzalez, Member, 4/28/81 to 4/19/82.

Fernando Guzman, Member, 4/28/81 to 3/16/82.

Alex Sotomayor, Member, 1/1/81 to 5/27/82.●

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, during July the House may begin consideration of the Export Administration Amendments Act of 1983 (H.R. 3231). No other trade statute so intimately intertwines international trade, foreign policy, and national security. Recently, the Committee on Foreign Affairs approved amendments to the existing statute which impose on the executive branch requirements to eliminate certain national security controls or limit the effectiveness of foreign policy controls.

For more than 30 years, this legislation has enabled Congress and the President to cooperate and jointly determine the degree to which militarily sensitive goods and technologies should not be sold, directly or indirectly, to the Soviet Union and other potential adversaries. In light of the Supreme Court's invalidation of the legislative veto, it is all the more important that Congress and the White House find a common ground on export control policy.

In the Subcommittee on Economic Policy and Trade, we have worked diligently to strike a proper balance between business, Congress, and the administration. I share my colleagues' concern that U.S. trade policy encourages exports. However, the primary purpose of the Export Administration Act is to restrict exports. The justifications for these restrictions must meet a prescribed set of conditions. Among the primary objectives of the current act are "to reduce the number of items subject to validated license controls" for reasons of national security and "to establish a set of criteria and procedural requirements to govern the use of foreign policy controls." Republicans and Democrats on the committee were unanimous in endorsing these objectives when the current law was written in 1979.

The approach reflected in H.R. 3231 eliminates a number of important national security and foreign policy controls as opposed to adding definition and clarity to the conditions enabling the President to act. If the legislation as drafted were to become law, there would no longer be a requirement for U.S. exporters to obtain validated export licenses for exports to most of Western Europe and Japan. At the same time, the bill obliges the President to undertake negotiations with our major trading partners to improve multilateral export controls over militarily sensitive goods and technologies.

Since 1949 the United States has participated in an informal coordinating committee of Western trading nations, known as Cocom, to restrict the transfer of militarily related items to the Soviet Union. As a result of the administration's deep concern over the transfer of such goods and technologies to the Soviets, the first high-level meeting of Cocom principals was held in January 1982. As a result of this ministerial meeting, and a subsequent meeting in October 1982, Cocom by unanimous agreement accepted the U.S. position to consider placing technologies—as opposed to products—on its list of controlled items. If the United States weakens its commitment to maintaining and enforcing a system of multilateral export controls, the Europeans and the Japanese will surely respond by weakening their own controls. The only winner will be the Soviets, who have embarked on a massive campaign to acquire the fruits of Western research and development.

There are alternatives to eliminating without a suitable replacement export controls which do protect the national security. It involves Congress requiring the executive branch to develop a list for goods, technologies, and keystone equipment which are genuinely militarily critical to the Soviets. The bill contains an amendment complete a militarily critical technologies list. It offers an alternative to several other provisions which lift controls instead of attempting to improve the control system.

H.R. 3231 also severely restricts the President's ability to impose the conduct of modern diplomacy; there are very few options before the President. There are times when the United States must be able to react with all deliberate speed to make its position known. One of the few instruments of crafting foreign policy is economic and trade sanctions. Foreign policy controls must be guided by four principals:

First, they must be timely;

Second, they must control exports for the United States;

Third, they must, to be effective, have extraterritorial application;

Fourth, they must include the authority, in certain special circumstances, to place foreign policy objectives over the terms of existing contracts.

However, the committee approved the elimination of extraterritorial controls in the absence of a joint resolution—the same instrument required for a declaration of war. International trade is a partnership between the President and Congress. Rather than restricting his foreign policy authority, Congress has the legislative prerogative to set down guidelines in which the President can exercise his constitutional responsibilities.

When this legislation comes to the floor, amendments will be offered to clarify and define the President's authority to control exports. Provisions in H.R. 3231 which compel the President to place individual export sales above major policy and national considerations should be modified.

The Export Administration Act is a highly complex and technical statute. It must be approached from three vantage points: Trade, national security, and foreign policy. There must be a balance among these factors. This legislation is very complex and lends itself to multiple value judgments. Therefore, I ask that my colleagues review this legislation in detail.●

THE MAGIC CITY

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, industry created the city of Birmingham, Ala. Incorporated in 1871 with a population of only 1,200, it became a

booming town 20 years later that was nicknamed "The Magic City" because of its rapid growth.

Birmingham is the only spot in the world where iron ore, limestone and coal, the raw materials necessary for making iron and steel, are found in abundance. Coal and ore mining and steel production brought jobs to hundreds of thousands in the area in the early 1900's and economic prosperity to the city.

Basic changes in many industries and today's poor economic conditions may have stilled many of the coke furnances and closed many coal and ore mines in Jefferson County, but the life and activities that abounded when Birmingham was the "Industrial Center of the South" will endure, thanks to Mrs. Marjorie White of Birmingham, author of the book "The Birmingham District: An Industrial History and Guide." Mrs. White is also the author of "Downtown Birmingham—Architectural and Historical Walking Tour Guide."

I would like to commend Mrs. White for her accomplishments and for her desire to make certain that the history of the growth and development of Birmingham and Jefferson County is preserved for future generations.

The text of an article in the June 13, 1983, Birmingham Post-Herald applauding Mrs. White for her activities, follows:

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, June 13, 1983]

THE MAGIC CITY

(By Carolyn Stern)

People came out of their houses in Docena and Brookside to stare and wave at the Greyhound bus that labored around corners designed for one-lane auto or buggy traffic.

It was a painless history lesson for the bus passengers. They were getting a first-hand look at towns that make up the industrial past of the Birmingham area, described in "The Birmingham District: An Industrial History and Guide."

Author Marjorie White stood at the front of the bus, giving a running commentary on the workers' and superintendents' houses, company stores and ghost towns.

The tour, and others like it, represent the third and final point of Mrs. White's research of the area over the past eight years.

She says her purpose has been to document the history, publish it and, above all, to get people out on tours to see the remnants of the time around the turn of the century when Birmingham was just awakening to its strength as an industrial giant of the South.

"In recording the past, we're taking the best from the past and interpreting it for future generations."

A romance language major, with a master's degree from Yale University, Mrs. White says she didn't take history in college because "it was too boring."

Born in Pittsburgh, she lived in Chicago before moving to new Orleans when her father, Dr. Herbert Longenecker, became president of Tulane University.

She says she and her parents "worked out a deal" about her college education—that if she stayed at home and went to Newcomb College (at Tulane), she could travel in the summer and increase her language proficiency. She spent summers in Canada, Mexico and Europe.

Her husband, Jim, is from Birmingham and they moved back in 1968.

Mrs. White taught French for a while at the University of Alabama in Birmingham, and one student remembers that she made learning French as much fun as learning history.

Along with verb conjugation and study of Antoine de Saint Exupery's "The Little Prince," the class learned to give a rousing rendition of "La Marseillaise" and feasted on Camembert cheese, French bread, strawberries and champagne.

When she and her husband started their family (three children in three years), Mrs. White says she realized her traveling might be somewhat curtailed, so she turned her attention to finding out about the town in which she lived.

After becoming associated with the Birmingham Historical Society in 1975 and finding there was no definitive guide to Birmingham's history, she took on the chore of developing one.

Though she calls the Birmingham District book (published in 1981) her "magnum opus," she is also the author of "Downtown Birmingham—Architectural and Historical Walking Tour Guide," published in 1977.

Tours of the downtown area began in 1978, and Boy and Girl Scouts earn badges declaring they have taken part in identifying landmarks and architectural details.

Mrs. White says she tried out the student tours on her children. "And they gave me their opinions. When they were younger, they said, 'Why do you want to do that? Those buildings are so dirty.' "

Now Marjorie Lee, 13, James, 12, and Goodloe, 11, work along with their mother on her projects. Marjorie Lee served as hostess on the recent bus tour, passing out apples, lemonade and cookies.

Mrs. White credits her husband, who is an investment banker, with practical assistance on book publishing. "It was my husband who had the writing and publishing expertise—and financial background."

She says the role of volunteer fits in with her lifestyle.

"I couldn't work 9 to 5. I think my own creativity would be killed. I put in 40-50 hours a week with the historical society, but not 9 to 5."

It's easy to believe her statement that she never gets nervous or bored. She doesn't have the time. She has enough projects lined up to occupy her for at least another three lifetimes.

Now she's working at Sloss Furnance, helping chart foundations of coke ovens that are being uncovered. She says she spends her time fighting fire ants and noonday heat instead of relaxing in her backyard with a cool lemonade because, "They need help."

And the project is interwoven with her research for the Birmingham District, she says. Coal from the mining towns like Cardiff, Brookside and Blossburg was brought to the Sloss Furnace.

"Plus," she says, "I've never been on a 'dig' before, and it's right here in downtown Birmingham."●

A HERO RETURNS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to bring to your attention the story of one of my constituents, Mr. Alexander Drabik of Holland, Ohio.

During World War II, Sergeant Drabik was in command of a unit of Army riflemen. On March 10, 1945, at Sergeant Drabik's initiative, this unit crossed into German territory over the Rhine River at Ramagen. By capturing this bridge and breaking down German defenses beyond it, Mr. Drabik's surprise maneuver was instrumental in assuring the Allies victory in Europe. As the first American to set foot over the Rhine at Ramagen, Mr. Drabik was hailed as a hero and praised as a soldier with an extraordinary ability to lead and inspire others. This feat has been called the turning point of the war on the western front according to the Chicago Sunday Times. For his bravery, Alexander Drabik was awarded our Nation's second highest medal of valor, the Distinguished Service Cross.

I stand today to tell you of Mr. Drabik's action because 37 years after first crossing the Rhine, Mr. Drabik will soon travel to Germany for a reunion with his unit. As Mr. Drabik returns to visit Germany, I believe it is fitting that we assure him that his brave actions during the war are not forgotten, and that we again commend his courage and the courage of those who served under him.●

IN OPPOSITION TO THE MX MISSILE

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an open letter to the U.S. Congress from the Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control in opposition to the land-based MX missile.

The National Board of Directors of the Lawyers Alliance for Nuclear Arms Control, Inc. unanimously calls upon the Congress of the United States to adopt an immediate six-month moratorium on MX missile production funds in fiscal year 1984. Believing that the recent action of the Congress in authorizing 1983 testing funds for the MX was ill-considered, the Lawyers Alliance views a six-month moratorium as a minimum necessary step to preserve our national interests and security.

Congress should impose this six-month moratorium so that the United States may seek a mutual and verifiable freeze on test-

ing and deployment of all new multiple-warhead ICBMs. The procedure would be similar to that taken with regard to the 1983 testing funds and would be consistent with the overwhelming approval by the U.S. House of Representatives of the Freeze resolution on May 4, 1983.

Moreover, in letters to Members of Congress on May 11 and 12, 1983, the President pledged to take new steps to advance nuclear arms reduction. These steps cannot be taken and evaluated before the Congress votes on the procurement of the MX missile unless there is a moratorium. This moratorium would allow the President to comply with commitments made to Congress in securing 1983 funding, and provide an opportunity to seek a mutually beneficial freeze on new American and Soviet multiple-warhead land-based missiles.●

SERGEANT HAMPTON, DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT, RETIRES FROM THE CYPRESS POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1983, a very dedicated Cypress police officer was honored by his family, friends, and many appreciative citizens for his loyal service to the community. He was honored on the occasion of his retirement. I know my colleagues in the House want to join with me in honoring this man.

Police Sgt. Walter F. Hampton is a 21-year veteran of the Cypress Police Department. He was first hired as a police officer on January 22, 1962. In 1968, he became a police agent, and was promoted to the rank of police sergeant in 1969.

Sergeant Hampton has had a very distinguished career. He holds the distinction of being honored as the first Officer of the Year in Cypress in April 1967. In addition to the commendations he has received for his outstanding work, Sergeant Hampton has attended many specialty schools. He has earned the intermediate, supervisory, and advanced certificates from the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.

Sergeant Hampton's career has included work as the vice intelligence officer, the watch commander in the patrol division, and the operational supervisor of the support services division. He has also served in the investigations division.

Sergeant Hampton has had the loving support of his wife, Patricia, for over 33 years. The Hamptons are La Habra residents, and have been blessed with three children.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of Sergeant Hampton to the security, safety, and betterment of the Cypress community can never be fully recognized. I know my colleagues in the House wish to join with the many Cypress citizens in wishing this fine man every success as he begins a new phase in his life.●

NEED TO PROVIDE EFFECTIVE SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the problems of soil erosion and the need to provide effective soil conservation programs is a challenge that the Congress has faced often in the past. Despite our continued record of support for soil conservation programs, we still have a serious problem of soil erosion and waste in this Nation. Such waste cannot be allowed to continue without extracting a serious toll on our future economic strength, so it is a matter of vital concern to all of us.

Our traditional approach has been to provide research, education, technical assistance, and economic incentives to farmers, ranchers, foresters, and other land users, in order that they might be encouraged to carry out good soil conservation management as part of their daily operations on the land. This approach is widely supported and has been credited with prevention of tremendous amounts of damage that would otherwise have occurred.

But the record today tells us that the traditional approaches continue to fall short. Soil erosion rates are too high, and farmers are finding it hard to install and maintain needed conservation systems. Part of the problem, I believe, is the impact of Federal farm programs themselves. Too often, they provide the financial incentive which leads farmers to carry out land-destructive practices or else penalize the farmer who tries to do a good job on his land. I am convinced that these adverse effects of Federal programs—even if they are completely unintentional effects—can and must be stopped.

It is in that light that I am today introducing the Soil Conservation Act of 1983. I am indeed pleased that three of my colleagues from the House Agriculture Committee are also joining me as original cosponsors: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, the ranking minority member of the Conservation Subcommittee which I chair; Mr. HARKIN of Iowa; and Mr. JEFFORDS of Vermont.

This bill has three operating titles. The first would halt the Federal subsidies that have helped underwrite the cultivation of marginal lands. It would not prevent a farmer from cultivating any land he wishes to cultivate, but if it is land where the scientifically determined capability is such that continuous cultivation will result in excess soil erosion or land damage, the farmer would have to farm that land without the assistance of Federal income support or financial incentive programs.

The second title would allow farmers who wish to utilize crop rotations, grass or legume seedings, hay, pasture, or similar crops as a means of preventing soil erosion and building up their soil to do so without running the risk of incurring penalties in the event of a future crop stabilization program. The device proposed in this legislation is a "certified voluntary set-aside," where farmers would certify to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that certain lands are being set aside on a voluntary basis for conservation purposes. These voluntary set-asides would not cost the Federal Government any money—the farmers would not be paid for setting them aside. Through this program, we could cut back on surplus crop production and improve soil conservation at the same time—and at no public expense.

But when a future farm program is announced, the farmers who have entered the certified voluntary set-aside would have some advantages over their neighbors who have chosen to raise grain fence-to-fence. That would reverse the situation we have today, where the fence-to-fence grower has the advantage.

Under this legislation, the farmer with the voluntary set-aside would have his normal crop acreage base computed on the basis of the crop rotation in effect at the time he entered the voluntary set-aside. In other words, he would not lose his crop history because of a good conservation system. If a mandatory set-aside is called for, he would be able to designate any of his voluntary set-aside acres to meet those mandatory requirements. By complying with any regulations imposed by the Secretary at that time, he could meet the program requirements more easily as a result of having voluntarily chosen a conservation system and having gone through the effort to keep it certified with USDA.

Mr. Speaker, neither of these programs would cost the Federal Government anything significant in terms of Federal outlays. All that either of them would require would be modest administrative costs. No funds would be needed for direct payments to farmers. These programs would not solve all our conservation problems, however, and there will be other programs needed which would require continued Federal appropriations. I believe that these low-cost, commonsense approaches should be instituted as soon as possible in order to keep budget outlays down and make the other Fed-

eral conservation programs that much more effective.

The third title in the Soil Conservation Act of 1983 is what I call the "conservation reserve program." It would consist of a paid diversion aimed at the croplands which suffer the most serious soil erosion. Soil erosion studies indicate that erosion damage is far higher on some croplands than on others. Again, these are lands which can be identified by the Soil Conservation Service on the basis of their scientifically determined soil properties, slope, and climate.

I believe that getting these lands out of intensive crop use would be the most cost-effective way for the Nation to dramatically reduce soil erosion and the tremendous price it is extracting from us all. The increased water pollution, flooding, dust storms, and other damage coming from those seriously eroding croplands damages every American, and I think it is in the public interest to pay what is needed to halt that damage. This is a program which would require Federal spending—I see no way around that. But I do feel it would be cost-effective spending and would result in more than a dollar's worth of damage reduced for every dollar we spend.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to seriously study the proposals contained in the Soil Conservation Act of 1983. I think they offer the chance to move toward Federal programs that do the job without excessive Federal outlays and with full regard for the private rights of farmers. The need is significant, and the time to move is now.

At this point, I insert the text of the Soil Conservation Act of 1983 to be printed following my remarks.

H.R. 3457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Soil Conservation Act of 1983.

TITLE I—POLICY, FINDINGS, AND DEFINITIONS

POLICY

SEC. 101. Congress hereby reaffirms its policy to promote soil and water conservation, improve the quality of the Nation's waters, and preserve and protect natural resources through the use of effective conservation incentives that encourage farmers participating in all federal programs to carry out good soil conservation management on a voluntary basis and through the minimization of federally-funded incentive programs that have the effect of encouraging farmers to violate basic soil conservation principles in their agricultural operations.

FINDINGS

SEC. 102. Congress finds that—

(1) lands classified as "erosion-prone" or "highly erodible" under the Land Capability Classification System typically have estimated annual soil erosion rates from sheet, rill and wind erosion that are from double to ten times as high as the average soil erosion rates for all croplands;

(2) the Land Capability Classification System, as outlined in USDA Handbook 210, dated in 1961, has proven to be a reliable guide, based on scientific soil measurements, to predict the capability of different soils to sustain continuous cultivation without excessive soil erosion damage;

(3) that there are lands currently being cultivated which are eroding at such serious rates that their continued productivity is doubtful, while serious problems of airborne dust, drifting sand dunes, and sediment in water are being created as a result;

(4) that Federal programs which provide economic incentives and income support to farmers are, under certain conditions, having the effect of encouraging or subsidizing the cultivation of erosion prone and highly erodible lands;

(5) the substantial benefits of growing grasses and legumes in a crop rotation for building soil productivity and reducing soil erosion have long been recognized by agriculturalists and conservationists; and,

(6) many farmers who would otherwise use perennial crops such as grasses and legumes in a crop rotation with grain and other cash crops are discouraged from doing so out of fear that a future crop stabilization program will not recognize those acres as part of the cropland base, and will not allow such acres to be designated as land currently in conservation use thereby meeting the set-aside provisions in the stabilization program.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 103. As used in this title—

(1) the term "agricultural commodity" means any agricultural product planted and produced by annual tilling of the soil, including one-trip planters; and

(2) the term "conservation district" means any district formed under state or territorial law for the express purpose of developing and carrying out a local soil and water conservation program. Such districts may be called "conservation districts," "soil conservation districts," "soil and water conservation districts," "resource conservation districts," "natural resource districts," or a similar name.

(3) the term "erosion-prone cropland" means land classified by the Soil Conservation Service as classes IIIe, IVe, VI, VII, and VIII under the Land Capability Classification System and upon which cultivated or rotation crops have been grown in three out of the past five years.

(4) the term "highly erodible land" means land classified by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture as class IVe, VIe, VII, or VIII land under the Land Capability Classification System.

(5) the term "Land Capability Classification System" is an interpretive grouping of soils based on a system set forth in U.S.D.A. Handbook 210, "Land-Capability Classification" and administered by the Soil Conservation Service. The definitions and specifications for all classes of land under the Land Capability Classification System, including the definitions of "erosion-prone cropland" and "highly erodible land," shall be those in effect on the day of enactment of this Act and published in the Federal Register within 60 days of such passage. The capability class for a field shall be that determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be the "predominant" class under regulations issued by the Secretary.

(6) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE II—PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY ON HIGHLY ERODIBLE LAND

SEC. 201. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, following the date of enactment of this Act any person who produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodible land shall be ineligible, as to that commodity produced on such land, for—

(1) any type of price or income support assistance on such commodity made available under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.), the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of (15 U.S.C. 714 et seq.) or any other Act;

(2) a loan for the construction or purchase of a facility for the storage of such commodity made under section 4 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714b(h));

(3) crop insurance for such commodity under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.);

(4) a disaster payment for such commodity made under the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.); or

(5) a new loan made, insured, or guaranteed under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) or any other provision of law administered by the Farmers Home Administration, if the Secretary determines that such loan will be used for a purpose which will contribute to excessive erosion of highly erodible land.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any land which was cultivated by a person to produce any of the 1973 through 1982 crops of agricultural commodities;

(2) any agricultural commodity crop planted by a person before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) any agricultural commodity crop planted by a person during any crop year beginning before the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) any loan described in subsection (a) made before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(5) any agricultural commodity crop produced using a conservation system that has been approved by a conservation district and that is based on technical standards set forth in the Soil Conservation Service technical guide for that conservation district. In areas where no conservation district exists, the Secretary shall determine the adequacy of the conservation system to be used in the production of any agricultural commodity on highly erodible land.

TITLE III— CERTIFIED VOLUNTARY SET-ASIDE

SEC. 301. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall formulate and carry out a program to allow owners and operators of cropland as defined in subsection (c) to certify that certain croplands have been planted to approved perennial crops of grass or legumes as part of a crop rotation pattern designed to reduce soil erosion or build soil productivity. Such certification shall be renewed annually by a statement to the Secretary wherein the continued existence of an adequate stand of the approved crop on the designated land is verified.

(b) For purposes of establishing a list of approved grass and legume crops to be used in each county, the Secretary shall utilize the state and local committees established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act who shall, prior to determining such list, consult with

the conservation district in the county, the Soil Conservation Service, and the local agent of the Cooperative Extension Service.

(c) Croplands eligible for certification under subsection (a) shall be classified by the Soil Conservation Service as Class I, II, III or IV (or any subclass within those major classes) under the Land Capability Classification System, and shall have been managed for the production of harvested crops as defined in Subsection (d) for the five (5) preceding years.

(d) For the purpose of establishing cropping history, the Secretary shall require farmers to certify that eligible croplands have been used for the harvest of field crops, grass seed, hay, haylage, or other forage products by mechanical means or grazing livestock, or have been managed as a grassed waterway or grassed filter strip as part of a soil conservation system developed in cooperation with the conservation district. If normal or planned harvest in any of the preceding five (5) years was prevented by a natural disaster that prevented normal harvest or reduced crop growth to the extent that no harvest was feasible, the Secretary may consider the land as having been used for approved cropland purposes during that year.

SEC. 302. (a) In the administration of any future commodity stabilization program authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1949 or any amendment or subsequent amendment thereto, the Secretary shall allow farmers who have certified lands under Section 301 prior to the announcement by the Secretary of such commodity stabilization program and who have maintained those lands in the voluntary set-aside program through annual reporting to designate those certified lands as cropland in rotation for the purpose of establishing a normal crop acreage base for their farm.

(b) In designating conserving use acreage under any future commodity stabilization program authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1949 or any amendment or subsequent amendment thereto, farmers may designate lands certified under Section 201 prior to the announcement by the Secretary of such commodity stabilization program as set-aside land or conserving use acreage under the rules of such commodity stabilization program, providing that all conditions established by the Secretary as to management and harvesting of crops on set-aside land or conserving use acreage are met by the farmer.

TITLE IV—CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

SEC. 401. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may formulate and carry out a program with owners and operators of erosion-prone land to assist such owners or operators to make, in orderly progression, changes in their cropping and land use systems needed to conserve, develop, protect, and use the soil and water resources of their farms, ranches, or other lands and to implement the soil and water conservation measures and practices needed under such changed systems and uses. In assisting such owners and operators, the Secretary shall provide contracts covering other than erosion-prone land upon a demonstration by the conservation district that a serious soil erosion problem exists on such land.

(b) The Secretary may enter into contracts of not less than seven or more than fifteen years for the purpose of carrying out this section. In such contract, the owner or operator shall agree—

(1) to effectuate a plan approved by a conservation district for the farm, ranch, or other land substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein unless any requirements thereof are waived or modified by the Secretary;

(2) to forfeit all rights to further payments under the contract and refund to the United States all payments, with interest, received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the land if the Secretary, after considering the recommendations of the soil conservation district and the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the violation by the owner or operator does not warrant termination of the contract;

(3) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm, ranch, or other land during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments under the contract and refund to the United States all payments received thereunder, unless the transferee of any such land agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations under the contract;

(4) not to adopt any practice specified in the contract by the Secretary as a practice that would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract; and,

(5) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and are included in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration thereof.

(c) In return for such agreement by the owner or operator, the Secretary shall agree to provide technical assistance, to share the cost of carrying out the conservation measures and practices set forth in the contract for which the Secretary determines that cost sharing is appropriate and in the public interest, and to pay an annual land rental fee on those acres of erosion-prone cropland that are placed in a conservation use for the duration of the contract.

(d) In determining the amount of cost-sharing for conservation measures and practices under this section, the Secretary shall determine that part of the total cost that is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the installation and maintenance of the conservation plantings and practices for a normally expected life of such a planting or practice. Payment shall be made in accordance with a formula developed by the Secretary to take into consideration—

(1) the costs of establishing and maintaining the agreed-upon coservation measures, plantings, and practices for a normal lifespan;

(2) the severity of the erosion hazard on the land to be converted from cropland to permanent cover; and,

(3) the willingness of the owner or operator, as evidenced in the contract, to apply the conservation measures as specified in the contract early in the life of the contract and maintain them for their normally expected life.

(e) In determining the amount of land rental to be paid for the retirement of erosion-prone cropland to conserving uses for the life of the contract, the Secretary shall accept bids from the owners and operators. In considering bids for acceptance, the Secretary shall give priority to those that will give a combination of—

(1) the lowest cost per ton of soil saved on the diverted land, as calculated by the difference between the estimated soil loss on the pre-contract cropping system employed by the owner or operator and the system that will be installed as a result of the contract; and,

(2) the lowest cost per acre/year of erosion-prone cropland diverted, taking into account both the amortized value of the cost-sharing required for installation of conservation measures and practices and the proposed per-acre rental fee contained in the bid proffered by the owner or operator.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, payments under this section shall be made in cash or in in-kind commodities in such amounts as agreed upon and specified in the contract.

(g) The Secretary shall provide the owner or operator the option to elect to receive payments under this section on a schedule, as outlined in the contract, that provides for a close correlation between the time the costs for conservation measures and practices are incurred by the owner or operator and the time the Secretary makes the payments to the owner or operator.

(h) The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments under the program.

(i) The Secretary shall provide by appropriate regulations for preservation of cropland, crop acreage, and allotment history applicable to acreage diverted from the production of crops to establish vegetative cover for the purpose of any Federal program under which such history is used as a basis for an allotment or other limitation or for participation in such program.

(j) In carrying out the program authorized by this title, the Secretary may use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

TITLE V—RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary shall, within one hundred and twenty (120) days after the enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register regulations implementing this title, including the technical definition of erosion-prone land.

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 601. The authority provided by this title shall be in addition to and not in place of other authorities available to the Secretary and the Commodity Credit Corporation for carrying out soil and water conservation programs.

TITLE VII—AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 701. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary for the administration of this Act.●

H.R. 2676

HON. JIM BATES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of federally funded research into the field of aquaculture.

As a long time advocate of research into alternative food sources, I am pleased to see that the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Agriculture Committees have taken

such responsible action to see to the passage of the provisions in H.R. 2676. This bill will significantly serve to strengthen the national commitment to the aquaculture industry by providing $6 million in fiscal years 1984 through 1986.

Aquaculture is merely a new name for a time honored technology of producing food from the sea and from fresh water sources. Up to the present time it has been sufficient to allow traditional methods to gather these resources. Populations pressures, pollution, and the growing dependence upon these resources makes it crucial that we begin to treat our oceans and inland waterways as the all important resource that they are.

The United States is now just fifth in the world in the production of food resources from aquatic plants. For the sake of the Nation and the world as a whole, we must continue building upon the many accomplishments that have already been made in this field.

There is an undeniable and growing need for the plants and animals which are produced from aquacultural farming. As we deplete the resources of our oceans and inland waterways by pollution and over-harvesting, we begin to understand the importance of a controlled environment in which to cultivate this resource. We must recognize the great demands that will be put upon the United States to produce food and technology for a hungry world.

The National Marine Fisheries Service has estimated that aquaculture enterprises could produce 20 billion pounds of fish in 25 years. At present consumption levels, this would meet the demands of the entire State of California 12 times over.

It is estimated that by the year 2000, the demand for many aquatic foods will have doubled. It is clearly evident that unless something is done to plan ahead for this increased demand, we will have food shortages on our hands.

We need to continue Federal funding of aquaculture research to provide for the future of this critical food resource. After a time, further aquaculture advances will be supported by profit in the industry. Continued research is the primary step to insure that aquaculture will play a major role in feeding the people of the world.●

STINGTIME FOR POACHERS

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, I am an avid fisherman and hunter. I enjoy the sport thoroughly, as do many of my colleagues. However, as I was reading this week's copy of Newsweek, I was shocked and appalled to discover that there are citizens of the United States who are wantonly destroying our Nation's wildlife, not for sport, but greed. These poachers take game in our national parks and make a tremendous profit. For example, poachers can get anywhere from $2,500 to $20,000 depending on the animal. There is a market for elk antlers where hunters get $6.50 a pound from dealers. The dealers in return can get $42 an ounce for the ground antler in San Francisco. Not only that, but the gallbladder of a black bear is worth $3,000 in Asia.

These poachers are needlessly depleting our wildlife preserves, an action opposed by nature lovers and outdoorsmen.

Our National Fish and Wildlife Service is doing all it can to stop this horrible nightmare, but because of the high profitability of poaching, the illegal activities are multiplying.

I am disgusted to know that there are U.S. citizens who are breaking our wildlife laws at the expense of irreplaceable resources.

Environmentalists and sportsmen should be outraged by these reports. Personally, I condemn these repugnant actions and take this opportunity to denounce those who ruthlessly and illegally use our national wildlife for personal gain.

For the RECORD, I submit a copy of "Stingtime For Poachers," an article from the June 20, 1983, Newsweek which highlights the problem of poachers in our national parks.

The article follows:

STINGTIME FOR POACHERS

They are accused of offering the most-prized trophy animals of the Rockies, and for prices ranging from $2,500 to $20,000—depending on the beast—a kill was guaranteed. How could a hunting business make such a promise? By guiding clients onto public land after the fall hunting season closed, when elk, bighorn sheep, mountain goats and mountain lions are at lower elevations and much less on their guard. Last week, thanks to five undercover agents for the Fish and Wildlife Service, the business abruptly went out of business. Seven hunting guides, including Denver police detective Dale Leonard, were indicted in Colorado, and nine more indictments are expected in Montana. State and federal agents claim they have cracked the biggest poaching ring ever uncovered in the Rockies.

The Colorado operation illustrates the service's new emphasis on "sting" work. In the past, Fish and Wildlife agents and their state counterparts looked on themselves simply as game wardens, keeping an eye out for the rural poacher who killed to feed his family. With the upsurge in commercial exploitation of wildlife on public land, however, that attitude is changing rapidly. In recent years, federal agents have been deployed undercover to combat poachers in Alaska, where walruses are being hunted for their tusks; in California, where Indians have been accused of sweeping king salmon from streams with gill nets, and around Lake Erie, where in one case 1 million pounds of walleye were lifted illegally. Agents have also tracked Indians who kill bald eagles for their feathers. "This commercialization of wildlife has been prevalent in Africa, Europe and Asia for years," said Terry L. Grosz, the Fish and Wildlife Service's enforcement chief in the Rockies. "We're just finally catching up to [it]."

The reason for the rise of poaching in the United States is straightforward: profitability. The Colorado ring allegedly hunted black bears as a sideline to obtain their gallbladders and paws—two items prized by Asians. Small enough to fit inside film canisters, the bladders are sold by hunters to dealers in the United States for $100 apiece and retailed in Asia for $3,000, where in dried form they are marketed as medicine and aphrodisiacs. Bear-paw pads are sold as food (a dinner can run to $150), and grizzly claws for necklaces. Until late in 1981, when well-publicized arrests by the California Department of Fish and Game seemed to scare off much of the trade, illegal hunts were making serious inroads into the California bear population.

Aphrodisiacs: The Asian herbal-medicine market accounts for what is perhaps the West's most persistent poaching problem: the trade in elk antlers. Sold to Asians both here and abroad, ground elk antlers are used in everything from vitamins to aphrodisiacs. Every year representatives of Korean buyers make their way to tiny Gardiner, Mont., which abuts Yellowstone National Park; they assemble at the Blue Goose Bar—the hangout for "horn hunters." Hunters get $6.50 a pound, with the average set of antlers weighing 25 pounds. Dealers make their profits, too; ground antlers sell for $42 an ounce in San Francisco, says one agent who estimates that $1.5 million to $2 million worth comes out of the Yellowstone area each year.

Antler hunters can be ruthless. The U.S. attorney in Cheyenne, Wyo., is expected to announce soon the indictment of poachers who last year allegedly chased to exhaustion at least eight winter-weakened elk inside Yellowstone. After hacking the antlers off their heads, they left them to bleed to death. In most cases, though, elk antlers can be obtained without killing. Horn hunters sneak around Yellowstone and neighboring areas each spring, collecting the antlers the bull elk have shed. Federal law prohibits the removal of any natural features from a park, and the rangers take that to include the cast-off antlers. This spring Yellowstone recruited rangers from other parks—raising their number from two to seven—and set up-decoy piles of antlers with hidden cameras to try to catch the poachers in the act. The result: 28 arrests, about half the number of horn hunters apprehended in 1982. "They're getting better every year," grumbles ranger Randy King.

With current penalties for poaching rarely exceeding a light fine, the only way to curtail it is to prohibit the buying and selling of game-animal parts. That has already been done in California and Oregon. However, Colorado, Wyoming and Montana, home to great herds of big game, allow trophies or antlers to be sold provided they are taken legally—and the contrary can seldom be proved. For the game police, then, the only recourse is undercover work. "The resource we are protecting is limited," says one agent. "So I want these guys to know something—their next partner may be us."—Micheal A. Lerner with Jeff B. Copeland.●

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IS A MUST TO NATIONAL NEEDS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to strengthen the Federal Government's small but critical involvement in a unique part of our educational system—vocational education. Though the Federal Government provides only 10 percent of the funding for all vocational education programs throughout the country, this commitment is crucial nonetheless for the growth and sustenance of this proven job—development initiative.

I have witnessed, in my own community, the tremendous ability of vocational education to bring labor, business, and Government together to meet the training needs of the workplace. Mr. Speaker, if we acquiesce to the President's desire to consolidate the vocational education system, fewer skilled workers will be available to meet growing industry needs, unemployed workers will lose a chance to be retrained, and young people who might have gained valuable work skills will be lost as contributing members of our society. I urge my colleagues to oppose this administration's efforts to wipe out a national-level commitment to a worthwhile endeavor. The Nation is getting an invaluable return on a minimal investment.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the President's vocational education consolidation proposal on Ohio and my district would be disastrous.

IF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL IS ENACTED

The current total budget for VEA programs is over $707 million for the States. The President's proposal would cut funding for vocational education by 43.46 percent.

Ohio would lose a total of over $14 million ($14,399,910).

In the aggregate, Ohio would have to eliminate almost 400 programs (disadvantaged, handicapped, full-time adult, consumer/homemaking, guidance counseling, career education), drop over 1,300 personnel, and leave almost 110,000 Ohioans unserved (108,396).

IMPACT ON THE NINTH DISTRICT IF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL IS ENACTED

Vocational education programs provided in the ninth district include accounting and computing, auto mechanics, data processing, carpentry, construction electricity, food service, health and community services, heating and air-conditioning, welding, machine trades, horticulture, and industrial agricultural equipment.

The Toledo School District has seen a decline in Federal assistance for vocational education. Toledo School District funding for vocational education has been:

Fiscal year:	
1980	$608,671
1981	413,972
1982	367,515
1983[1]	408,353
1984[2]	343,000

[1] Includes fiscal year 1983 continuing resolution.
[2] Under the administration proposal, these funds will have to pay for vocational and adult education.

In addition, the superintendent's office at Penta County vocational schools (which provides vocational education programs in the Swanton, Northwood, Maumee, Rossford, and Anthony Wayne School Districts) has informed me that in the last 2 years, the school lost $44,000 of Federal money for their programs for disadvantaged and handicapped students. This necessitated the loss of two staff persons. Their guidance counselor reimbursement rate was also reduced so as to increase their costs by $10,000. This could have required terminating up to five people, but the school found the funds to keep them on staff. Further, if the block grant proposal were enacted, the school estimates they would lose a total of over $160,000 which would require terminating as many as eight staff members in administration and programs for the handicapped. The level of services would also be severely impaired.

The President of Owens Technical College in my district, has said that adoption of the block grant approach at a reduced funding level ($500 million) would "wipe them out." Owens would lose $300,000, which would necessitate termination of around 10 instructor/professors.

RHODE ISLAND RESPONDS

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wall Street Journal printed an article on the State of Rhode Island which, in the opinion of the congressional delegation, seriously misrepresented the resilient character and wonderful environment of our State. Today, Senators PELL and CHAFEE and our colleague, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and I responded. I would like to share our reply with our colleagues (attached).

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1983.

Mr. ROBERT L. BARTLEY,
Editor, The Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BARTLEY: The harsh and unfair portrait of Rhode Island in a recent article painted a grossly inaccurate picture that brings the Wall Street Journal's reputation for objectivity into serious question.

That unbalanced article did less than paint Rhode Island "warts and all." It painted the warts alone. It dismissed, almost as asides, many of Rhode Island's unique charms and strengths. Beauty is, of course, in the eye of the beholder . . . but we do not think that you looked closely enough.

Our state has economic problems which we freely acknowledge and are working to solve. Rhode Island has forged a strong, creative partnership of labor, business and government—the Rhode Island Strategic Development Commission—to find new solutions. The firestorm of protest ignited in our state by your article is convincing proof of both the depth and strength of this coalition.

While we understand our problems, we also understand that the solutions to these problems can be found in our strengths. Rhode Island offers a total environment and a quality of life that many have found to be among the very best in the United States.

Employers, for generations, have valued the character and reliability of Rhode Island's workforce. Much of this unique character flows from the ethnic and cultural richness of our people, who have combined from many backgrounds to make Rhode Island one of the most diverse and interesting States in America.

The compact size of our state, while perhaps a source of continuing good humor for residents and non-residents alike, also means that our residents can live in city, rural or suburban settings and still be only minutes from work or from the beaches that ring the Rhode Island coastline.

Rhode Island is a beautiful State that has something to offer everyone—breathtaking beaches, old world and new world neighborhoods, industries to provide jobs, entertainment and opportunities for growth and new businesses.

Cross pens, Gorham silver, Bostitch staplers, Brown & Sharpe machine tools, Trifari jewelry, American Tourister luggage, General Dynamics submarines, all these and many more are products of Rhode Island.

We invite you to visit Rhode Island and hope you will bring along any editors or reporters who have grown weary of commuting or tied of the high prices of "big city" living and would like to improve the quality of their lives.

You may discover what we have known all along. Rhode Island is a great way of life. We are proud to represent the fine people of this State.

Warm regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN.●

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUATION OF THE GUERNSEY SILT RUN

HON. DICK CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I represent the members of the irrigation districts located in the Wyoming part of the North Platte irrigation project, which itself is located in both Wyoming and Nebraska. For many years,

the irrigation districts have employed on a seasonal basis a natural water conservation practice known as the silt run. A silt run allows water released from storage and containing silt to flow into the irrigation project distribution systems, lining those distribution systems and increasing their conveyance efficiency substantially.

In the past few years, the North Platte project and the Secretary of the Interior have disagreed about whether, and on what terms, the silt run should be allowed to continue. The disagreement occurs essentially because the United States some time ago purchased certain hydropower facilities from the project and now claims the right to maximize power output from them even though this would impair or prevent the silt run, a custom which clearly predates the purchase of the facilities.

I have reviewed the correspondence between the Department and the irrigation districts concerning the dispute. I have also reviewed additional materials collected and supplied to me by the irrigators. On the basis of this review, I believe it is likely that representatives of the U.S. Government promised the irrigation districts during the hydropower negotiations that the customary silt run could continue. Recent Department of the Interior analyses of the dispute appear to concede that such promises were made.[1] Nothing in the contracts between the United States and the project is to the contrary.

For these reasons, I remain unconvinced by the Department's position that its contracts, although silent on this issue, do not allow or require the continuation of the silt run, or that they would allow the Department to impose unspecified, and potentially very burdensome changes on the irrigators if the silt run interrupts power generation.

It seems to me that in this situation, the Government should be required to keep its promises, and this is what the legislation I am introducing today would do. The legislation would require the Department to continue the silt run in return for only those charges already explicitly spelled out for water deliveries under existing contractual agreements.●

[1] Guernsey Silt Run—Power Interference charges: An Analysis Report, pp. 25-27 (DOI, April, 1983).

THE REYE'S SYNDROME ACT OF 1983

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mrs. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Reye's Syndrome Act of 1983. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the bill.

The legislation I am introducing today is identical to a bill I introduced in the last Congress. It has been sponsored in the Senate by Senator MELCHER, and cosponsored by 11 other Senators.

When I first introduced legislation to increase research on Reye's in 1979, the disease was very obscure, known only to those American families whose children had been afflicted by it and those members of the medical research community who were trying to understand it.

Since then, Reye's has become more widely known by the general public. Through the work of the National Reye's Syndrome Foundation, which now has 64 local chapters, public awareness has been increased of the dangers of Reye's and the need for strong support of efforts to combat the disease. One measure of the increased awareness is the fact that 226 Members of the House have cosponsored a resolution, introduced by Representative VANDER JAGT, to declare the week of November 7 "National Reye's Syndrome Week." I am pleased to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 49, and I urge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to act promptly to bring it to the floor.

Unfortunately, the strides that have been made in publicizing the dangers of Reye's have not been matched by similar strides in curtailing those dangers. While research is being conducted and some progress has been made, we still know very little about the causes of Reye's, and even less about possible cures.

There are some things we know. We know Reye's most often follows viral infections like influenza, chicken pox, or German measles, and it is most likely to strike young children, though young people up to age 18 have been afflicted. While doctors do not understand the cause of the disease, it can be successfully managed if the patient is under the care of experienced medical professionals.

Sadly, all too often Reye's is fatal because neither parents nor the family doctor recognize it quickly enough. In 1982, according to the Center for Disease Control, there were 200 reported cases of Reye's Syndrome in this country. Of these, 66, or approximately one-third, were fatal, with other cases still unresolved.

The legislation I am introducing today is designed to give the National Institutes of Health the resources to increase its research effort on Reye's. The bill establishes within NIH a Reye's Syndrome Coordinating Committee which shall fund basic and clinical research on Reye's, including its causes, diagnosis, early detection, and treatment.

To fund the research, the bill provides $1.5 million for each of the next 3 years. In addition to the research money, the bill also provides $150,000 a year for the next 3 years for the operations of Reye's Mobile Research Teams. One of the problems in establishing a body of data on Reye's has been the failure to get experienced personnel to areas undergoing Reye's outbreaks. The Mobile Research Teams would be able to gather information on the onset, diagnosis, treatment, and outcome of Reye's cases, and to attempt to identify anomalous community factors that may contribute to the occurrence of Reye's.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will cost less than $2 million a year to combat a disease that threatens our most priceless possession—our children. In these times of tight budgets, it is hard to imagine a more justifiable expenditure of funds. When one out of every three children who contract this disease are dying, we have a responsibility to do everything we can to find a treatment. I seek the support of my colleagues for this worthy cause.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE EL SALVADOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill entitled the "El Salvador Humanitarian Assistance Act of 1983." This legislation would provide assistance to persons in El Salvador who have been displaced and are suffering as a result of the war in that country.

Much has been said about how the United States should respond militarily to the political problems in El Salvador. But we have oftentimes overlooked the hundreds of civilians who have had their homes destroyed, their crops burned, their businesses wiped out, and their livelihoods snatched away. Prompt economic assistance by the United States is necessary to alleviate the human suffering arising from the civil strife in El Salvador.

The legislation I am introducing would amend section 495I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizing $5 million, in addition to the amounts already available to the President, for the relief and rehabilitation of needy people in El Salvador; $3 million of this authorization is earmarked to be available through international relief agencies to the Archdiocise of San Salvador and other organizations in El Salvador that provide food, medical care, clothing, and other basic needs to the civilians in this war-torn nation.

In addition, the President is encouraged to use other funds allocated under the Foreign Assistance Act for the relief of the suffering Salvadoran citizens.

Over the past few years, this Nation has sent millions of dollars in military equipment and advisers to the government in El Salvador to assist them in their war against guerrilla insurgents. But the bitter fighting continues in this small Latin American country, while families are without shelter, and children are without food or clothing.

If we feel it is necessary to send military aid to El Salvador to protect them from leftist take over, then we should certainly provide their citizens with the basic human needs which have been robbed from them as a result of the ongoing war. I urge my colleagues to join with me and cosponsor this much-needed and important legislation.●

SOME COMMENTS ON THE FEDERAL RESERVE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 29, 1983, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOME COMMENTS ON THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The appointment of Paul Volcker to another four-year term as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has been described as President Reagan's most important personnel decision. When one considers all the appointments a President makes—Secretary of State, Justices of the Supreme Court, and so on—the description may sound exaggerated, but I have come to believe that it is not.

In times past, the selection of a Federal Reserve chairman caused scarcely a ripple in the national news media. Indeed, I suspect that until recently, most people would not have known the chairman's name. There are several reasons for the position's increased prominence. First among them is a growing appreciation of monetary policy's role in the ration's economy. One does not have to subscribe to the "monetarist" school of thought (which favors growth of the money supply at a steady, non-inflationary rate) to understand why the experts now pay much more attention to monetary policy than they did a few years ago. Interest rates and money supply are now generally recognized as very powerful tools in the hands of national economic managers. Another reason for the extraordinary rise in interest in Mr. Volcker's position is that misuse of the principal devices of fiscal policy—taxing and spending—has prompted a discouraged public to believe that the President and Congress can do little more than pile up huge deficits. The Federal Reserve, people are beginning to think, is the place to produce sound economic policy. The Federal Reserve is by and large an independent agency, even though the President names its Chairman and his six fellow governors. The governors are appointed for fourteen-year terms, so they are quite insulated from the political whims of the President and Congress. The Federal Reserve is also self-supporting, despite the fact that it is a creature of Congress (to which its chairman reports twice a year). It derives most of its revenues from interest income on its large partfolio of Treasury securities purchased in the course of open market operations, so it does not need congressional appropriations.

There are strong reasons to maintain the independence of the Federal Reserve. It can look at the economy objectively, without the political lens that the President and Congress must use. It can go against the political trends. Without a tightening of monetary policy in 1981 and early 1982, it is difficult to say where we would have been in the fight against inflation. Even so, given the extraordinary power that the Federal Reserve exercises, it is rather amazing that the governors are not accountable in any very direct way to the President or Congress. Although few would argue that the Federal Reserve should lose its independence, there is an effort afoot to make the governors more accountable. There is no clear consensus as to what the Federal Reserve should be doing or how it should be doing it, but increased accountability to political authorities could be achieved in several ways: we might require the Federal Reserve to issue more explicit economic goals; we might have the governors serve coterminously with the President; we might bring the Secretary of the Treasury into the key decision-making processes of the Federal Reserve.

The Federal Reserve's lack of accountability is no academic matter. In its successful effort to stop inflation, the Federal Reserve adopted policies which caused the highest unemployment in forty years and a record number of business failures. My view is that the Federal Reserve engaged in "economic overkill," bringing enormous and unnecessary hardship to millions of Americans in 1981 and 1982. In the pursuit of its worthy goal, the Federal Reserve was too insulated from the people. Had it been more accountable to the people, it would have been more sensitive in implementing its anti-inflation program. Had it implemented its policies more carefully, the deepest phase of the recession might have been avoided and the recovery might have begun sooner.

My judgment is that we have relied too much on monetary policy in recent years to run the economy. The President and Congress have not managed fiscal policy with skill and vision, and the principal burden of conducting economic policy has fallen squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Reserve. But the country cannot have a balanced and productive economic policy if the Federal Reserve acts alone. The Federal Reserve has been able to avoid the disaster of runaway inflation, but only by pursuing a policy of low growth, high joblessness, and high interest rates.

I believe that the key economic decisions in the near future will be made at the Federal Reserve. Unfortunately, the odds are that the President and Congress will not shrink the deficit enough to help. The appointment of Mr. Volcker probably means that ridding the economy of inflation will continue to be a main focus of monetary policy. For the balance of the year and perhaps well into 1984, the prospect is for continued recovery with interest rates staying close to present levels. The problem looming ahead for the Federal Reserve is the likelihood of a clash between monetary and fiscal policies. As the recovery picks up steam, the private sector will demand more credit. The deficit-ridden government will begin to compete seriously with private borrowers. There will be upward pressure on interest rates. Thus, the Federal Reserve will face tough choices: either it will have to loosen monetary policy and risk renewed inflation, or it will have to stay on its anti-inflation course and risk higher interest rates, a sinking economy, and an increase in unemployment. In order to avoid the extremes, the Federal Reserve will have to tread a very narrow path.

For the present, the question is whether the Federal Reserve can engineer a non-inflationary recovery despite record deficits and rising pressure for an easier monetary policy. It must do this against a backdrop of great international financial instability, at a time when many developing nations are finding it difficult to maintain payments of billions of dollars on commercial bank debts. The weeks ahead will be a time of genuine testing for the Federal Reserve.●

REFUSENIK—YULI KOSHAROVSKY

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud and honored to be a member of the 98th Congressional Class for Soviet Jewry and would like to take this opportunity to announce that I have "adopted" refusenik Yuli Kosharovsky.

Yuli Kosharovsky is living a nightmare tragically common among Soviet Jews. In 1971, he lost his job as a radio-electronics engineer when his state-controlled employer learned that Yuli had applied for a visa to Israel. In a manner typical of the oppressive Soviet policy toward Russian Jews, Soviet officials then rejected Yuli's visa application on the grounds that he was a security risk.

In 1980, Yuli's security classification was removed, but he was again refused a visa—this time because his invitation to Israel was not from a relative of the "first degree."

Despite these setbacks, Yuli remains determined to maintain his Jewish heritage. He began studying with a leading refusenik Hebrew teacher and has become an important authority and teacher of Hebrew literature. Once again, however, Yuli has experienced the anguish of Soviet religious repression. The KGB recently shut down his teaching activities and confiscated all of his Hebrew teaching materials.

Yuli continues to persevere in his quest for religious freedom despite frequent threats of arrest and imprisonment. He has become a leading activist for religious liberty and human rights, and he is more committed than ever before to the mission of spreading

Jewish culture throughout the Soviet Union.

As Members of Congress and as proud citizens of a nation where religious freedom is the rule rather than the exception, I ask you to join Yuli in his struggle and condemn this latest evidence of Soviet injustice.●

PUERTO RICO'S ROLE IN THE CARIBBEAN BASIN INITIATIVE

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico continues to be deeply committed to the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the promise it offers to ameliorate the economic and social conditions of the poor countries in the region. Since 1898 when Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States, Puerto Ricans have been blessed with the freedom of democracy. The "poorhouse of the Caribbean," as Puerto Rico used to be called, is now termed "a successful experiment in democracy." The economic incentives granted to industries coming to the island permitted Puerto Rico to achieve an unparalleled development never before attained in this region.

Although still poor in comparison to the States of the Union, Puerto Rico is experiencing a standard of living higher than any Caribbean or Latin American nation. We have no vision of grandeur, but rather the perception that, in light of the growing Cuban and Soviet interference in the region, the economic development of the Caribbean is an important step in consolidating the democratic states that now stand on the peril of disintegration. Because of Puerto Rico's close political ties with the United States, its 3,200,000 U.S. citizens and the cultural traits that bind it to our Hispanic neighbors, Puerto Rico can serve a vital function in promoting the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

Puerto Rico is ready to do its share toward helping the Caribbean region. Already the island's government, in coordination with the Department of State and with AID funding, has signed an agreement with the Government of Jamaica to train 7,000 Jamaicans in construction skills such as masonry, carpentry, electricity, and plumbing. At a cost of $320,000, the program is a primary step in narrowing the gap of misunderstanding between the United States and the Caribbean nations.

In October 1983, the island is scheduled to complete the training of 32 officials of the Jamaican National Investment Promotions, Ltd., an equivalent of Puerto Rico's Economic Development Administration.

In addition, Puerto Rico's Governor Hon. Carlos Romero-Barceló and members of his administration have been negotiating with the Governments of the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Haiti and the Eastern Caribbean nations to create and expand similar kinds of assistance programs.

The Caribbean Basin Initiative has been approved by the Senate and by the House Ways and Means Committee. It will soon come up for consideration by the full House of Representatives. It is of utmost importance that once the CBI is approved, we continue to closely monitor and assess the needs of these countries. U.S. aid will help the Caribbean nations procure the necessary infrastructure and provide adequate health and education facilities for its citizens. The promise of economic development embodied in the CBI will revive the currently depressing situation that yields to social and political turmoil. This condition is the perfect setting for Cuban and Soviet unwarranted intervention. With their so-called wars of national liberation, Communist allies intrude in the internal affairs of these countries with the promise of a better future. As seen in Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada, and recently Surinam, there has been no better future. However, it is clear this situation could have been avoided had the pressing need for economic development and social justice been addressed long ago.

Puerto Rico can play an important role in the region. We are proud to be part of the United States and our people are noble defenders of the American democratic system. The Caribbean Basin Initiative is an example of the American commitment to improve the conditions of our neighboring countries; a commitment essential to our own national security. Economic development is the key to assure ourselves that conditions in the Caribbean will not become too perilous for democracy to prevail.●

GERMAN REPARATIONS PAYMENTS AND SSI ELIGIBILITY

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill I introduced last session which would exempt German reparations payments from income for the purpose of determining eligibility for supplemental security income.

In 1980, my constituent, Felicia Grunfeder, was denied $119 monthly SSI benefits because she receives monthly reparations payments of about $200 from the West German Government for mental and physical injuries she suffered during World War II. Ms. Grunfeder was sent to a concentration camp as a 5-year-old child where she remained until the end of the war.

Germany's reparations are largely symbolic of that country's accepted responsibility for its war crimes. We all know that, no matter how generous, they can only partially compensate for the revolting crimes committed against Holocaust victims. I do not believe when Congress passed the Social Security Act it intended to deny welfare and health benefits to a poor person who would otherwise be eligible were she not receiving token payments from Germany for the torture she underwent and survived at the hands of the Nazis.

Ms. Grunfeder's reparations payments are now counted as unearned income, putting her over the eligibility limit of $1,752 of outside annual income by some $648. Only legislative action can remedy this grave injustice to her and others in the country who have been denied SSI benefits for the same reason.

Federal disaster relief and tribal settlement payments are already excluded from income when SSI eligibility is determined, but only as the result of special statutory and regulatory exclusions. Recently, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that Federal legislation for such an exclusion for German reparations payments is necessary to exempt them from being considered as countable income.

This legislation does not affect many people or involve much money. It is not retroactive. The restoration of the SSI benefits would occur only after enactment. It only affects Americans who are otherwise eligible for SSI benefits except for the counting of their reparations payments. Individuals like Ms. Grunfeder have suffered immeasurably, perhaps more than several lifetimes of pain, and our Government should move quickly to correct this basic oversight in our laws.●

A SAUDI PRINCE PASSES THROUGH, PLEADING FOR KIDS AND A PEACE PLAN

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, His Royal Highness Prince Talal bin Abdul Aziz Al Saud, was in my State of Washington this week touring our hospitals and promoting the U.N. Children's Fund which we all know as UNICEF. The work of this fine organization and Prince Talal's generous and untiring support of it merit our serious consideration.

While he was in San Francisco, Prince Talal had an unfortunate incident in which a picture was taken and run by the press. As the Seattle Post Intelligencer reported:

The picture, taken at a children's science exhibit showed the Prince holding a musical instrument and the caption said he was singing. The picture made him look foolish in the Arab World, he said, because he and other Muslims are celebrating their holy month Ramadan, and singing is forbidden. He does not sing anyway, he said, and someone simply had handed the instrument to him to demonstrate its use.

I commend excerpts of a report of the Prince's visit by the Post Intelligencer to your reading:

A SAUDI PRINCE PASSES THROUGH, PLEADING FOR KIDS AND A PEACE PLAN

A Saudi Arabian prince winds up a worldwind tour of Seattle today, breaking fish with Indians and giving two of his daughters a tour of Children's Orthopedic Hospital.

Yesterday, his Royal Highness Prince Talal bin Adul Aziz al Saud, 50, urged the United States to take a stronger role in bringing peace to Lebanon and toured an Asian health center in the International District with Seattle Mayor Charles Royer.

"Hey Prince!" yelled one enthusiastic youngster outside the International District Community Center at 416 Maynard Avenue South. The Prince turned, gold robe and white headdress ripping around his ample frame, and blew the applauding crowd a kiss.

Talal, known as "The Children's Prince" for his fundraising on behalf of the United Nations Children's Fund—UNICEF—arrived Monday in his private 727 jet to promote UNICEF and his brother's peace plan for the Middle East. He made some more stops in Los Angeles, San Francisco and leaves today for Chicago or Washington, D.C., after a baked salmon lunch with Indian Tribal leaders in Discovery Park.

He is the 23rd son of the late King Saud and half-brother to Saudi Arabia's King Fahd. The Prince served in several government posts, including that of Minister of Finance in the 1950's and 60's, but was expelled from the ruling circle after going into exile in Egypt to protest the way the country was being run. Talal maintains homes in Virginia, Paris and London as well as the palace in Saudi Arabia. He reconciled with his brothers in 1964 but has limited his work to fundraising and has stayed out of politics.

Monday night, Boeing president Malcolm Stanper hosted a private dinner at Canlis' for the Prince, Royer, George Weyerhaeuser and a few other community leaders. The Prince praised Boeing's support for the UNICEF program.

At a world affairs council luncheon yesterday, Talal urged the United States to increase its efforts to solve the Lebanese crisis and to pressure Israel to provide a home for Palestinian refugees.

He also issued a statement to the press criticizing a picture taken of him by a San Francisco newspaper.

The picture, taken at a children's science exhibit showed the Prince holding a musical instrument and the caption said he was singing. The picture made him look foolish in the Arab world, he said, because he and other Muslims are celebrating their holy month Ramadan, and singing is forbidden. He does not sing anyway, he said, and someone simply had handed the instrument to him to demonstate its use.

Before the Prince's speech, sixteen children from the Highline Chicano Pre-school entertained with Spanish dancers but the dais was so high the people at the head table could not see the dancers. The Prince and Royer left their seats to stand at the side of the room to see part of the dances.

Speaking in a deep, resonant baritone, the Prince apologized for his English and read a 13 page speech about the Palestinian problems in Lebanon and the Middle East.

"We cannot have peace in our land as long as what has been called the 'Palestinian problem' exists," the Prince said. "The Palestinian problem, I must remind you, involves people, not objects which can be swept away. Neither can the Palestinians' aspiration for nationalism be swept away. It has been tried by their best equipped foes, and it will not work."●

NOW ACCOUNTS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the Monetary Control Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-221) authorized the Nation's banking institutions to offer their customers the use of negotiable order of withdrawal (NOW) accounts. For millions of this country's consumers, interest-bearing checking accounts are an attractive method of banking.

As enacted, Public Law 96-221 permits NOW accounts to be used only by individuals and by not-for-profit organizations, such as religious or charitable groups. Evidently there was concern at the time that permitting everyone, including businesses, to use NOW accounts would cause a massive shift in deposits from banks which were not then offering NOW accounts to those which were.

That does not seem to be a problem anymore. Accordingly, I am today reintroducing legislation to authorize the use of NOW accounts by small businesses. In today's economy, I think our small businesses need every break they can get, and I see no reason why they should continue to be denied the use of interest-bearing checking accounts. I hope the 98th Congress will take prompt action on my bill.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE'S POLITICAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Jonathan S. Kessler and Madeline Stifel, the vital forces behind the American Israel Public Affairs Committee's (AIPAC) political leadership development program (PLDP). This program under the superb direction of Jonathan Kessler, has built a network of informed, articulate, and politically astute students.

The political leadership development program has recently been named winner of the 1983 B'nai B'rith Haber Award for its excellence in a program designed to involve college students in the American political process. PLDP was established 3 years ago by AIPAC to coordinate a network of informed and articulate student activists nationwide. This program hosts workshops, seminars, and conferences throughout the country on both college campuses and on State and regional levels. Since the establishment of the PLDP, over 5,000 students from 350 college campuses in all 50 States have become more involved in the political process.

AIPAC coordinates the efforts of the political leadership development program with the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations on college campuses. PLDP also reaches the unaffiliated student by offering a political outlet. The program works closely with the College Democrats and the College Republicans, thus, extending activism opportunities to students who have not previously been involved with foreign policy issues.

I would like to mention several students, whom I want to honor for their contributions in making their college campuses more politically aware in regard to U.S. relations around the world: Sandy Curtis, Florida International University, Michael Fischer, University of Florida, Gainesville, and Barry Weinberger, University of Miami, Law School.

The political leadership development program has earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us in Congress for the quality of its leadership and excellence in education. Jonathan Kessler has spent countless hours personally cultivating students, visiting college campuses and encouraging students to participate in the political process.●

WHY DOES IRAN KILL BAHAIS?

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the terrible brutality of the Khomeini regime in Iran becomes more and more apparent daily. One of the gravest crimes that regime is now committing against humanity is their merciless persecution of the Bahais.

There is no more blatant case of religious persecution in the world today than that which is taking place in Iran against the Bahais. I believe it is incumbent upon all of us to speak out as strongly as we can in an effort to persuade the Ayattollah Khomeini and his government to stop their campaign of eradication of Bahais.

Roy Mottahedeh recently described the horrors of this anti-Bahai campaign in the New York Times and I submit his analysis to be reprinted here:

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1983]

WHY DOES IRAN KILL BAHAIS?

(By Roy P. Mottahedeh)

PRINCETON, N.J.—News of the barbarous execution on Thursday and Friday of 16 Bahais in the southern Iranian city of Shiraz has shattered the small remaining hope of many well-wishers of the Iranian revolution who kept saying, as I did: "Wait, give it time."

Six men and 10 women, including three teenage girls, without publicly announced charges or public trial, were hanged, apparently for the mere crime of adherence to a religion. For, as the Islamic judge explained to the newspapers: "It is absolutely certain that in the Islamic Republic of Iran there is no place whatsoever for Bahais and Bahaism."

It is becoming increasingly unclear for whom there is a place in Iran.

It was possible to understand why the Iranian Government felt that there was no place for the radical left, which advocated armed struggle against the existing Government.

It was harder—but just possible, given the deep differences between peoples about ideas of propriety—to understand why there was no place for women who went out in public without their hair covered.

It was even harder to understand why there was no place for the Iranian Communist Party, which had repeatedly and slavishly declared itself to be in total support of the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini.

But no room for the Iranian Bahais?

No room for 300,000 Iranians who specifically repudiate rebellion against any duly constituted government such as the present Government of Iran?

No room for the only people who, besides the Zoroastrians, consider Iran a sacred land and revere the Persian language as a language of revelation?

For the only religion in Iran besides Islam that, however much it may look to a prophet subsequent to Mohammed, accepts the belief of Moslems that the Koran is an infallible revelation from God, presented in a text that, unlike the Old and New Testaments, has never been corrupted by the tampering of men?

Well-wishers of the revolution waited and gave it time—and for what?

To see the promise of parliamentary democracy blasted by an intolerance of any political party that meekly disagrees with the Government?

To find the universities still largely shut four years after the revolution, while Iranians suffer from a severe shortage of qualified teachers and technical experts?

To see proud, courageous Iranian soldiers lay down their lives in human wave attacks in the stalemated war against Iraq, a country that is a third the size of Iran in population and wealth?

Perhaps today's Iranian authorities find the Bahais a good focus for their genocidal fantasies precisely because this Government wishes to make clear that it wants nothing to do with early hopes for a Government religious in morality and democratic in method. Hang a few teenage girls, and everyone will get the point: The rulers of Iran do not need to consult the Iranian people because they know what's best for Iran, whether Iranians like it or not—and, by the same token, they do not want a freely given moral consensus because they trust only coercion.

Shiite Islam, the religion of the great majority of the Iranian people, puts a greater emphasis on reason than does any other form of Islam or do most other religions in the world. Then why the irony—why do the present rulers of Iran so desperately distrust reason?

Do they trust coercion more because they have secretly admitted to themselves that they are unable to change anyone's opinion through reasoned discussion?

Or, do they really believe that reason—or, for that matter, any form of persuasion that can win meaningful assent to religious truth—operates only on people who live in the shadow of the hangman's noose?

The Islamic Republic of Iran—how neatly and thoroughly it has come to belie every part of its name.

It is hardly Iranian in that it finds it necessary to hang 16 Bahais—in addition to the scores it has killed in recent years—merely for the "crime" of professing a religion that believes Iran to be a sacred land.

It is hardly a republic: A state that so terrifies and coerces its people is a republic in only some contorted sense of the word.

It is hardly Islamic in the spirit of the Koranic verse (10:99): "If it had been your Lord's will, they would all have believed, all who are on earth! Will you then compel mankind, against their will, to believe?"

It is, in fact, hardly religious—it is difficult to imagine any tradition motivated by the spirit of true religion, that would not cry: "Shame on these cowardly killers of defenseless people!"●

SHORE UP! INC. FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, the Shore Up! Inc. Foster Grandparents program recently held their Seventh Annual Grandparent Recognition Picnic in Salisbury, Md. This event marks another successful year for a much needed and appreciated community service.

Initiated on the lower Eastern Shore in 1976 and operated by Shore Up! Inc., this program aids children who have special needs in physical, social, emotional, and mental growth and development by providing them with caring, comforting adults whose life experiences enable them to give affection, understanding, and love on a 1-to-1 basis. In this rapidly changing and very pressured world, these Foster Grandparents pass on their own life values and goals to the children of today who need such direction.

Sixty Foster Grandparents now serve in Dorchester, Wicomico, Somerset, and Worcester Counties, at retardation and handicap facilities, and at various Head Start centers throughout the area. I applaud the care and dedication which these 60 people have shown by joining their lives with the lives of their spiritual, if not biological, descendents, and recognize the program for its 7 years of worthwhile existence. In special recognition of their unselfish contributions, I offer my personal commendation to the following Foster Grandparents:

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS

Dorchester County: Hazel Chester, Maggie Dennis, Emma Jones, Maggie J. Jones, Agnes Pinder, Grace Pinder, Iona Robinson, Mildred Sharp, Mildred V. Stanley, Claris Washington, and Helen M. White.

Worcester County: Leona Hayes, and Clara B. Mills.

Somerset County: Helen Ballard, Lena Brittingham, Nora Brown, Pearl V. Coulbourne, Gladys M. Handy, Beulah Landon, Curtis Landon, Nellie K. Tyler, Reverand Walter B. Ward, Sereta White, Margaret Whittington, and Jeanette Wilkins.

Wicomico County: Pearl Adams, Margaret Barkley, Audrey W. Dix, Elsie Dix, Mary Dukes, Renager Dutton, Dora Elzey, Sarah D. Evans, Gertrude Foreman, Mary Gale, Martha Garland, Annie Handy, Charles Holbrook, Minnie M. Hudson, Alice Johnson, Jessie Jones, Mary Lawrence, Mary Layman, Henry McCleese, Leila McCowan, Essie M. Mason, Emma Moore, Eva Morris, Pauline Morris, Blanche Palmer, George Palmer, Luna S. Pusey, Milton Rider, Audrey Schnidt, Alverta Smiley, Carrie Smith, Mary Smith, Rosalee Turner, Ocie Wooten, and Harry Wright.●

JUGI TANDON RECEIVES OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM ASSOCIATION OF ASIAN INDIANS IN AMERICA

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Association of Asian Indians in America in honoring

Sirjang Lai "Jugi" Tandon for outstanding achievement. On Saturday, June 25, 1983, the association presented Mr. Tandon with an award in recognition of the fact that this Asian Indian American has, over the past 23 years, risen to the height of corporate success. Inc. magazine lists Jugi's company, the Tandon Corp., as the fifth fastest growing company in the country. Others have achieved success in the corporate world, but few of them have risen as far or as fast as Jugi Tandon.

In 1960, Jugi migrated to the United States from Punjab, India. He took a job as a busboy in a District of Columbia restaurant, and showing great initiative, put himself through college, earning a master of engineering degree from Kansas University and an M.B.A. from Santa Clara University. With that training under his belt, he was snapped up by IBM. In the course of his engineering career, he worked for IBM, Memorex, and Pertec. But all the time he was working for these corporations, Jugi was also learning much about corporate strategy. He realized that in the computer industry, perhaps even more so than in other industries, a mass market is achieved by selling a superior product at a reduced price.

By 1975, he was ready to try his hand at business. Recording heads were his first project. He and his wife, Kamla, used to solder the heads in their own home. His product was soon in such demand that he was able to open a manufacturing plant in the United States, and, later, to open branches in India, Singapore, and Sri Lanka. The year 1978 saw Tandon Corp. enter the floppy disk market. Growth in high technology is occasionally spectacular for those with the right idea at the right time. And Jugi had the right idea. By 1982, Tandon Corp. was the world's largest independent producer of random access disk drives.

Between 1975 and 1980, the Tandon Corp. grew from a kitchen-table operation to a $22 million corporation, and earning have more than doubled each year since 1980. It is expected that the corporation will gross $1 billion per year in the not too distant future.

Jugi, for all his success, has remembered his beginnings and the impetus that was given to his career by proper training. I wanted most especially to recognize Sirjang Lal "Jugi" Tandon's achievements because success has not isolated him from the need of others. In the 31st District of California, we have a job training program known as the Compton-OIC Technological Training Institute. The program is worthy of note because of its alliance with industry. The institute is financed largely by industries, and training is provided in the work environment of the industries themselves. Jugi has been one of our solid corporate sponsors. He has been eager to extend a helping hand to those who, like himself, understand that hard work along with proper training is the best formula for success.

Jugi Tandon is truly the embodiment of the American dream. He began with nothing besides vision and drive, and these carried him to the frontline of American industrialists. But success is not the only element of the American dream. We are a generous people, willing to give of our riches for the benefit of others. Jugi is the exemplification of all that is best about Americans. He is a magnanimous man, and it is a privilege for me to acknowledge the achievements of this great-souled person before my colleagues in the Congress. His example is worthy of our emulation.●

CONTINUING TRADGEDY IN EAST TIMOR

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been quite concerned over the continuing tragedy in the former Portuguese colony of East Timor, a predominantly Roman Catholic island territory invaded and illegally occupied by Indonesian military forces in late 1975. On Sunday June 26, the Washington Post carried what may be the most positive news to come out of East Timor since the Indonesian invasion: That after nearly 8 years of bitter armed conflict, a meeting has recently taken place within East Timor between representatives of the Indonesian military and Timorese guerrillas resisting the Indonesian occupation. The Indonesian Embassy in Washington denies that such a meeting took place, but other diplomatic sources confirm the authenticity of the Post's report. This meeting could ultimately represent a first step toward an honorable termination of a war that has already claimed countless lives. It is generally acknowledged that at least 100,000 East Timorese have died as a result of the Indonesian invasion, but some sources believe that the true figure exceeds 250,000—out of an original population that was less than 700,000. If a just peace is on the horizon for East Timor, this would be excellent news indeed.

Some recent history is in order. A statement dated May 13 of this year, from a group of Catholic priests in the Diocese of Dili—the capital of East Timor—speaks of the horrors that have afflicted their country. The statement, sent to Catholic bishops' conferences throughout the world, tells of "moral and physical violence" against the people of East Timor, including "the execution of those who surrender," and "the execution of whole groups of those captured." It speaks of "disappearances and the destruction of whole families" as well as "hunger and disease throughout all of East Timor." We must remember that East Timor had already experienced a war-induced famine from 1978 through 1980 that was credibly compared with the cataclysm that struck Cambodia during that period.

Congressional concern about East Timor has been growing. Last October, for example, 84 Members of the House and Senate signed a letter to President Reagan asking that the Timor tragedy be accorded "priority attention" in meetings held during Indonesian President Suharto's state visit to Washington. On June 10, 72 Members of the House signed a letter to Robert Hawke, the Prime Minister of Australia—a country with longstanding ties to East Timor—asking him to implement the positive platform on the Timor issue that was adopted by his Labor Party in 1982. These initiatives, spearheaded by our esteemed colleague, TONY P. HALL of Ohio, who has worked diligently on the Timor issue since 1979, have been aimed at generating national and international action and publicity. Along these lines, in the days to come, I will be seeking support, with Representative HALL, for a letter addressed to Portuguese Prime Minister Mario Soares. This letter will underscore humanitarian and diplomatic matters involving Portugal, a nation that bears great responsibility toward East Timor because of its four centuries of colonial administration and its hasty abandonment of the territory in 1975. In recent years Portugal has taken some positive diplomatic steps concerning East Timor, and deserves to be commended as well as encouraged to expand these measures.

From another quarter, it is reassuring to note that on June 12, the nationally circulated Sunday supplement, Parade magazine—which has tens of millions of readers—published an informative article on East Timor, by Irving Wallace, David Wallechinsky, and Amy Wallace. Entitled "The Forgotten War," this article stresses American involvement in the East Timor events and has made an immeasurable contribution toward furthering popular awareness of the issue. The appearance of articles of this sort insure that East Timor will not remain forgotten.

The stage is set, then, for a just settlement to the conflict. The crucial issue of self-determination for East Timor is being raised. It is increasingly clear that there can be no lasting humanitarian solution to the East Timor tragedy without a corresponding polit-

ical solution. No matter how long it may take, voices must be raised to help guarantee that the people of East Timor will receive their rights under international law.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include for the RECORD the June 26 article from the Washington Post, the June 13 article from Parade magazine and the translated text of the May 13 message from the East Timorese priests.

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1983]

JAKARTA AIDES REPORTEDLY MET TIMOR REBELS

(By Peter Wise)

LISBON.—East Timorese guerrillas have met secretly with Indonesian military officials to negotiate a demand for self-determination after declaring a cease-fire in their eight-year war to free the remote Southeast Asian island territory from Indonesian occupation, according to a highly placed source here in the Portuguese capital.

Top-ranking Indonesian officers traveled by helicopter from the island capital, Dili, to a jungle base in the interior twice in March to negotiate with the leaders of the Revolutionary Front for an Independent Timor, known in Portuguese as Fretilin, according to this source.

The source, a well-placed non-Fretilin Timorese who arrived here recently from the former Portuguese colony, asked not to be named. He said the Indonesian delegation headed by the military commander of East Timor, Colonel Purwanto, and an intelligence officer flew to Lari Guto in the rugged eastern region of the territory for meetings March 21 and 23.

Fretilin leader Sha Na Na, 39, and his general staff reportedly centered the talks on three principal demands: a cease-fire, government notification to the United Nations that it is willing to negotiate with the rebels, and a self-determination act supervised by the United Nations and neighboring states.

The source in Lisbon said the governor of East Timor, Mario Carrascalao, a liberal Timorese who took office in 1982, attended the meetings, together with two Roman Catholic priests. The guerrillas are predominantly Catholic.

[An Indonesian Embassy spokesman in Washington, Mgurah Gedhe, said Friday that "there was no such meeting" and that "we are not aware of any fighting" in East Timor. The State Department's desk officer for Indonesia, Alfred M. Lehn, said the fighting was at a low level and noted that Jakarta had made clear its intention to seek an end to the insurgency.]

Abilio Araujo, a Fretilin Central Committee member based in Lisbon, confirmed the details of the meetings and said photographs, recordings and documents of the negotiations would be released at a meeting of Fretilin representatives.

This is the first report of negotiations between the two sides since Fretilin withdrew to its mountain strongholds to wage its guerrilla campaign against Indonesian invasion forces in October 1975.

The island, about twice the size of Hawaii, historically was divided between the Portuguese eastern half and the Dutch west, where Indonesia's claim was not contested. Portugal abandoned East Timor during a three-month civil war among three independence movements. Fretilin emerged the victor. Neighboring Indonesia then invaded, alleging an independent Timor could pose what a general described as "a Marxist threat to our soft underbelly."

Relief agencies estimate that more than 150,000 islanders perished during the hostilities and the famine and disease they provoked. The East Timorese population is now about 560,000 according to Indonesian census figures.

After the fighting Indonesia pronounced East Timor its 27th province and said the population had accepted integration. It imposed a selective news blackout that diminished reports of guerrilla warfare and virtually sealed off the island from the outside world, according to Timorese refugees here.

The Jakarta government has persistently denied well-documented and consistent reports from refugees, church sources and international human rights organizations that there have been mass executions, thousands of disappearences, torture, widespread fire-bombing of villages and other human rights violations.

It was not clear from which side the current reported truce initiative came. The non-Fretilin source in Lisbon said the guerrillas appeared to be negotiating from a position of strength, having regrouped 6,500-strong under a new leadership after setbacks last year.

Indonesian authorities say, however, that the guerrillas have been reduced to a few hundred ill-fed and ineffective men. Despite Indonesia's undoubted military superiority, observers here say, Jakarta may be seeking a respite in a war that it apparently cannot win, a war in which the guerrillas—with their intimate knowledge of the island and at least the passive support of the population—are able to hold Indonesian battalions to a stalemate.

A second motive behind Jakarta's reported role in the negotiations could be a determination to win international support for its presence in Timor by casting itself as a peacemaker and seeker of dialogue. After an intense diplomatic campaign, Indonesia has steadily reduced the number of nations supporting a U.N. resolution calling for its immediate withdrawal. Last year the motion, consistently opposed by the United States, passed by only 4 votes.

STATEMENT BY A GROUP OF PRIESTS OF DILI DIOCESE

A group of priests of the diocese of Dili wish to send to the Episcopal Conferences and to the whole world its voice, which it hopes will be an echo of the social and religious situation in East Timor.

This group feels responsible for the life of its diocese; it knows closely the various forms of agony caused by a war which, for 7 years, has been tormenting its people; it knows in a word the REALITY of the people, because the group shares in its own flesh the drama which is being carried out in East Timor; the group knows the suffering and the anxieties of its people and witnesses helplessly the whole process of annihilation presented under the disguise of truth and we foresee the implacable extermination of the people.

This group feels disappointed and profoundly hurt, knowing that members of the Indonesian Catholic Church have joined in the chorus of campaigns carried on inside and outside Indonesia and the defamation of its Prelate, accusing him presumptively of falsehood, exaggeration and irresponsibility in his affirmations and attitudes; when his is the only voice raised in defense of the people on whom silence and fear are imposed and for whom the exercise of freedom of expression will only result in imprisonment or disappearance.

The group affirms its Solidarity with the martyred people and wants to affirm also its solidarity with the clear position assumed by its Prelate in defense of those denied their fundamental human rights, attesting the truth of the following:

Moral and physical violence;

Arbitrary imprisonment, the resettlement of families and whole villages;

The execution of those who surrender;

Executions without trial or after summary judgment;

Disappearances and the destruction of families;

The execution of whole groups of those captured;

Hunger and disease throughout all of East Timor.

[From Parade magazine, June 12, 1983]

THE FORGOTTEN WAR

(By Irving Wallace, David Wallechinsky, and Amy Wallace)

Few people have heard of East Timor, yet it is the scene of one of the bloodiest wars in recent history—a war being fought with arms supplied by the U.S.

In August 1975, in the face of a coup and civil war, Portugal yielded its sovereignty over the eastern half of Timor, a small island 400 miles north of Australia. On Dec. 7, shortly after East Timor proclaimed its independence, Indonesian forces attacked with tanks, napalm and heavy artillery, shooting unarmed civilians in the streets. Indonesia's plan was to crush the new nation and annex it—quickly and without attracting notice.

U.S. officials knew of the attack in advance. Yet they did nothing to prevent it, though it was carried out with U.S. weapons supplied specifically for defense. When the UN voted to condemn the aggression five days after it began, this country abstained, presumably fearful of antagonizing oil-rich and pro-West Indonesia.

Today, East Timor is a devastated land, its farms abandoned, its towns in ruins, its economy destroyed. Disease and starvation are rampant, and the bloodshed continues. Out of a population of 600,000, as many as 250,000 have died in the war. Though Indonesia officially annexed East Timor in 1976, the remaining nationalist guerrillas occasionally emerge from their mountain strongholds to battle Indonesian troops. Meanwhile, thousands of civilians and political prisoners have been forced into interment camps, where they risk disease, torture, sexual abuse and murder.

Despite East Timor's desperate plight, only a few food shipments have been allowed in since 1979; the Red Cross was finally permitted to treat political prisoners in 1982. Most foreign journalists, however, still are barred. Thus the holocaust rarely receives press coverage. During talks with President Reagan in Washington last year, Indonesian President Suharto never mentioned East Timor. Neither did President Reagan.

For more information about East Timor, write to: East Timor Human Rights Committee, Dept. P. Box 363, Clinton Station, Syracuse, N.Y. 13201.●

INTRODUCTION OF A SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE BILL

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to correct a problem which arose as a result of language in the recently enacted Social Security Amendments of 1983, Public Law 98-21.

In that legislation, we provided for social security overage, starting January 1, 1984, for Federal judges. Our intention was to insure that this group of Government officials would be covered essentially in the same way as Members of Congress and appointed officers of the executive branch. We were striving for equity, but in the process we achieved an unintended result.

This result is, in effect, a penalty on senior judges, who have retired but who return to active service from time to time to help meet workload needs of the Federal judiciary. When these retired judges do return to the bench in the future, they will be required to pay social security payroll taxes. This understandably will have an adverse impact on their decision to return to active service, and we certainly did not intend that consequence when we agreed to extend social security coverage to Federal judges generally.

The bill I am introducing today would correct this situation by exempting the computation of these retired, senior judges from the social security payroll tax when they do return temporarily to active service.●

CROWN POINT CLINIC NAMED AFTER THE LATE ADAM BENJAMIN, JR.

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill which would name the new Veterans' Administration Outpatient Clinic in Crown Point, Ind., after the late Adam Benjamin, Jr.

Congressman Benjamin ably served the people of the First Congressional District of Indiana as a Member of the House of Representatives from 1977 until his untimely death on September 7, 1982. A tireless worker, Adam worked very hard to bring this new outpatient clinic to northwest Indiana and his efforts, obviously, have paid off.

The VA recently announced it would build a new outpatient clinic in Crown Point, a city located about 25 miles south of Adam's hometown of Hobart. The facility will be equipped to handle 50,000 outpatient visits a year when it opens in 1986.

For years, hundreds of northwest Indiana veterans have been forced to drive to the Hines VA Hospital in Chicago—a difficult and time-consuming commute especially at rush hour. The Crown Point Clinic means the end of that inconvenience and the beginning of a strong veterans health care program in northern Indiana.

As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am particularly pleased at the VA decision to locate its new clinic in Crown Point, a city I now represent. Crown Point is a progressive and safe community that is anxious to assist VA officials in finding the best location for the new clinic. Adam would be pleased to know that the clinic will not only solve the transportation problems of hundreds of area veterans but also provide at least 100 jobs to the community.

Throughout his all too brief but distinguished career in the House, Adam Benjamin represented the people of northwest Indiana and Crown Point with a dedication to his job that was second to no other Member.

He knew better than anyone how difficult and dangerous it was for northern Indiana veterans to drive into Chicago and he prevailed upon the VA to come up with a remedy.

Northwest Indiana deserved an outpatient clinic, he argued, and the excellent system of highways and interstates in the Calumet region would make the clinic accessible to thousands.

Sadly, Adam did not live long enough to see his goal accomplished. The VA announced its decision to build in Crown Point last month, 8 months after Adam's sudden death. While I played some role in the final decisionmaking process, I am convinced that, without Adam's persistence, the Crown Point Clinic would still be only a dream.

I can think of no better tribute to the memory of Adam Benjamin and the hard work he put into securing the clinic for northern Indiana than to name the hospital facility after him.

In addition to his service in the House, Adam had a distinguished military career. He served in the Marine Corps from 1952 through 1954 and then entered the U.S. Military Academy in West Point where he graduated in 1958. He then served 3 years in the U.S. Army.

With his many years of Government service—10 years in Indiana State government and 5 years in the U.S. House—and his 10 years in the Armed Forces, there is no doubt in my mind that Adam is deserving of this honor. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill and name the new Crown Point hospital facility the Adam Benjamin Veterans Administration Outpatient Clinic.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE EL SALVADOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducting today a bill entitled the El Salvador Humanitarian Assistance Act of 1983. This legislation would provide assistance to persons in El Salvador who have been displaced and are suffering as a result of the war in that country.

Much has been said about how the United States should respond militarily to the political problems in El Salvador. But we have oftentimes overlooked the hundreds of civilians who have had their homes destroyed, their crops burned, their businesses wiped out, and their livelihoods snatched away. Prompt economic assistance by the United States is necessary to alleviate the human suffering arising from the civil strife in El Salvador.

The legislation I am introducing would amend section 4951 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizing $5 million, in addition to the amounts already available to the President, for the relief and rehabilitation of needy people in El Salvador. $3 million of this authorization is earmarked to be available through international relief agencies to the Archdiocise of San Salvador and other organizations in El Salvador that provide food, medical care, clothing, and other basic needs to the civilians in this war-torn nation.

In addition, the President is encouraged to use other funds allocated under the Foreign Assistance Act for the relief of the suffering Salvadoran citizens.

Over the past few years, this Nation has sent millions of dollars in military equipment and advisors to the Government in El Salvador to assist them in their war against guerilla insurgents. But the bitter fighting continues in this small Latin American country, while families are without shelter, and children are without food or clothing.

If we feel it is necessary to send military aid to El Salvador to protect them from leftist take over, then we should certainly provide their citizens with the basic human needs which have been robbed from them as a result of the ongoing war. I urge my colleagues to join with me and cosponsor this much needed and important legislation.●

IN SUPPORT OF SECTION 190: TAX CODE HELP FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in January, I introduced H.R. 901 which would extend for 2 years section 190 of the Internal Revenue Code which provides a deduction for businesses which make their facilities accessible to the handicapped. Today, I wish to reemphasize the need for prompt action on this legislation.

The most fundamental approach to increase the employment opportunities for disabled people is to remove architectural barriers that restrain their mobility. Despite this basic reality, section 190 is the only inducement in the Tax Code to make buildings accessible. In fact, with the exception of a few clauses benefiting the blind, 190 is the only statement in the code directly benefiting the handicapped. Remarkably, Congress has failed to renew this provision.

By losing section 190, the resistance to considering disabled people as potential employees will return. Though the costs of making a building accessible are usually small, the absence of any economic incentives will even make these costs prohibitive. Without the benefit of such tax incentives, the typical proprietor is much more likely to make expenditures for cosmetic improvements rather than to provide accessibility. In short, without 190, we can only urge businesses to make their facilities accessible, because it is the morally right thing to do; with 190, we can argue money. Business, as we know, responds more readily to money.

Mr. Speaker, some have expressed concern as to the effectiveness of section 190. Unfortunately, it is impossible to produce quantifiable arguments that point to its successes or failures. Because of certain reporting procedures, the Treasury Department is unable to provide numbers or even estimates as to how many businesses took advantage of 190. The only way we can evaluate its success is to look at the individual efforts of people across the country to remove architectural barriers. I am happy to say that such examples are numerous and encouraging.

A study published by the U.S. Department of Labor, in June 1982, and titled "Accommodations Provided to Handicapped Employees by Federal Contractors," made several recommendations on how to bring about the removal of these barriers. First on its list was for the Federal Government to provide tax credits for such accommodations. The study concluded: "The policy option cited by most firms as providing a strong incentive for firms to hire and accomodate handicapped workers is the provision of tax credits." A similar conclusion was reached a year later by Gerben Dejong in Scientific American.

So, while the approach of tax incentives seems to be the proper one, we must still ask whether the rather obscure section 190 has been effective. I have received several reports and articles that would indicate that 190, combined with strong community support, has had significant effect in various regions of the country. Baco Raton, Fla., and Nassau County, N.Y., are two such communities where accessibility for the handicapped has been greatly improved through the use of 190. The greatest example of how 190 can be effective if combined with strong community support is found in Suffolk County, N.Y. The Suffolk County Office of Handicapped Services began an extensive informative letter campaign to inform local businessmen of the deductions available through 190. The result was that most of the 226 shopping centers in the areas voluntarily added parking spaces, built ramps, and cut curbs, thus making their facilities accessible. The director of the program wrote: "I sincerely believe that pointing out the availability of this Federal tax deduction was the key to obtaining such an overwhelmingly voluntary response."

As the median age of Americans continues to rise along with the incidence of severe disability, we will find ourselves with more and more citizens who need special access to buildings. They must have this access to lead full and meaningful lives. Thomas Denisto, a veteran of the Vietnam war and a quadraplegic, wrote to me about this problem. He said that he was disturbed that the Tax Code allows a 10-percent tax credit for the restoration of historic buildings while we allowed section 190 to expire. He concluded: "The past is dead; we are living!" The quality of that life can, at least in part, be improved by the extension of 190.

Therefore, I again urge that we act quickly to extend this vital provision in the Tax Code.●

DEATH IN BEIRUT

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 27, 1983]

DEATH IN BEIRUT

EDITOR.—My uncle, Thomas Blacka, died in Beirut April 18; the latest casualty in the Byzantine tragedy. He went downstairs for a cup of coffee and was blasted into oblivion. I'm torn apart by negative thoughts as I try to understand what is happening over there. I feel the grief of personal loss. Disappointment that my government had no better protection against this worst case scenario. Incredulity that hatred exists that can justify such indiscriminate and anonymous killing. Frustration that man-made philosophies can so divide genetically identical peoples. Anger over religious intolerance that evokes a diety to legitimize the most heinous of crimes. Pity over the waste of so much talent when and where it is so desperately needed. And fear that this vestige of reptilian behavior could easily unleash devastation of unprecedented magnitudes throughout the world.

There is not solace here, only hate and despression. These are not what solve world problems. Quiet, middle-aged accountants like Tom Blacka do. He went to Lebanon to help stop the death in that corner of the globe. He knew that only international infuence could stablize a region where the locals have failed to for 10,000 years. He also knew that real peace will be won not with a gun but with economic and social permanence. He went to the front armed with irrigation systems and garbage trucks. He carried not a flag or holy book, but rather the standard of human dignity. He knew it was risky. He had been under fire many times before, but he believed his efforts toward civil stability were the only way to a genuine peace and therefore worth the risk. He was a man of overwhelming courage and as much a hero as any dogface who ever stormed a pilbox. He sacrified his most precious commodity for the benefit of others not even his blood.

Tom Blacka died in Beirut, a victim of philosophical fervor. Nothing will bring my uncle back, but what he lived for must go on for all our sakes. May he have been the vanguard of a legion of builders in a land of destruction.—John B. Rose, Brownsville, Calif.●

BALLOON CRASH TAKES LIFE OF MAXIE ANDERSON AND DON IDA

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly saddened to learn of the balloon crash yesterday that took the life of Maxie Anderson and Don Ida in the Bavarian Forest. I had an occasion to speak with Maxie Anderson several years ago, I was most impressed by his enthusiasm and humility. His feats will be long remembered and I know that he will be an inspiration to generations that follow, as he truly set the example of accepting difficult challenges, I know that all Members of this body join me in extending sympathy to his family.●

11-059 O-87-46 (Pt. 13)

HOUSE REAFFIRMS FEDERAL ARTS SUPPORT

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my fellow Members of Congress for their overwhelming vote in favor of Federal arts support as recommended by subcommittee chairman SIDNEY YATES and his committee in the interior appropriations bill.

Legislation emerging from the 89th Congress more than 17 years ago declared that "a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly and cultural activity * * *" and that "it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry, but also the material conditions facilitating the release of this creative talent."

Legislation, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, recognized the vital importance of Federal support for this Nation's arts and humanities and set the stage for America's cultural growth and expansion during the next decade and a half. Figures documenting this growth have been presented at numerous hearings. Orchestras, theaters, opera and dance companies, and museums have multiplied. Artists' spaces, which were almost nonexistent in 1965, now number in the hundreds. In 1965 there were only 23 State arts agencies, now all States and jurisdictions have agencies. In 1965 no State had a council devoted soley to the humanities, now all States have such agencies.

In fiscal years 1982 and 1983, the Reagan administration proposed drastic cuts to the Federal arts agencies which were a strong part of the growth in the arts in America. Fortunately, Congress wisely kept these cuts to a minimum. Nonetheless, the effect of the Federal budget cuts has been a reduction or even elimination of many important educational programs and outreach programs. Dance touring has been cut; theaters have eliminated special ticket prices for schoolchildren and senior citizens; museums have raised admission prices. Budget reductions of any kind in arts and humanities funding could threaten the very existence of many local arts groups nationwide. Cuts of the magnitude that the President proposed would destroy the very core of Federal arts and humanities programs.

The $165 million in the Interior appropriations bill for the National Endowment of the Arts, the $150 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the $21.5 million for the Institute of Museum Services represent a strong statement that the arts and humanities are an important aspect of our society. These 1984 levels for funding approved by the full House will insure a healthier arts community and economy thus creating a climate in which the arts and humanities can flourish and preserving our Nation's diverse cultural heritage.●

WESTPORT, MO., CELEBRATES 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, residents of the Westport community this weekend will begin a summer celebration of the founding of Westport 150 years ago. I am honored to have the opportunity to participate in the inaugural event at the Penn Valley Community College in Kansas City on Sunday.

I would like to briefly share with my colleagues the history of Westport, which is an inspiring example of urban revitalization.

The history of Westport is a remarkable story, from its birth on the Santa Fe Trail in the 1830's, to its annexation by Kansas City at the turn of the century and to its inspiring rebirth in the 1970's.

John C. McCoy opened a trading post on the Santa Fe Trail 150 years ago and the Westport community was born. The hard work of McCoy and other enterprising pioneers turned Westport into a vibrant town, and soon Westport became a gateway to the new West. The town developed into a major outfitting center for wagon trains on the Santa Fe, California, and Oregon Trails.

After reaching a population of 5,000 in 1855, Westport became an incorporated town in 1857. But the Civil War years were hard on its citizens—many of whom were Southern sympathizers. A major battle was fought there, and the town was occupied by Union troops.

In the postwar period, Westport could not maintain the momentum in business and commerce that it had gained in the 1840's and 1850's. Kansas City officials decided to annex the town about the turn of the century. Kansas City developed into one of the Nation's great metropolitan centers in the 1900's, but Westport's fortunes declined. The community suffered from the loss of business to Kansas City, and Westport, with many of the area's finest 19th century residential structures, sadly became a deteriorating community.

Fortunately, in the late 1960's, some visionary local leaders, imbued with the same pioneering spirit that emboldened Mr. McCoy to open his trading post, saw a future for Westport. Those people formed Westport Tomorrow in 1971, an organization committed to rebuilding confidence in the community and creating a pleasant place to live. Their strategy was built on preserving the existing buildings, planned new development compatible with most of the area's housing and a unique partnership between business, residents, and government.

Largely due to the efforts of those people and Kansas City officials, Westport is presently known as the "bridge between yesterday and tomorrow." The reasons are obvious. Westport is the cultural heart of Kansas City with its numerous art galleries and fine arts groups, including the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, the Kansas City Art Institute, and the UNKC Conservatory of Music.

Westport is also a thriving business community with several corporate headquarters located in the area, including H&R Block, Kansas City Life Insurance, and Sutherland Lumber Co. Westport can also boast of two of the city's most prominent shopping and entertainment districts, the Country Club Plaza and Westport Square/Old Westport.

Most importantly, Westport is people, 35,000 people living and working together to form an enjoyable community. A walk through the 4-square-mile area of Westport is testimony to the rebirth of this proud community. The fruits of the labors of the local leaders and area residents can be seen in the beautiful facade of the Westport Bank, the spectacular restoration of Westport Square and the charming blend of architectural styles through Westport's 15 neighborhoods.

The revitalization of this community with such a proud heritage is truly remarkable. I urge community leaders nationwide to emulate Westport's model of urban rebirth.●

HAYSI PROJECT STALLED BY CONFERENCE

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I learned this morning of the refusal of the Senate conferees on the energy and water appropriations bill to agree with the House-approved funding for the Haysi reservoir and flood control project in Dickenson County, Va.

With the assistance and support of Chairman BEVILL of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommit-

tee, H.R. 3132 included $500,000 for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers studies on the Haysi project. Unfortunately, the other body did not include the Haysi funds in its appropriations bill, and Senate conferees apparently refused to accept the House language.

The Haysi reservior and flood control project was first authorized by the Congress 38 years ago. It was reauthorized in 1977. The people of the Haysi area have waited patiently for this urgently needed flood control project, and I am hopeful that in the future the other body will be more cooperative in our effort to fund this needed project.●

IRONBOUND EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL CENTER HOLDS FESTIVAL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this weekend we celebrate our Nation's 207th birthday, and all over America there will certainly be Independence Day festivities. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to one such festival that will be held in my home city of Newark, the Multi-Ethnic Festival and Parade sponsored by the Ironbound Educational and Cultural Center.

The center is a neighborhood social service agency, and the festival helps to support its programs. Represented at the festival will be the Newark Fire Department, the Bronze Shields, the Youth Council of the IECC, local Scouting troops, and, of course, the many ethnic groups that comprise the city of Newark. Amusement rides, games, ethnic foods, and a parade on July 3 are the highlights of the festival.

Perhaps the single most important aspect of our country is the diversity of its people and the blend of many heritages that have contributed to our history. This festival is an excellent illustration of how people of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds can bring the best of their particular heritage to work toward the advancement of our society as a whole.

I salute all of the participants in the IECC festival, and would like to mention in particular, the executive committee of the IECC: Vincent J. Aresti, president; Ms. M. E. DaCunha, vice president; Donald Bernard, vice president; Manuel J. Corte, vice president; Elizabeth Del Tufo, secretary; Rose A. Leonardis, treasurer; Paul N. Gilbert, legal counsel; Joseph J. Parlapiano, legal counsel; Richard A. Pereira, executive director; and Jesse E. Kasowitz, program administrator and also festival coordinator. Ms. Del Tufo, who is the director of the Essex County Cultural Affairs Department, will serve as grand marshal for the parade.

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of '76 is certainly alive and well in Newark this weekend, and I know the festival will be a tremendous success.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES F. "BUCK" BURSHEARS

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, next month, the town of La Junta, Colo., will celebrate the 50th anniversary of one of the Nation's most successful Boy Scout troops. It is appropriate that we take special note of the achievements of this troop and, most especially, the contribution made to it by its founder and only scoutmaster, James F. "Buck" Burshears.

Every year since 1933, seventh grade boys from La Junta and the surrounding area have been invited to become members of Boy Scout Explorer Troop 2230, better known as the Koshare Indian Dancers. The Scouts of this troop have taken as their full-time project the preservation of the American Indian heritage through the performance of Indian ritual dances. They have been phenomenally successful. Today the Koshare Indian Dancers have over 100 dances in their repetoire and are nationally known for the realism and historical accuracy of their costumes and dancing.

The boys raise money for their Scout troop by performing in public. Neither the boys or their scoutmaster personally receive any money. But the troop's earnings and contributions from the community have enabled it to acquire Indian artifacts as part of its effort to promote an appreciation of American Indian culture.

The Koshares' success has taken them from their first clubhouse—an abandoned chicken coop on the Colorado prairie—to the Koshare Kiva and Indian Museum, which houses one of the world's largest collections of Indian lore, artifacts, paintings, and sculpture.

In the summer, thousands of Boy Scouts and other youth groups from all over the United States visit La Junta to watch the Koshares dance and to see their museum exhibits.

When he started the troop 50 years ago, Buck Burshears wanted it to have a challenging interest that would be fun and give each boy an opportunity to experience leadership and responsibility early. Buck is fond of telling his Scouts, "You don't have to wait to be a man to be great. Be a great boy."

The older Koshare boys, the chiefs, are responsible for teaching the younger boys the dances, costumemaking, and the Scout tests. If a young boy does well, he is elected a brave, and, eventually, a chief. In turn, he then becomes responsible for teaching younger boys. The Koshare chiefs also help make decisions about the management of the troop's earnings and the maintenance of their meeting place, the Kiva, and the museum.

The Koshares' accomplishments are impressive. More impressive are the lessons they have learned from Buck Burshears that have made such achievements possible. Buck has helped instill the boys with many qualities: Leadership, a sense of responsibility, confidence, self-discipline, and a knowledge of how to work with others in a joint endeavor. Most importantly, he has taught them that in life success is no accident. Excellence in education and effort is needed to succeed.

Over 2,000 boys have been Koshare Indian Dancers. The best testimonial to Buck himself is that over 500 of them have become Eagle Scouts, and over 90 percent of them have gone on to college.

Buck Burshears has received many awards and honors for his outstanding contribution to the education and growth of these young people. He is the recipient of Scouting's highest honor, the Silver Buffalo. In 1982, the Colorado State Legislature and Gov. Richard Lamm named Buck Colorado's "Citizen of the Year." He is an hororary member of the Chippewa and Blackfoot Indian Tribes and has been honored as a "human treasure" by the nation of Japan.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to also honor Buck and to express my wish that the Koshare Indian Dancers will continue to benefit from his wisdom and guidance for many years to come.●

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1984

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to explain my vote on the Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1984—H.R. 3363.

Acknowledging the fact that the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee's recommendations for the Department of Energy fossil energy programs in fiscal year 1984 represent an increase over the administration's request for fiscal year 1984, I would submit that my colleagues have failed to increase funding in an area I consider to be an important component of our national energy policy.

I call attention to the fact that funding for surface coal gasification research was reduced from a total of $39 million in fiscal year 1983 to $27 million for fiscal year 1984. This represents a cut of over 30 percent. One example of a surface coal gasification facility that was not funded was the Homer City coal gasification research test facility in Homer City, Pa. Over the past 7 years this facility has contributed substantial amounts of valuable coal research data to the Nation's coal data base. Tests were run on Montana rosebud coal as well as Pittsburgh seam coal. Currently tests are being run on Illinois No. 6 coal. Over 100 skilled research technicians are employed at the facility. The Homer City facility is the last of its kind in the Nation and it would be a tremendous error to close it.

There is no doubt in my mind that we must use the window of opportunity we currently enjoy to prepare for the next energy crisis. When foreign oil trinkles into this Nation because of circumstances beyond our control, the people of this country will ask: Why did the Congress not have the foresight to prepare for it?●

SOUTH AFRICAN CRISIS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, I would like to express my concern about the present continuing human rights crisis in South Africa, where daily over 20 million nonwhites (be they black, colored, or Asian) are humiliated and discriminated against by law.

Let me quote a remark Secretary of State George Shultz made recently before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. He most aptly stated that, "Human rights cannot be relegated to international politics." I would venture to state that this administration has done exactly that in South Africa. In the hopes of improving communications with the racist South African Government, we have lifted export controls, vetoed economic sanctions in the U.N., persuaded the IMF to loan the South Africa Government $1 billion (almost exactly the amount they have spent on a war preventing Namibian independence) and continually refused to speak out against the inhumanities directed at the black majority.

If this administration truly believes that human rights supersede international politics in importance, then it should not hesitate to support the provisions in the Export Administration Act (H.R. 3231), reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee, which would change our ineffective and insupportable policy toward South Africa. This legislation, which may reach the House floor by the end of July, would restore export restrictions on the Government of South Africa, restrict bank loans which help stengthen the system of apartheid, ban the sale of the South Africa Krugerrand in the United States, force U.S. businesses in that nation to observe fair employment practices, and finally, reaffirm our commitment to the basic human rights of all people throughout the world.●

BUMPER BILL

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention my reintroduction of what has become popularly known as the Bumper bill. This amendment to the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act would require that the impact test velocity for the motor vehicle bumper standard be restored from 2½ miles per hour to 5 miles per hour.

Restoring the threshold of damage standards will result in greater savings for motorists. Fewer replacement parts would be needed and insurance costs would thus decline. Though the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) cites savings to consumers as its reason for originally lowering the standards, I am of the opinion that if any savings are realized at all, they would certainly seem to be negligible.

The average automobile owner in Brooklyn pays in excess of $1,000 annually in auto insurance even with the 5-miles-per-hour standard. Under a 2½-mile-per-hour standard it is more than likely that there will be increased damages sustained in minor accidents, which will represent a tremendous cost in terms of repairs, insurance, and lost job time. These costs will far exceed the $28 savings per new car customer which the NHTSA claims will result from lowered standards.

In light of today's advanced technology, reducing safety standards does not seem to be the optimum way of making automobiles more fuel efficient. Our auto industry, which is presently on the rebound, is employing new design techniques which utilize advanced aerodynamic styling. The application of scientific formulae means a great deal more in terms of gas saving, which is one alleged goal of the lowered standard, than a lighter bumper.

It is my hope that my colleagues recognize the impending dangers in allowing this relaxation of damage standards for automobile bumpers to go unheeded. A decline in damage and safety standards is neither good for industry or consumers.

It is my firm belief that restoring the 5-mile-per-hour bumper standard will benefit many. I urge my colleagues to join me in my battle for greater consumer protection.●

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF KALAMAZOO-NUMAZU SISTER CITY AFFILIATION

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the 20th anniversary of the sister-city affiliation of Kalamazoo, Mich., and Numazu, Japan. As many of my colleagues are aware, the sister city relationships which bind many of our municipalities with cities abroad are a result of President Eisenhower's people-to-people international program, which was founded in 1956. Although the program ceased to be a function of the Federal Government in 1961, the sister city program has since prospered as a private endeavor.

Kalamazoo and Numazu became officially affiliated in 1963. Under the sister city program, the two cities have developed a broad range of contacts and interactions. Mayoral delegations have exchanged visits on at least four occasions. Teachers from Kalamazoo and professors from Western Michigan University have traveled to Japan. A special scholarship program has resulted in Kalamazoo students studying in Numazu and a number of Numazu students studying in Kalamazoo. Several elementary and junior high schools have established sister-school relationships, resulting in an exchange of pen-pal letters, art exhibits and numerous gifts.

I can personally testify to the warmth and value of this sister city affiliation. While serving as a member of the Kalamazoo City Council, I had the opportunity to visit Numazu. It is an experience I will long treasure. The genuine feeling of friendship with which I was received by the people of Numazu made a deep impression on me. I know many of my fellow citizens in Kalamazoo have experienced the same warm friendship.

On July 29 a delegation from Kalamazoo headed by Mayor Caroline Ham will again visit Numazu to mark the 20th anniversary of the Kalamazoo-Numazu sister city affiliation. On this happy occasion we can all join in saluting a program which has, in a very real and personal way, promoted true friendship between the Japanese and American peoples. I congratulate the

leaders of Kalamazoo and Numazu for their efforts to foster a strong sister-city relationship.●

UNEMPLOYMENT IN ARIZONA

HON. JAMES F. McNULTY, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, no problem surpasses the problem of unemployment among the people of southeastern Arizona in the summer of 1983. The years of expansion as part of the well-known "Sun Belt" growth were so vital and profound that our people were not well equipped to face the consequences of the current recession, nor the failure of the economic policies of this administration to restore economic vitality since taking office.

Copper production and smelting is one of the fundamental strengths of southeastern Arizona. As I address this House this evening, the hard fact is 14 of the 28 mines in Arizona are shut down totally. Of the State's 24,000 copper miners, 11,000 are unemployed. Many have been unemployed so long that they are now exhausting their unemployment compensation benefits. Small businesses are suffering near record failures. This is paticularly so in the small towns of my district that are totally dependent on the copper industry for their well being. Of those fortunate enough to still be working in copper production and processing, many are involuntarily working reduced hours.

Congressional District 5 also includes the border with Mexico and the havoc visited upon the economy, particularly the commercial economy, of the border is unbelievable. Declines of as much as 60 percent in gross revenues are not at all uncommon.

Hundreds of jobs have disappeared from the nonmetropolitan counties which I have the honor to represent. Hundreds of men and women have left their homes in despair, looking for new employment opportunity in Phoenix and Tucson, the two great urban centers of the State. Yet the unemployment in Pima County and Tucson, its central urban place, remains at 10.3 percent.

Recovery is following a very slow path indeed for the area taken as a whole. The only bright light is in the residential home construction industry in Phoenix and Tucson. In both these areas home permit activity is running at very high, nearly record levels. There is every reason to believe this pace cannot be continued as excess demand is satisfied and any rise of interest rates will place homeownership out of the reach of people who for now can hope to purchase a home.

It is of the utmost urgency that this House continue to insist on budgetary restraint and budgetary responsibility. The House is to be commended, in my view, for pressing to restrain the growth in new Federal debt in the coming fiscal year, and for resisting pressures from the administration to throw out the budget process altogether. It is bad enough to confirm a budget with $180 billion in deficit. It is less than responsible to present higher budget deficits as the administration has done for the coming year and for as many years as the eye can see. The financial markets and the American people have every reason to view such financial planning as imprudent. The recovery thus far is frail at best.

We must demonstrate that we are committed as a nation to help the unemployed and to help Americans who want to work to return to work. The House has shown its understanding through passage of a jobs bill and the American Conservation Corps legislation. We soon shall have the opportunity to consider the Coal Slurry Transport Act from which several hundred thousand jobs will shortly be created. This is the kind of legislation that America wants and expects.

Congress can and must respond to the economic emergency facing this Nation. I am proud to be part of this effort and I congratulate my colleagues who this evening in this forum of the Representatives of the American people are focusing the attention of the Nation on this, America's No. 1 problem.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to append to this statement a copy of my newsletter of June 1983 which extends and documents the points I have made concerning the plight of Arizona's No. 1 industry, the copper mining and smelting industry.

COPPER: THE SLOW REVIVAL OF ARIZONA'S NO. 1 INDUSTRY

Copper is a stricken industry. I know it, and southern Arizonans know it better than anyone. Similar problems afflict other American industries, such as automobiles, steel and timber, and as a result the Federal government has been slow to understand the depth and severity of copper's problems. My colleagues from other copper producing states and I frequently find ourselves explaining our all-too-familiar problems to people who are hearing the facts for the first time.

One primary concern since becoming the Representative from Arizona's Fifth District has been to advance bills and policies that will permit copper workers to go back to work, allow mines to operate in a market where they can make a respectable profit, and give the small businessmen and women of southeastern Arizona the opportunity to plan for a better future.

This is a report on the progress we have made, keeping in mind that much remains to be done.

The copper industry, America's most important nonferrous mineral industry, was afflicted severely by the national recession, and remains in poor health. Some 11,000 of Arizona's 24,000 copper workers are still out of work. A good fraction of the remainder are involuntarily working reduced hours. Of the 28 mines in Arizona, 14 are shut down completely. Every major copper producer lost money in 1982, and in some cases the losses were quite substantial. For example, Phelps Dodge Corp. lost $74 million last year, the largest loss in its history, and Kennecott Corp. reported a loss from its metals operations of $189 million.

Small businesses in Arizona, many of which provide goods and services directly to the copper mines, have also suffered on account of the copper recession. At the end of 1981, 90 percent of the members of the trade association serving the copper industry had laid off workers and reduced salaries, and a number of companies had simply gone out of business.

This downward trend has had severe impacts on state and local governments. Recession and unemployment translate into decreased tax revenues, which mean smaller government payrolls and diminished public services. For example, Pima County experienced a loss of $2 million in sales tax collections over the past two years as a result of the slowdown in copper. Greenlee County sales tax revenue fell off 57 percent in one year. Statewide, the Arizona Office of Economic Planning calculates that in the second half of last year, state sales tax revenues fell a full $12.1 million. Such sharply reduced revenues, directly due to the hard times in copper, force state and local officials to make extremely difficult decisions on how and whether to fund vital and necessary public services.

In short, a healthy copper industry is critical to a healthy Arizona.

Copper has always been a boom and bust industry. But in the past, downturns have been followed quickly by strong improvements in prices and demand that restored payrolls and profits. This recession has proved far more severe, and it is increasingly clear that we are not going to have that strong bounce-back which we could count on in earlier times.

A number of factors lead us to this conclusion, but to know the full story we must look at the copper situation worldwide—and specifically at the relatively recent changes in who owns the copper mines and smelters of the world. When I became a practicing attorney in Bisbee 32 years ago, virtually all the mines and smelters in the world were privately owned. No more. Today, 40 percent of the world's copper production capacity is controlled by governments, primarily governments of Third World nations who are mining not just for profit but to keep their people at work (which helps to insure governmental stability) and to earn hard dollars on the international market.

These governments, as a rule, keep copper in production no matter what is happening to demand. So, when prices fall in the international market, it is the private producers—almost exclusively in the United States and Canada—who shoulder the burden. Through August of last year, U.S. production had fallen off 23 percent, while production abroad had actually increased 2 percent.

Moreover, this deliberate overproduction is often bankrolled by multilateral development banks, frequently with U.S. approval. I have identified several cases this year in which the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has bailed out countries that insist on expanding copper production without regard for market conditions. For example,

the Chilean national copper company, CODELCO, the world's largest copper producer, increased production by more than 15 percent from 1979 to 1982, just as the global recession was taking hold. Earlier this year, Chile was forced to go to the IMF to borrow $327 million to compensate it for the revenues it lost due to the low price of copper. The IMF and other institutions have propped up or bailed out other nations for similar questionable business judgments, to the tune of $468 million in the case of the IMF alone. These are potentially dangerous practices.

A look today at the future of copper must always lead us to one conclusion: new markets must be found for the mineral. The decline in American automobile sales and housing construction have lowered dramatically domestic demand for copper. Copper has always had to compete with other metals in industrial uses, and technological advances in other industries, such as communications, have also reduced the need for copper. A general restoration of our economy will pick up some, but not all, of the slack, and it is clear that in the longer term American copper companies will have to find new customers. Company executives with whom I talk assure me that they are willing and able to do this.

In fact, there is a growing understanding on the part of management and labor of the fact that the boat in which we all find ourselves is lower in the economic water than we would like to have it. There is a need for cooperation and mutual support if the industry is going to rescue itself. Productivity gains will have to be achieved in an atmosphere of teamwork.

The third member of the team, however, is our government, and it is there that much work still needs to be done. The current Administration has yet to propose an industrial policy that brings trade and financial practices into a form that will encourage enterprise and production. And it continues to support international loans to prop up projects that compete directly with our depressed industry. I have sponsored or cosponsored several bills that would help to address these underlying problems, and will continue to work on them.

The road ahead has many uncertain prospects before we can expect to see a fully-recovered, healthy copper industry again. But we have every right to expect to see it, and if we continue to work together we will see it.

COPPER BILLS PENDING

Congressman Jim McNulty has sponsored or cosponsored the following bills this year in an effort to improve prospects for economic recovery in the copper industry:

H.R. 2412, which would direct the U.S. government to purchase immediately $85 million worth of copper for the domestic strategic stockpile, which remains several million tons below its authorized level.

H.R. 2413, which would apply a tariff on copper imported from countries which impose little or no environmental controls on copper production facilities.

H.R. 2946, which would prohibit U.S. approval of multi-lateral bank (World Bank, IMF) loans to nations for further production of a commodity already in surplus in the world.

H.R. 2945 would expand that same principle to the board of directors of the U.S. Export-Import Bank.

CANANEA SUBSIDIES TYPIFY U.S. DILEMMA

One of the biggest obstacles to recovery in the domestic copper industry has been the worldwide copper "glut" caused by overproduction in nations which, because of heavy subsidization, can ignore the normal supply-and-demand forces of the world market. The United States frequently assists foreign copper producers, and thus hinders its own copper recovery. A particularly vexing example of this dilemma is right at our own doorstep: in Cananea, Sonora, Mexico.

The Cananea mine and smelter is undertaking a major expansion, with the help of a $75.7 million loan from the U.S. Export-Import Bank. In addition, the United States had backed a $50 million loan from the World Bank to Cananea, although that loan has since been tabled. The expansion will triple the production capacity of Cananea, allowing the company to produce an additional 100,000 metric tons of copper per year for an already-depressed market. In addition, post-expansion Cananea could emit 500 tons of sulfur dioxide per day from its stacks—more than all seven Arizona smelters combined will be allowed under Clean Air Act regulations scheduled to take effect in 1988.

Congressman NcNulty and 13 other members of Congress from both parties protested the U.S. participation in the Cananea expansion in a March 17 letter to President Reagan, arguing that the project will have "serious adverse effects on the American economy and environment."

The letter was cosigned by Arizona Senators Dennis DeConcini and Barry Goldwater, Arizona Reps. Morris K. Udall, Bob Stump, Eldon Rudd, and John McCain; New Mexico Senators Pete V. Domenici and Jeff Bingaman, New Mexico Reps. Manuel Lujan, Jr. and Bill Richardson; Montana Senators Max Baucus and John Melcher, and Montana Rep. Pat Williams.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 26, 1983]

U.S. HELPS NEIGHBORS—COPPER MINERS ANGRY AS AID CROSSES BORDER

(By Bill Curry)

KEARNY, ARIZ.—For more than a year, Ernesto Estrada has watched his life slowly undermined by unemployment.

He has lost his house, and his truck is next. He has seen his once-healthy paychecks from the Kennecott copper mine up the road replaced by sparse $115-a-week unemployment checks, food stamps and five-pound bricks of free surplus cheese.

His $11.50-an-hour job as a shovel operator in the yawning Kennecott mine has given way to a federally funded job-retraining course, one of those designed to help U.S. workers who are jobless because of foreign competition.

ONE OF 11,000 JOBLESS

But the federal government itself has also provided foreign aid to that competition, copper mines in underdeveloped nations. And it has supported loans to them through multilateral lending agencies like the World Bank.

Ernie Estrada is only one of an angry army of 11,000 unemployed copper workers in Arizona, the nation's No. 1 copper-producing state.

But 20 miles across the border, a Mexican copper mine is booming, in part because of U.S. assistance.

"I was working toward getting the kids out of school, getting an education, and things would get better for us—the American Dream—and somebody comes along and cuts the strings," said Estrada, 45, a father of three who has worked 26 years at Kennecott's Ray Mine here. "All this foreign aid and we got people in the United States who can't even afford to buy a pound of beans."

International development efforts, according to data compiled by Phelps Dodge Corp., the nation's second-largest copper producer, have helped six nations expand eight copper projects in the last four years alone.

Although the practice is government policy with well-intentioned international goals, it has the effect of subsidizing employment abroad in an industry with widespread unemployment at home. And that dilemma has brought a new and critical examination of U.S. efforts to develop Third World nations suffering from high unemployment and low standards of living.

The result of this new scrutiny could be an important change in U.S. developmental efforts overseas, and billions of dollars in loans and countless numbers of jobs could be at stake worldwide.

But regardless of the outcome, the current debate has already revealed an intricate network of national and international practices rife with conflict.

For example, to create jobs, political stability and foreign exchange in underdeveloped regions, primarily in Africa, South America and Mexico, world lending institutions, with U.S. approval, have subsidized the development and operation of foreign copper facilities. Critics contend that this development has come at the expense of U.S. mines, which have been forced to shut down, and U.S. miners, who have been laid off, as copper prices fell to the lowest levels in four decades.

Government-owned copper companies in other nations, meanwhile, have actually increased production to maintain export earnings, driving copper prices still lower.

Chile, for example, depends on copper exports for 43% of its foreign exchange, and in 1982 it ran its mines at 110% of their listed capacity despite a world oversupply of copper. Meanwhile, the International Monetary Fund approved $880 million in loans to Chile.

"This deep pocket (of international loans) is obviously not available to finance continued operations in the Western United States," Yale University economics professor Paul W. MacAvoy has written. "In effect . . . American companies and their domestic employees have absorbed all the worldwide (copper) industry's reduction in employment . . .

"And not much is gained by telling unemployed Arizona copper mines that American loans supporting the low-cost sales of Chilean production are in the long-run interests of all nations."

Other conflicts are noted:

The U.S. copper industry has complained about loans to foreign mines, yet it has made its own copper investments overseas.

Loans from the U.S. government's Export-Import Bank have helped create copper jobs overseas at a time of unemployment in the copper industry at home, but those same loans have also created jobs for other U.S. workers, who build such things as mining equipment purchased with the Export-Import Bank loans.

"Our bread is buttered on both sides of the border," admits a spokesman for the mining-supply industry in Arizona.

"The United States (is) shooting itself in the foot," contends Rep. James F. McNulty Jr. (D-Ariz.), who has introduced legislation designed to restrict assistance to competing commodity producers overseas. "It is time the United States started paying attention

to the conditions in its own economy before it decides to assist similar economies abroad."

McNulty spoke at a congressional subcommittee hearing May 20 on the role of U.S. assistance to foreign copper producers. The hearing was prompted by disclosures that the World Bank, with U.S. approval, and the Export-Import Bank of the United States had approved separate loans, totaling millions of dollars, to help triple production at the Compania de Minera Cananea copper mine in Cananea, Mexico, just 20 miles from the Arizona border.

At the time, much of Arizona's copper industry was shut down and its work force unemployed.

Moreover, a World Bank agency has reported that its role "has been particularly significant" in arranging an additional $400 million in private bank loans to the mine.

A BELEAGUERED ALLY

The bank loans were an effort to help a beleaguered and friendly ally. In Mexico, where estimates of unemployment and underemployment run as high as 40 percent of the labor force, the vast expansion of the Cananea mine and smelter is considered necessary to preserve the jobs of 2,360 workers.

In addition, the expansion will create 770 new jobs, which a secret report prepared by the World Bank's International Finance Corp. describes as well-paying jobs with generous fringe benefits: health care, schooling, cooperative purchasing—and 455 houses to be built for new employees.

Moreover, the company plans to recruit the new workers from the northwestern region of Mexico, where chronic joblessness impels many to migrate illegally to the United States in search of work. The Cananea mine expansion would offer some of them skilled and semiskilled jobs in Mexico instead.

Through copper exports from the mine, the expansion is also expected to earn Mexico much-needed foreign exchange. Mexico's disclosure to New York bankers last Aug. 20 that it could not repay its loans was the beginning of the current international debt crisis.

So on July 15, 1982, the International Finance Corp., with the U.S. representative voting "yes," approved a $50-million loan for Compania de Minera Cananea. The United States contributes about 30% of the international agency's funds.

More important, the agency arranged private financing to produce a total of $450 million toward the $1-billion cost of tripling Cananea's copper production. In addition, the Export-Import Bank provided $75 million in loans to finance the purchase of more than $100 million in mining equipment from U.S. firms.

The International Finance Corp. loan has since been put on hold because of Mexico's burdens from debts and perhaps because of the opposition originating in Arizona. But the Mexican government considers the expansion a high-priority project, and Cananea is continuing it at a slower pace. Company officials are expected to return to the international agency as the expansion, from 50,000 to 150,000 metric tons a year progresses.

Nonetheless, the issues raised by the agency's help and the U.S. government's Export-Import loan continue. For whatever the intentions of the assistance, it spawned a hailstorm of objections in Arizona where thousands of copper workers had lost their jobs and some, like Estrada, would lose their houses while Mexican workers stood to gain both jobs and houses.

"SEEMS INCONCEIVABLE"

"I spent a good deal of time trying to help our people improve their living conditions," Al Skinner, a retired United Steel Workers of America Representative, told the subcommittee hearing last month, "and it seems inconceivable to me that our government is taking the taxpayers' money to guarantee loans to foreign countries that are subsidizing industries that compete with American industry and undermine our whole industrial progress.

"The unemployed deserve something better than that."

"We use to fight forced overtime," said Donald Shelton, president of the United Steel Workers local in Oracle, Ariz., "and now we don't know where the next meal is coming from."

Another issue has also arisen. Arizona's copper smelters are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for air-pollution control equipment, and the Cananea smelter appeared to pose a threat to the industry's efforts—and to Arizona's air—by increasing pollution from its expanded production.

Concern about that brought together environmentalists, management and labor in a fleeting coalition to criticize the U.S. and multilateral efforts to help Cananea.

"It was like a veneer," Michael Rieber, professor of mineral economics at the University of Arizona in Tucson, said of the unusual alliance. "But they're all right about one thing: Cananea will displace jobs in the United States. Cananea is a low-cost, world-class mine."

What the coalition sought was U.S. government action to thwart federal and international loans to competing and polluting projects that could hurt U.S. industries. Such lending is a small portion of Third World development loans; the bulk is provided by private banks. However, the multilateral lending agencies arrange and influence much of that lending as well.

Cananea declined to appear before the hearing, conducted by the House subcommittee on mining, forest management and the Bonneville Power Administration. But it said in a prepared statement that it plans to pursue anti-pollution control at its expanded facility. It maintained that the current facilities have reached capacity and "expansion is necessary."

The company pointedly noted that it bought $25 million in U.S.-made products last year, and added that its additional copper production will be consumed in Mexico, not exported.

The International Finance Corp., however, said that the additional output will be exported initially. Whichever is true, Cananea will add to worldwide copper supplies and therefore is likely to slow recovery of the market and the recall of thousands of U.S. copper workers.

Cananea was once owned by Americans, including the Anaconda minerals subsidiary of Atlantic Richfield Co. Now, as Cananea grows under Mexican government and private ownership, Anaconda has retrenched. It has demolished its smelter in Anaconda, Mont., and its Butte, Mont., mine will close indefinitely on June 30.

In fact, says Rep. McNulty, 14 of 25 major American copper mines are shut down. Some will almost certainly never reopen. Here in Kearny, Kennecott's Ray Mine and its smelter in nearby Hayden are closed indefinitely. Of 1,853 workers, all but 184 have been laid off "until the economic conditions permit," said Richard W. Banghart, vice president and general manager.

The mine and smelter can produce 100,000 tons of copper a year, but since May 2, 1982, the bustling open-pit mine has been eerily quiet, the smelter cold and lifeless. There is some agriculture in the area, but towns like Kearny, Hayden—and Cananea—exist because of copper.

RELATIVES IN MEXICO

The people here, in fact, have other ties to Cananea than the same belt of copper that they work. "I have relatives over there," says Hayden Mayor Carmelita Hart, "but I could care less."

"We all have relatives down there," added Luis Fontes, 50, a repair foreman who has worked at the Ray Mine for 30 years. The mine takes its name from the town it swallowed when it was expanded in 1958.

Kennecott donated the land for the new town of Kearny, population 2,650, unemployment rate 40%. Jobs paying $25,000 a year were once common at the mine, said Banghart, but in the last year, a $40-million-plus payroll has simply vanished.

"When the community is working," said Bob Morales, 35, a diesel mechanic laid off in Kennecott after 15 years, "the community is rich."

But in the last year, the number of food stamp recipients here has risen from 86 to 740; the number of families on welfare from 19 to 39. "Life was super," said Frances Marin, who has three teen-age daughters and was supporting them with her $11.27-an-hour truck-driving job at the mine. She now supports them with $282 a month in federal Aid to Families With Dependent Children and $165 in federal food stamps.

Once middle-class, Marin was recently elected to the board of a local community action agency—as the low-income representative. "I never thought I'd be on welfare," she said.

She is renting a house that another mine family must sell. Out front, the "For Sale" sign joins many others in Kearny. They seem as numerous as the saguaro cactuses in the hills nearby.

Some homes, however, are just empty. One is Ernie Estrada's old place at 447 Jamestown, the little red-brick bungalow with the foreclosure sale notice on the front window. "I had it built from the ground up," said Estrada, who was born in Ray. He, his father and two of his brothers together have worked more than 100 years at the mine.

"Two days after Thanksgiving, we moved out."

Now he is renting a smaller, rundown house for $125 a month, but he is behind in the rent.

His unemployment checks will run out in September, when he finishes his federally funded training classes.

"If you were getting benefits because of foreign competition and the government was helping the competition," said Jerry Bribiescas, mayor of Mammoth, Ariz., and an employee of Magma Copper, "you, too, would be furious."●

NATIONAL HOME CARE WEEK

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, I was joined by Representatives CLAUDE PEPPER and BARBER CONABLE in sponsoring House Joint Resolution 268, to designate the week beginning November 27, 1983, as "National Home Care Week." To date, this resolution has been cosponsored by more than 90 House Members. Senator HATCH has sponsored a similar measure in the other body.

When I introduced this resolution, a letter from the National Association for Home Care in support of this resolution was made referenced to in my statement. However, this letter was omitted from inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At this time, I am including this letter in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues. Once again, I urge support for the National Home Care Week resolution. Following is a text of the letter:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR HOME CARE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1983.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PANETTA: This is to thank you for your support in creating National Home Care Week. We are most grateful for your having introduced this resolution last year. National Home Care Week proved to be a tremendous success. We greatly appreciate your asking Congress to once again designate the week after Thanksgiving as "National Home Care Week," and warmly endorse this measure.

Best regards,

Sincerely,

VAL J. HALAMANDARIS,
President.●

HUNGER PROGRAMS IN MACOMB COUNTY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many people in Macomb County, in both government and private organizations, are working to meet the needs of the hungry. In spite of these efforts, hunger programs are strained by the growing number of people who need their services and the lack of adequate resources. The following exerpts describe the status of some of these programs.

SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(By Chacelle Russell, Food Service Consultant, Macomb County Schools)

In the recent National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs report prepared for USDA it is noted that the biggest single determinant of School Lunch Program participation is meal price.

Before the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, the average charge to the elementary child was $.68 per meal.

In 1980-81 $.76, 1981-82 $.93 and the average charge to the student currently is $1.07. As schools were forced to raise their prices due to rising costs, inflation and reductions in federal assistance, the resultant loss of participation closely follows the national rate of 1 percent participation loss for each $.01 the price goes up. The price increase of 64 percent has resulted in a decrease in participation of 60 percent. A Federally subsidized meal is offered both free and reduced priced. The reduced price is to help financially struggling families who do not qualify for a free meal. Generally these are often the working poor.

As reported in the National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs report, the Breakfast Program serves mostly poor children and this is again true in Macomb. In 1979-80, four districts offered breakfast, served 67,000 meals of which 92 percent were free or reduced priced. Presently two districts are serving breakfast—43,000 meals of which 98 percent are free and reduced priced. The two districts who dropped the program did so because of lack of funding and rising costs.

We provide for many children their only meal of the day. We care about our children and we are concerned that East Detroit where 50 percent of the meals served were free or reduced priced no longer can afford the program and that Roseville where 55 percent of the children served were free or reduced priced has closed the elementary feeding program.

We recognize that with any program, there will be a small percentage of abuse and surely school lunch is no exception. However, there is great concern for the reams of paperwork now required to complete and verify any application. The "new poor" are especially sensitive to the loss of dignity they are subjected to as they bounce between agencies. Directors hope that one complete application, easily verified could be developed. Many people who we now serve have worked and contributed to these programs through their tax dollars for years and deserve to receive this needed help with dignity.

THE WIC PROGRAM

(By Mary Ann Mahaffey, Member, Detroit City Council, Chairperson, Michigan Statewide Nutrition Commission)

The Women, Infant and Children Program serves pregnant women and children up to the age of five. The program provides coupons for fresh eggs, milk, cheese, orange juice, fortified cereals and fortified formulas. It is designed as a supplement for women, infants and children at nutritional risk. Every dollar spent on the food component of the WIC program can save us as much as three dollars in immediate medical costs according to a Harvard University study. At this point the cost to the government in extended hospital care in the neonatal unit may run to $40,000. By contrast the cost of getting a WIC participant through a pregnancy runs to $450.

Congress rejected severe funding cuts for WIC in the last several years, but the fact that funding has been kept steady in the face of inflation means that it has in reality been significantly reduced. In 1982, in Michigan we served 77,117 people. In 1979 and 1980, we served 77,452. In February 1983, the caseload was 78,554. Money was turned back in 1981. The problem is that there has been insufficient money to cover administrative costs.

In Michigan, children in many areas were dropped from the program when their nutritional status was normal perhaps at one year. There is no follow up to determine if the child needs supplements again, between that point and entrance in school, i.e., whether or not if the supplement is discontinued the childs health becomes once again at risk. In the past, mothers have tried to stretch their own allotment to cover the three or four year old dropped from the program.

In addition, last year reductions were made in the coupon package, in an effort to increase the number served in Michigan to 90,000 in 1983. It is estimated based on the 1970 census, that 210,000 are potentially eligible which means that the program is falling 120,000 short of need based on the 1970 census. The question is what would be the need given the increased unemployment, reductions in health service and the termination of benefits for many people if the estimates were to be based on the 1980 census.

THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(By Leland E. Hall, Director, Office of Food Programs, Michigan Department of Social Services)

The food stamp program has dramatically expanded between January 1979 and March 1983. In the state as a whole, the caseload has increased 96 percent and the value of monthly benefits during that period by 250 percent. The caseload in Macomb County during 1979-83 period has gone up 75 percent and monthly expenditures by 206 percent.

In 1983 alone, more than a million people will receive food stamps each month and the annual benefits will exceed half-a-billion dollars. Comparable 1983 figures for Macomb County are: 50,000 people will receive benefits each month for an annual value of $21 million.

It is quite plain that the food stamp program provides a good deal of assistance for needy people. The statistics relating to the amount of benefits per family and individual make it equally plain that the benefits do not fully meet food needs. For example, statewide benefits average about 49 cents per person per meal while in Macomb County the comparable figure is 47 cents per person per meal.

It should also be noted that one of the Reagan Administration's approaches to reducing federal spending was to delay for almost two years any benefit adjustments resulting from food price inflation. This too diminished a family's food purchasing power and there is reason to believe that many people who are in need of food assistance from private charities have not had enough food stamps to meet their needs. I should add here, however, that they probably never had enough to meet them. What appears to be different now is that people require assistance who never have before. The specific evidence on this point is very scarce but given what we know about the economy and the amount of food stamp and other assistance that has been available, hard data is probably unnecessary to conclude that people need help in feeding their families for a month. The food stamps run out, the energy bills are due, and the rent is in arrears—they have no place to turn but to private groups.

(E)mergency funds (provided by the Jobs Bill) have been most necessary, but we firmly believe that the food stamp program has provided and should continue to provide a regular avenue for dealing with hunger and malnutrition in America. At least some part of the current emergency is best understood as a measure of that program's inadequacy.

SURPLUS COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION

(By Mary Ann Mahaffey, Member, Detroit City Council, Chairperson, Michigan Statewide Nutrition Commission)

National surveys found that our previous reliance on surplus foods or commodities rarely provided even minimumly adequate nutrition and frequently left the most vulnerable seriously malnourished, because what happens to be in surplus does not make up a reasonable nutritious diet. * * * There are very few foods currently in government warehouses other than dairy products (approximately a ten year supply of dried milk, processed cheese, and butter). * * * Fruits, vegetables and meats are rarely in the surplus stocks, most perishable items simply can't be. Commodities impose the monotony of eating the same foods day after day, and disregard individual tastes, religious beliefs, and cultural preferences. Health Departments have fought to remove the highly salted, high fat, sweetened commodity foods from their menus because of concern for the nutritional problems in the senior population. In addition, many poor people can't use surplus commodities.

In the 1960's, the average surplus food package for a family of four, weighted 95 pounds. It couldn't be carried on the bus or subway or by anybody very old, or pregnant or young, or without access to a car. Storage was a constant problem, families couldn't easily use bulk amounts of wheat or soybeans or corn, and warehouses were plagued with roaches, mice and worse.

Commodity food giveaways are not the answer. They will never be able to provide a reasonable diet and there can never be enough distribution points to make the food accessible. Giving some of our "surplus" foods to the hungry Americans will not solve the problem of the surplus four billion. That involves agriculture policies beyond the matter at hand. A block of salty, high fat cheese is no substitute for food stamps. In some programs such as the institutional feeding programs, bulk foods can be used and stored, a separate distribution system is not required and the trap inherent in old surplus commodity distribution programs for individuals can be avoided. They are helpful for emergencies, but only for short periods of time.

EXPANDED FOOD AND NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM

(By Marilyn Rudzinski, Director, EFNEP)

The Cooperative Extension Service is a department of Michigan State University, whose function is to provide non-formal educational programs based on the needs of local county residents. The programs are funded cooperatively by Federal, State and County governments through the United States Department of Agriculture, Michigan State University, and the Macomb County Board of Commissioners. Cooperative Extension Service programs address educational needs. Federal funding for the Cooperative Extension Service, and consequently EFNEP is under the Farm Bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program teaches basic food buying, preparation, sanitation and nutrition skills to low income homemakers and families on a one-to-one basis by para-professional nutrition aides.

With limited funding at its inception in 1969, the program serviced 27 Michigan counties. Now only 17 counties are able to offer the program, due to lack of funding. The 1984 budget requests a decrease of 42 percent. Further county reductions are inevitable. Macomb County Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program will suffer staff reduction or possible elimination.

The Expanded Food and Education Program offers people an opportunity to help themselves. That is Michigan Cooperative Extension Service basic philosophy. Give people the opportunity to develop skills that form the basis for decision making to maintain and enhance long range quality of life.

Therefore, we recommend that food supplement programs are maintained based on need and that the House Agricultural subcommittee recommendations which restores funding for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Program to its existing level be supported.

UNITED COMMUNITY SERVICES

(By Margaret J. Szmanek, Planner, Macomb Division, United Community Services)

United Community Services of Metropolitan Detroit (UCS) is a community-based human service planning organization. In the tri-county area, along with the United Foundation, UCS serves as the local United Way. In that framework, UCS works extensively with volunteers.

In the last several months, the Macomb Division has been extensively involved in the organization and implementation of various food distribution programs, in response to the critical food shortage many unemployed persons are experiencing. In some instances, efforts to meet this basic need—providing food to hungry persons—have been hampered by the inability of the cooperating food-providing agency or organization to distribute large amounts of food without adequate staff or volunteers. This occurs when large donations of food from corporations and businesses or purchased through governmental grants is suddenly made available for distribution with specific timetables, but with no provision for administrative costs, additional labor, or time to organize volunteers.

We must encourage governmental entities, when making grants or programs available, to include funds for administrative and personnel costs.

MACOMB EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM

(By Teri De Schryver, Coordinator, Macomb Emergency Food Program)

The Macomb Emergency Food Program has functioned continuously since 1975, structuring a network of over 60 collection and 28 distribution sites. Recent food collections generated by the "hunger emergency" provided abundant supplies of food. The major contributor was the GM-UAW Care and Share donation.

During the GM-UAW project, over six hundred prepared boxes of food were distributed to families in Macomb County weekly. Prior to this project approximately 250 families were receiving emergency food assistance each month. These families average four persons in size and food service averages slightly over five days per family.

Preliminary surveys show that 51% of families and individuals who received food during the GM-UAW food project were on public assistance. Fifty-seven percent were families in our current target group of so called "new poor." An example of the later is a request received through our office last week. A family consisting of a husband, wife and five young children recently moved to Macomb County from Detroit. The husband was permanently laid off from Ford's 3½ years ago. Because employment since that time has been sporadic and meager, the family lost two homes before moving to East Detroit. In spite of the fact that both parents have Masters degrees, the family is subsisting on temporary employment, plus ADC and Food Stamps. Requesting emergency food was humiliating for this mother who began to work as a volunteer in the site that had assisted her.●

CONGRESS SPENDS BUCKS, BUT PASSES BUDGET BUCK

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the liberal Democrats and defeatist Republicans in Congress are irresponsibly voting for big spending bills and then blaming President Reagan for the deficits. We members of the optimistic wing of the Republican Party believe it is possible to control spending and to shift from a liberal welfare state to a conservative opportunity society. We are committed to supporting the President's vetoes of irresponsible spending.

The Atlanta Journal-Constitution defined the need for this confrontation as irresponsbility when it wrote the following editorial.

[From the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, June 26, 1983]

CONGRESS SPENDS BUCKS, BUT PASSES BUDGET BUCK

The halls of Congress are now replete with breast-beating, the sounds of pious members entoning that they have done their job, arriving at a budget resolution.

They will, they say, present this fiction to the nation, but they bear, they say, no responsibility for what the evil Ronald Reagan does with the individual spending bills. Whoop-te-doo.

The budget, agreed to by the House Democratic leadership with the reluctant consent of Senate Republican leaders, is a pipe dream. It calls for $12 billion in new taxes in the next year, with $51 billion in new taxes for the following two fiscal years.

Increasing taxes in a recession is folly. Congress has done that several times in the last two years. To increase taxes during a fragile economic recovery is suicidal. The president is opposed and we hope he sticks to that opposition, rather than compromising on tax increases as he did last year.

The recovery is exceeding expectations. The release this week of growth projections of 6.6 percent was great news. But every expert adds cautionary notes. Most see the recovery imperiled if interest rates rise.

Most see interest rates triggered by the staggering federal deficit.

Which brings us back to Congress. Its budget does virtually nothing to narrow the deficit. It sets up a confrontation with the president by holding defense spending to a 5 percent increase. It adds billions in nonmilitary spending and it calls, really, for a blank check on tax increases.

The president had suggested contingency taxes to reduce the deficits. His tax plan would have been triggered in 1985 and 1986 if inflation moved up and out of control again.

Congress rejected that notion and went even farther astray. Its members earmarked $8.5 billion in pork-barrel spending as a contingency. If Congress agreed, that largesse would be used to relieve the effects of a recession that is all but over.

Such political legerdermain fools no one. Congress wants to continue to spend—as its appropriations committees prove daily—even in the face of a deficit most optimistically put at $170 billion. Even with the new taxes.

We have no desire to see a budget confrontation, with vetoes, attempts to override them and the usual scare stories about the government running out of check-writing authority.

But Congress simply cannot continue to avoid the larger picture, its decision to view individual programs on their own, rather than as part of the whole budget has led to eight straight deficit-spending years.

The Reagan administration has offered compromises on defense spending, but Congress refuses to consider altering the domestic side of the budget. That standoff deserves confrontation—and more of the president's basic lessons in economics for the American people.●

A GROWING ECONOMIC AND DIPLOMATIC RESOURCE FOR AMERICA

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the strength of America's free market system has always been one of our Nation's greatest assets in the ongoing struggle for freedom and democracy in the world. More recently, the balance of food power has become a prominent ingredient in East-West relations and has brought out a clear ideological disparity the world cannot ignore.

The proven failure of the Soviet economic system—a centralized, wholly government-controlled structure which offers no private enterprise, no individual decisionmaking, no incentives or profit, no flexibility—cannot go unnoticed. In the agricultural sector, for instance, the Soviets employ 26 million workers—or slaves—yet still cannot feed their own people.

Our Nation, by contrast, has fewer than 4 million farmers who can produce twice as much food, and more. The ultimate irony is that we have to take measures to slow American agricultural production to prevent oversupply.

As the Soviet Union relies more heavily on American grain exports, the issue of food as a diplomatic tool becomes increasingly apparent in our bilateral relations. The significance of this issue should not be overlooked within the debate on overall strategic balance in the world.

A recent interview published in the International Wildlife issue for July-August 1983, with Lester R. Brown, an authority on world agriculture and resource matters, provides insight on this development. The article, "Russia's Achilles' Heel," follows:

RUSSIA'S ACHILLES' HEEL

(Food is the earth's most critical resource, and increasingly it is becoming a political issue. Here, Lester R. Brown, an authority on world agriculture and renewable resources, makes some astonishing observations about how American abundance and Soviet farm problems may lead to easing of tensions between the super powers. Brown, a founder of the World-watch Institute, a Washington-based think tank, was interviewed by International Wildlife editor John Strohm.)

Q. Has the balance of food power shifted decisively between the two superpower?

A. Yes! Last year for the first time U.S. farmers doubled the grain output of their Soviet counterpart, 331 million tons to 165. The Soviets are in deep trouble on the farm front.

Q. How bad?

A. Last year the U.S.S.R. imported 45 million tons of grain—more than any country in history. More than half of that came from North America. As of early 1983, the Soviets appeared to be trying to reduce grain imports from the U.S. to punish the Reagan administration for its now-abandoned pipeline embargo.

Q. But the Soviets used to export grain.

A. They did until 1970. That year they exported 8 million tons; the U.S. exported 38 million tons. But in 1981 U.S. grain exports had skyrocketed to a staggering 115 million tons, while the Soviets had to import 34 million tons.

Q. And that's why you believe corn, wheat and soybeans may be as important as nuclear warheads in dealing with the Soviets?

A. I believe the shift in the agricultural power balance in favor of the U.S. provides an opportunity to reshape relations with the Soviet Union.

Q. What happened? Are the Soviets failures as farmers?

A. Not exactly. Much of their land is too hot, or too cold, too wet or too dry. Corn won't mature in the Moscow region which is as far north as Hudson Bay. But the real problem is that the Soviet system just doesn't work very well with farming.

Q. What do you mean by that?

A. Farmers' freedom to make their own decisions in response to market forces is one reason U.S. farmers get 16 tons of grain per ton of fertilizer used. In the Soviet Union, they get only 6 tons per ton of fertilizer, because it's often used inefficiently, if not wastefully.

Q. Why's that?

A. Farm management which is made-in-Moscow simply can't respond to real needs of farmers in the field. In agriculture five-year plans distort the situation they are intended to manage.

Q. If centralized planning hurts Soviet agriculture, why is the U.S. plagued by crop surpluses? Our farms are getting bigger and bigger, with fewer farmers.

A. It's not the same. About 2.4 million farms—mostly family owned—account for cultivation of 350 million acres in the U.S. The Soviet Union has 20,800 state farms averaging 13,000 acres each and 26,000 collectives averaging 9,000 acres each.

Q. Productivity per person must be terribly low on Soviet farms.

A. True. The Soviet farm labor force totals 26 million; the U.S. 3.7 million.

Q. So with only one-seventh the manpower, American farmers produce twice as much food?

A. Correct. And this is what worries the Kremlin. A centralized agricultural system relying on five-year-plans cannot begin to match the flexibility of a system in which basic decisions are made by individual farmers.

Q. What can they do about it?

A. I'm afraid that fixing the ills of Soviet agriculture without reforming the system will be like treating the symptoms of an illness rather than the cause.

Q. Let's get back to diplomacy. Can Soviet farm problems be a boon to peace?

A. Each day in 1982 two 20,000-ton freighters loaded with grain left the U.S. for the Soviet Union. No other country has dominated world grain trade as the U.S. does. The Soviets are probably not going to war against the country that has helped raise the standard of living of the Russian people while masking failures of their own system.

Q. What's the significance of all that?

A. This massive new commercial link may represent the most important change in relations between the two countries since the Cold War.

Q. In what way?

A. The Soviets know they need us to produce food for their people to eat. They may talk belligerently but in effect, we have become their agricultural partners and I believe we can negotiate political problems from a position of strength. In the final analysis, the long line of grain-laden ships that links U.S. farms with Soviet dining tables may come to dominate overall relations.●

REMEMBERING BILL MILLER

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, former Republican Vice Presidential nominee William E. Miller passed away in Buffalo this past week. Bill died on Friday, June 24, at the age of 69. I extend my own and my family's deepest sympathies to Bill's lovely wife Stephanie and their children: Elizabeth Ann, Mary Karen, William E., Jr., and Stephanie.

I know the people of his native Lockport are joined by his former colleagues in the House and the people of the State of New York, and the entire country, in mourning the loss of a man who contributed to the Nation's political life for so many years.

Bill served western New York as Congressman from the Lockport, Buffalo, and Niagara Falls area for seven terms—the old 42d and 40th District. He also served his party as chairman of the Republican National Committee for 3 years and joined Senator BARRY GOLDWATER as Vice Presidential standard bearer for the 1964 campaign and election.

Mr. Speaker, after Bill's return to private life he came back home to Lockport, resumed the practice of law but continued his involvement in bettering his community, region, and State. Governor Rockefeller appointed him chairman of the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority. Bill also remained close to President Ford and provided political assistance and policy advice both before and during Ford's White House years.

As recently as last year, Bill spoke out on the issues facing the Nation: the state of the economy, defense spending and its effects on the economy, and the ominous build up of nuclear arms by the superpowers.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of his political and business affairs, Bill occasionally returned to Washington. I was privileged to spend some time with Bill, and learn from his many years of experience serving the congressional district I now represent. He was always willing to help and advise when asked. His company was always enjoyable, his wit was always entertaining, and his concern for the best interests of the people he represented a continuing one.

There are a number of Members still serving in the Congress who were colleagues of Bill's. There are many throughout the country who were closer personally and politically to him. However, Mr. Speaker, the association we built up in the past few years was helpful to me and the district and personally gratifying. Bill Miller could certainly be a strong partisan but he also could be, and was, a good friend. We shall all miss him.●

HONORING U.S. COMMITMENTS: A COMMENTARY BY JACK BINGHAM

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, all of us who were privileged to serve in the House of Representatives with Jonathan Bingham know that Jack was a man who believed in keeping his word. Thus, it is hardly surprising that he would be in the forefront of those arguing that the United States should honor its commitments as a nation.

Unfortunately, as Jack has pointed out in a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor, the United States has failed thus far to honor its commitment to the International Development Association (IDA), a failure that has potentially far-reaching consequences.

As Jack points out, IDA plays a critical role in promoting equitable economic development abroad and in advancing U.S. interests in the developing nations. Because we have a clear stake in its work, our commitment to IDA is thus a test of our leadership as a nation in the world community. "Unless the United States acts boldly to provide the necessary leadership," Jack argues, "it will forsake not only an institution but the very ideas that have helped to build a better world."

Because this issue will soon be coming before the House for consideration, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of Jack Bingham's article into the RECORD at this point. I hope that our colleagues will read it carefully for Jack has an important message that we in Congress should take seriously.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 22, 1983]

WILL U.S. ABANDON ITS LEADERSHIP ON WORLD AID?

(By Jonathan Bingham)

A little-reported failure by the United States to honor its international commitments is undermining America's role as a world leader at a crucial time.

The failure is this:

In 1979 the US agreed to provide $3.2 billion to the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association (IDA-6), the World Bank's credit window for the least-developed nations. The agreement negotiated with 32 other donors was to provide funds for IDA-6 in equal installments during 1981, 1982, and 1983.

From the beginning, the US reneged on its commitments. First, in 1981, the Reagan administration decided to make unequal payments, with the larger payouts coming later. Next the Congress appropriated less money than the administration requested, forcing the US to spread its payments over four rather than three years.

Now even that radically altered timetable may be upset. In order to fulfill the four-year schedule, the administration asked for $945 million for this year. Congress appropriated only $700 million and is balking at a $245 million supplementary IDA appropriation request. If Congress does not pass the supplementary measure, the US contributions to IDA-6 will almost surely slip over into a fifth year.

For many Americans, the response to this breach of faith has been, "So what? We have our own problems." Unfortunately that view ignores the lessons of the last 35 years, which show that US leadership in international economic development redounds to America's interest as well as the interest of the nations it helps. Those lessons are particularly important today when the world economy is receiving its greatest test in recent memory.

Following World War II the US pioneered the concept of international economic assistance. It started the first major bilateral foreign aid program, the Marshall Plan, and the first aid effort aimed at poorer nations, the Point Four program. The US was the driving force behind establishment of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, including its IDA affiliate founded in 1960.

Inspired and sometimes prodded by the US, 34 noncommunist nations now have bilateral foreign aid programs of their own. These allies—many once recipients of foreign aid themselves—are shouldering an increasingly large share of multilateral assistance funding. In the twenty-odd years since IDA was founded, the US portion of contributions to replenishments has dropped from more than 42 to 27 percent of the total.

But just as the US has prompted other nations to assume more responsibility for third-world development so can it reverse this trend by setting a negative example. Only 26 of the 32 donors made their 1982 payments to IDA-6, and the delayed contributions and failure of other countries to ante up until the US fulfills its pledges reduced planned IDA activities last year by 35 percent.

As Treasury Secretary Donald Regan pointed out on Capitol Hill recently, US foot-dragging is hurting relations with developing and developed countries. European nations, who took the lead in providing a special $2 billion contribution to sustain IDA lending through 1984, have warned the State Department they will not bail out IDA again and that agreement for a badly needed seventh replenishment will not be reached until the US honors its current pledge.

Typically the debate over IDA has concentrated on whether development assistance works. My own firm conviction after more than 30 years of following aid activities is that it does. Some of the developing countries we helped in the past have turned into our fastest-growing trading partners, such as Taiwan and South Korea.

But it is not enough to calculate the contributions of institutions like IDA in dollars and cents. IDA is part of an overarching international framework built up since World War II that helps to promote economic and political harmony.

The World Bank, for instance, consistently reinforces international codes of conduct essential for the growth and stability of global commerce. A Reagan administration Treasury study last year noted that the bank, through IDA and its other arms, emphasizes open trade and realistic exchange rates, and "maintenance of sensible fiscal and monetary policies" by recipient countries.

The inability of the World Bank to provide assistance through IDA-6 may not only erase economic gains among the poorest countries, who cannot borrow from commercial banks but who desperately need external assistance to weather the current global recession. It may also prompt nations to defect from the international economic system by restricting trade or defaulting on loans to commercial banks.

Walter Bagehot once wrote, "The characterisic danger of great nations like the Romans or the English, which have a long history of continuous creation, is that they may at last fail from not comprehending the great institutions they have created."

His warning applies no less today. Unless the US acts boldly to provide the necessary leadership, it will forsake not only an institution but the very ideas that have helped to build a better world.●

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH OPPOSE MX FUNDING

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, many national organizations have now taken a stand in opposition to deployment of the MX missile system. One of these is Friends of the Earth, a national environmental organization with 35,000 members in the United States and sister organizations in 27 other countries. At their request, I am placing in the RECORD the organization's formal statement opposing further funding, testing, and deployment of the MX missile system and pointing out that the threat of nuclear war is the greatest environmental problem faced by mankind.

The full text of the Friends of the Earth statement follows these remarks:

STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION TO FURTHER MX FUNDING

Friends of the Earth, a national environmental organization with 35,000 members in the U.S. and sister organizations in 27 countries worldwide, opposes further funding, testing and deployment of the MX Missile System. We believe the threat of nuclear war to be the greatest environmental problem faced by mankind. We further believe that a convincing case can be made on both political and military grounds that approval of the MX program is unnecessary, and will increase rather than decrease the risk of nuclear war.

The MX cannot be justified on military grounds. It fills no defensive purpose, and will only be useful in scenarios in which the U.S. strikes first. It will encourage "launch-on-warning" strategies by the superpowers. Neither can it be justified on political or arms control grounds. It will not force the Soviets to "come to the bargaining table" or eliminate their existing ICBMs. The only Soviet response will be deployment of a counterpart weapon, currently being tested.

The fundamental argument behind Congressional MX approval is that the MX may act as "leverage" to force serious arms control policy revisions out of the Reagan Administration. However the Administration's arms control concessions to date have been paltry at best. The chances of further substantial concessions are slight. Congress may achieve small changes in Administration positions, but major changes resulting in a world somehow safer with the MX than without it are extraordinarily unlikely.

We encourage Congress to oppose further funding of this misguided weapons system.●

HUNGER IN MACOMB COUNTY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this testimony concerning hunger in Macomb County for the RECORD.

Hunger is no stranger in Macomb County. Teri DeSchryver, director of the Emergency Food Program can certainly tell you that. Captain Pouff of the Salvation Army who houses the Community Kitchen could verify that too. And hunger is not a new phenomena. What is new is the numbers of people on fixed limited incomes in our County who are hungry. We know we have many disabled people unable to earn a living who are just barely making ends meet. Possibly familiar to us are single parents—mostly mothers who are either unable to work because of small children, few skills etc. or are working at subminimum wage and receiving supplemental food stamps or AFDC.

But a combination of soaring unemployment rates, (Macomb County is around 19 percent—above the states average—some communities are over 25 percent) coupled with a severe state fiscal crises, has mushroomed the number of citizens in need in social programs. This has resulted in many people in need with fewer resources and many going hungry.

For example, the purchasing power of an AFDC grant is down 35 percent from 1979 levels. General Assistance is worse. The state was forced to reduce grants by 7.5 percent (of 1979 grant) which at that time was only 85 percent of poverty level as defined by U.S. government. General Assistance was reduced by 10 percent. Governor Blanchard's budget proposal to restore 5 percent of the grants still won't bring them back to 1979 level. Our grant levels are very close to surrounding states. It is a myth that people flock to Michigan to receive higher benefits.

SHARON GIRE,
Director, Northeast Interfaith Center, Fair Federal Budget Coalition.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS FOR OLDER ADULTS

State and Federal funding for the nutrition progams under the Older Americans Act is allocated to the county projects through area agencies on aging. The area agencies monitor local projects, and provide technical assistance to the staff.

Macomb County Community Services Agency is the direct provider of the nutrition program under the capable hands of the Project Director, Jane Buller.

The nutrition program is funded by a combination of sources: Federal Older Americans Act dollars, State dollars administered by the Office of Services to the Aging, Department of Labor USDA reimbursement, as well as support from Macomb County. Over $80,000 of program income donated by the participants also contributes to expand the program.

The nutrition program has two parts: the congregate nutrition program, funded by the Federal dollars, and the home delivered meals program funded with State dollars.

The nutrition program is available to any older adult over age 60, as well as handicapped individuals living in subsidized senior housing. In addition to the Older Americans Act Nutrition Program, Macomb County provides a number of Meals on Wheels for homebound persons under age 60 through the Community Services Agency.

The Macomb County Nutrition Program will serve 109,725 meals in fiscal year 1983. 4,500 persons will be served daily at the 21 congregate sites, and 400 persons in the home delivered meals program.

Three new sites were recently opened. These sites will expand the service to areas of the county where service has been limited. The opening of these sites is especially important since the home delivered meals are packaged at each site and delivered to the residents in the surrounding area. Over 300 volunteers were recently honored for their service in the past year. The volunteers not only deliver meals, but also provide a personal contract, sometimes the only one the homebound person has.

The home delivered meals programs, after much trial and error, has come up with a system of delivery that has eliminated long waiting lists in this county. The number of people that can be helped has increased considerably. Careful monitoring of the length of time a participant actually needs a home delivered meal has decreased the number of persons getting long term assistance, thereby making more meals available for emergency and/or short term illnesses. Health professionals in the county have praised the system, testifying that the frustration of not being able to obtain a meal for a seriously ill person has been virtually eliminated.

The nutrition program is vital to the older adults in this county. On the basis of the population explosion of this age group alone the need will increase tremendously in the next 10 years. The over 60 population has increased from 46,000 in the 1970 census to over 83,000 in the 1980 census. St. Josephs Hospital estimates that this number has already grown to 97,000 since that census was taken. In addition, people are living longer. In 1981 only 1,800 persons over age 60 died in the entire county. This indicates that the older elderly are becoming a significant segment of the population that will need nutrition services. We are seeing that increasingly the older elderly are the ones attending the nutrition sites.

The chance to get out of their homes and eat a nutritious meal in the company of others increases the well being of the elderly. Studies have shown that the health and well being of participants increases measurably when only three meals are eaten at the site per week. In my opinion, this is the best preventative medicine program available to older adults.

The benefit to the homebound is immeasurable. Having the meal delivered to the home for a short time when illness strikes, or having a meal coming in regularly when unable to prepare meals for themselves has kept many county residents out of nursing homes.

The program director of Clemens Towers, subsidized senior housing in Mt. Clemens, related that previously when residents became ill and could not take care of themselves, even for a short time, they would be required to move. Now, she reports, with the meals available for a few weeks they can bounce back and continue to live independently in their own place.

Service providers in the county are reporting an increase in the number of older adults with multiple needs. They are observing that as the population ages, the needs are increasing for in-home services. The outreach, personal care, homemaker, chore programs and the home delivered meals are the only thing keeping many of these people out of costly institutions.

In addition, discharge planners from the hospitals report that there is a crisis in the making as hospitals are refusing admittance to chronically ill older adults and discharging them as quickly as possible because of lower reimbursements allowed under medicare. Discharge planners are alarmed as to where the care is going to come from for these people. The importance of home deliv-

ered meals take soon a greater significance under these conditions.

State money has been reduced for the home delivered meals program while Federal money has been held at a maintenance level for the congregate program. Although Macomb County will receive an increase in funds in 1984 due to the adjustments for population, there is a continued need for funding of the nutrition programs and other support services.

One of these support services that is vital to the nutrition program is transportation. The ability of the isolated low income, the frail and the handicapped elderly person to access the nutrition sites is an increasing problem. Formerly county CETA drivers were used to provide transportation for these special populations. For example, in East Detroit eleven former handicapped participants could not continue at the site after this program was eliminated. Local municipal credit funds have not been able to fill the gap as the money is controlled by the municipality and in the majority of cases is not targeted to provide transportation for these people to the nutrition sites. Everywhere you go in the county, you hear of the pressing need for transportation for the elderly and handicapped. The SEMTA small buses are designed for transporting the elderly and handicapped, however, because the federal government allows none of the transportation funds to be used for operation of the kind of individualized transportation needed for a special population is too costly to provide. A shift in the priorities of transportation at the federal level is one of the most pressing needs.

One final point—although there is sometimes criticism that many of the people going to the nutrition sites do not really need the meal, the Area Agency and the project staff continue to stress the targeting of the socially and economically disadvantaged, the minority population, and the handicapped. The low income of many older people in the county, especially the women, and the isolation and loneliness of many of the participants cannot be identified by looking at outward appearance. By not having a means test for services, the Older Americans Act does not segregate the haves from the have nots, they all can participate and interface with each other at the sites. Federal support to maintain this position in the Older Americans Act, is vitally important to all older Americans.

BARBARA RICHARDS,
Services Coordinator/Macomb County Area Agency on Aging 1-B.●

THE NEWARK BOYS CHORUS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday my office and the Halls of Congress were alive with the sound of music—the beautiful voices and harmonies of the Newark Boys Chorus.

These tremendously talented young performers were here in Washington as part of the Smithsonian Institution's Annual Festival of American Folk Life, which this year featured the State of New Jersey. I had the distinct pleasure of hearing them perform twice—once at the Smithsonian at a reception for the festival, and earlier that day in my office. I could not recall the last time I heard such lovely voices and perfect precision.

The chorus was established in 1967 by the Newark Symphony as part of an effort to involve more members of the community in music. The result was so successful that it soon became apparent that the boys would require their own special school. In addition to regular academic curriculum the members of the chorus have rehearsal 3 hours every day. It is obvious to anyone who hears them that the result of their hard work is an exceptionally rewarding experience.

Only 12 members of the school were able to visit us in Washington, and I look forward to hearing the entire chorus sometime soon.

I want to thank the 12 members who performed for us—Lenny Wright, Marcellus Mitchell, David Holley, James Peterson, Shindana Montegue, Jon Williams, Tamon Foster, Elliot Warren, Alfred Barcliff, Nware Burge, Alan Zamora, and Brian Gibbs—as well as the two faculty members who accompanied them, Larry Emery and David Butterfield, for enriching the day for all who heard them.●

JUDGING WILLIAMSBURG

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Foreign Affairs Newsletter for June 1983 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The newsletter follows:

JUDGING WILLIAMSBURG

The May 1983 Williamsburg Summit among the leaders of seven major industrialized nations of the West was both a success and a disappointment. How it is judged depends on the perspective from which it is viewed.

From the point of view of Western security, the summit must be judged a success. In fact, the most salient action at Williamsburg was the issuance of a statement on arms control. With a nod to the concept of sufficient military strength, the leaders called for arms control based on the principles of verifiability and equality. They avoided the polemics that have tended to characterize Mr. Reagan's individual remarks on the Soviet Union in the recent past. There was no mention of an "evil empire" or a "focus of evil in the modern world". Nonetheless, the leaders were firm. Without progress and agreement on arms control, deployment of intermediate-range American missiles in Europe will proceed. The statement on arms control bore the clear imprint of the allies. The signatures of Messrs. Mitterrand and Nakasone reinforced a signal to Moscow of military resolve and cohesion in the West.

From the point of view of politics, the leaders also did well. Since three of them faced imminent elections and the host, Mr. Reagan, is acting more and more like the candidate for reelection next year, they had an understandable incentive to win political points on Williamsburg's very public stage. Each of them did so, and none of them was embarrassed either by substantive missteps or by statements made in haste.

From the point of view of procedure, Mr. Reagan deserves particular credit for a successful outcome at Williamsburg. He seemed to arrange the meeting very well. He demanded and provided an atmosphere that gave the leaders the chance to discuss important affairs in a relaxed and informal manner. As Mr. Trudeau observed, the host took a gamble when he insisted on an unstructured conference, but the gamble paid off. By all accounts, the discussions were frank and creditably led. Mr. Reagan kept them free of acrimony, and the leaders, not their advisors, played the central role. Furthermore, he did not press too hard on sensitive issues, such as East-West trade. Such a meeting of the leaders, sitting together to analyze problems and seek solutions, is a very powerful symbol for all the world.

From these varying points of view, nearly everyone had reason to be pleased with Williamsburg. It is in the review of all-important economic results that questions about success arise.

It is difficult to argue that the leaders succeeded in conveying to a skeptical world the impression that they were prepared to grapple with tough economic problems. They had a clear duty to cut through disagreement and map out a common response, but Williamsburg yielded no ringing message of economic hope, no real optimism regarding the strength of the global recovery, no sense of confidence that American deficits and interest rates will come down, and no genuine feeling of economic direction and purpose. The economic product of the summit was lackluster at best.

The allies appear to have been especially disappointed by Mr. Reagan's failure to commit himself unequivocally to lower deficits and interest rates. Without this commitment, they left Williamsburg uncertain that he has a workable plan to restart the world's economy by achieving vigorous and sustained economic growth in the United States. Their uncertainty was clearly expressed in the final declaration. The best Mr. Reagan could manage was an acknowledgement that the allies see "signs" of recovery. They seemed to reject his assurances that the world's economy is on the mend. Millions of unemployed people and dozens of nations crushed by international debt will derive scant hope from the Williamsburg Declaration.

No one has the right to expect miracles at summits, but modest progress is another issue altogether. At a minimum, progress at Williamsburg would have included both a commitment by the United States to trim deficits and interest rates and a program of economic stimulus in countries with low rates of inflation. However, Mr. Reagan hedged, and there was no indication that restrictive economic policies in low-inflation countries will change.

The summit's treatment of international debt was further reason for disappointment. Given the precarious situation of Mexico, Brazil, and other major debtor nations, it can only be described as Williamsburg's astonishing lapse. The leaders failed to give their unqualified endorsement to the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the General Agreement of Tariffs and

Trade. Their pledge to resist protectionism was welcome, but it was made both without recognition of existing protectionist practices and without reference to the concrete measures needed to eliminate hidden subsidies and other trade-distorting devices. Moreover, there was no call for another round of global trade negotiations, and the leaders did not forswear new efforts to restrict trade or increase subsidies. Also, they failed to express their support for any increase in the resources of the International Development Association, the single most important multilateral institution which assists the poorest nations.

There is always a risk that leaders will try to do either too much or too little when they meet with one another face to face. At Williamsburg, too little economic work was attempted. We were justified in expecting a better record of economic accomplishment from this most visible and important of summits.●

HARRISON TWEED AWARD

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Rapids Bar Association and its pro bono program has been nominated for the Harrison Tweed Award. This award is given in recognition for legal services to the indigent.

Before I came to Congress, I was a practicing attorney in Grand Rapids for 30 years. During my early years in practice, I was seriously involved in instituting a pro bono project, which proved itself extremely efficient once in force. When the Federal Government created legal assistance for the indigent, pro bono programs nationwide dried up as the private bars let the Federal programs take over. Now, in the light of financial restraints being imposed upon legal services, the private bars have been called upon to assist the fiscally ailing Government project.

Federal funds for Legal Aid of Western Michigan were cut by 25 percent in 1982, resulting in staff diminution of 42.9 percent and the closing of one-half or the area's legal aid offices. In September 1982, the Grand Rapids Bar organized their pro bono program, with Patricia Jackson as coordinator. They have had an overwhelming response from more than half their members who have pledged their time and/or money. I find their project consummately impressive, productive, and very valuable for the indigent, whom legal aid can no longer afford to assist. From the project's conception in September to June 1 of this year, $29,170 has been received, well over 500 cases have been committed and 525 members were in participation. Many of the large law firms made responses to the program as firms, rather than individual firm members.

This program offers the options of financial or hourly service to the low-income community. Participants may first, accept four pro bono cases per year; second, contribute $100; or third, accept two cases and contribute $50. The voluntary enrollment system has proven itself superlative. I am extremely proud of the way the Grand Rapids Bar has rallied to the legal needs of the poverty stricken in western Michigan. their excellence merit is beyond question. These words cannot possibly express my pride in them for their efforts and achievement in this direction.●

WALL STREET JOURNAL EXPOSES ABUSES IN DAY LABOR CAMPS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, men and women desperate for work have been flocking in ever-increasing numbers to day labor camps throughout the country. Those camps provide temporary manual laborers to industry. According to a story in the Wall Street Journal, the operators of those establishments typically collect from $6 to $15 per hour for each worker supplied, while paying the worker the minimum wage of $3.35 per hour. In many instances, that minimum wage is severely eroded by questionable deductions for food, shelter, work clothes, medicine, and transportation. In some cases, there are allegations that workers are physically prevented from leaving the camps.

The Wall Street Journal is to be commended for exposing the plight of the temporary day laborer. Staff reporte George Getschow, at considerable personal risk, joined work camps in Texas and Louisiana to provide us with a chilling inside account of what it is like to fight for part-time work at the bottom of our industrial structure.

Because of the blatant abuse of minimum labor standards detailed in this article, the Subcommittee on Labor Standards that I chair has launched a major investigation of the day labor market. We are planning hearings in July to determine what Federal, State, and local authorities can do to eliminate the intolerable conditions described by the Wall Street Journal in the article that follows:

THE DAY LABORER'S TOIL IS HARD, PAY MINIMAL, SECURITY NONEXISTENT

(By George Getschow)

HOUSTON.—It's 5 a.m., and the 120 tenants of Krash Cabin, a filthy flophouse run by one of the many day-labor outfits on the fringes of downtown, are getting their instructions from the burly bunkhouse manager: "Get your asses out of bed before I throw you out," he shouts.

One man, exhausted after digging ditches for 10 hours in 85-degree heat the day before, begs to be allowed to recuperate in his bunk. "I'm too sick to work today," he tells Bob McClarity, the tattooed bunkhouse boss. "I don't give a damn," barks the boss, hauling him out of his bunk. "This ain't a charity hospital."

Indeed it isn't. The men in Krash Cabin are shipped out day and night to unload boxcars, shovel cement, clean coke ovens or handle other dirty, often dangerous, temporary work. The company that runs the operation collects $6 to $15 an hour for the labor but pays the workers the minimum wage of $3.35.

Then it manages to get a good part of that pay back by deducting from the day's pay voucher assessments for lodging, locker rentals and perhaps work clothes or gloves. To cash the voucher, the worker must go to the company tavern and pay for a drink, whether he wants one or not. Though his work is often hazardous, he it told his employer doesn't have workers' compensation coverage. "It's a slave shop," says the Rev. James Chapman, a local street minister.

Yet this and similar day-labor outfits in this Sun Belt City know their labor pool will be full each day with a growing mob of desperate job seekers willing to endure such conditions. "Sure it's slavery," says Kenneth Sweet, a laid-off auto worker from Detroit with a wife and three children. "But a man's got to feed his family somehow."

Companies providing temporary manual laborers—which operate much differently from suppliers of clerical and other white-collar temporaries—enjoy virtual immunity from supervision. They are not, for instance, considered employment agencies, which in most states face strict licensing requirements and fee reviews. They function under their own rules and have lobbied hard to keep it that way, helping stamp out several federal and state legislative attempts to impose curbs on the industry.

NOBODY'S RESPONSIBILITY

Thus, the country's estimated two million day laborers are on their own. Their employers, unregulated and in a highly competitive business, spend little to protect them. The companies to which they are sent feel little responsibility, mostly regarding the workers as a convenient tool to handle fluctuations in demand, union problems or menial tasks.

Labor unions largely ignore day laborers, too. Because the temporaries work only for brief periods and are often afraid of getting blacklisted, "it would be hard to organize them," says Bill Hogan Jr., a Teamsters official in Chicago. Some observers, such as former Texas Labor Commissioner Jackie St. Clair, believe another reason unions lack interest is that "day laborers do most of the dirty, nasty work that the unions couldn't get their own members to do."

It isn't uncommon for companies to use day laborers as strikebreakers. And Carlene Walker, the head of a Denver firm called Stand-By Personnel, says striking unions occasionally hire her laborers to man picket lines.

A four-month investigation, during which this reporter interviewed scores of day laborers across the country and spent time as a worker in several Houston labor pools (including Krash Cabin), suggests that many U.S. day laborers face some of the same abuses as powerless workers of the 19th century did during the Industrial Revolution.

They frequently work in hazardous conditions. At the same time, there sometimes is scant provision for compensating them if they do get hurt. Various fees may be assessed against their meager wages. Clauses in their contracts may largely preclude them from stepping up to permanent work at a company to which they are sent. And, of course, they can be fired any time.

NO WINOS NEEDED

They also face discrimination at the hiring hall and often exploitation at the job site. Customers of the labor-pool firms have used temporary laborers for every task from high-speed water blasting to mopping up radioactive waste. Young "troublemakers" tend to get blackballed, and old-timers tend to get left behind when jobs are assigned.

Gene, a toothless alcoholic and 20-year veteran of Houston's labor pools, sits on a bench—under a sign reading "Employment Unlimited is an Equal Opportunity Employer"—while a dispatcher picks out the strongest-looking from a milling crowd of 150 men. "They've got all these guys to work for them, and they don't need me anymore," he says with disgust.

"Before things went to hell," Gene continues, "you know, before the economy got bad, all they had was drunks and drifters like me here. But now everybody's working out of these pools. Guys with trades, guys with families. Hell, a guy told me he was a geologist the other day. I couldn't believe it."

Industry officials confirm this impression. They say the long recession has created a new class of day laborer; the Northerner who has lost his job, exhausted his unemployment benefits and set out for the Sun Belt in a fruitless search for work.

Many people expect the trend to continue even after the economy recovers, as workers displaced by automation and capacity cutbacks in basic industries enter the ranks of what economists call the structurally unemployed. Some fear that such people will wallow in a sort of poor people's economy, without unemployment benefits, health insurance or other support.

Jon Mason, a 23-year-old from Maine who came to Houston looking for work in offshore drilling, instead haunts the labor pools "with all these other guys from Michigan, Ohio and Indiana." He gets work only two or three days a week, earning not enough to feed a French poodle," and so one day is standing in line at a downtown center to sell blood plasma. He says he does so twice a week, every week, earning $15 in all. "Strange way to make a living, isn't it?" he muses.

Dr. Gene Boisaubin, a physician at a county-run charity hospital, says he is "amazed at how these people survive. A lot of them have health problems, and they're working in hard jobs at the same time that they're ill." They keep on, he believes, "because they don't have a choice; if they don't go in, they might lose their jobs."

Mr. Chapman, the street minister, notices that most day laborers "seem chronically downcast and depressed." But they are afraid to protest their situation, he says, and besides, "who can they complain to? The city doesn't care about them because if these places (labor pools) didn't exist, these people would be out panhandling or causing other trouble."

LIQUIDATED DAMAGES

As many day laborers see it, their best hope is to happen to get a steady "ticket" to one company for several weeks and make such a good impression there that they are offered a job. That has happened to a lucky few, such as Harry Davis, who was hired as a truck driver at a steel-distributing company. But the odds are against it. "Many employers won't hire you," Mr. Davis says, "because they think only tramps and losers work in labor pools."

That isn't the only obstacle. Another is the "liquidated-damages clause" found in many day-labor contracts. Such clauses state that if a company gives a full-time job to a temporary worker who was sent over, it must pay the labor pool a fee, either all at once or over a period of weeks.

That fee is $696 for a day laborer at a Houston firm called Quality Temporary Service. The woman who runs the firm, Diane Birch, concedes that liquidated-damages clauses may discourage clients from offering employment to temporary workers. But she says the clauses are "only fair," given the cost of recruiting and retaining the laborers.

Some temporary workers try to deal with their seemingly inescapable situation by buying beer and other gifts for the bunkhouse bosses, hoping to improve their chances of getting a steady work ticket. But the recent weakening of Houston's robust economy has reduced demand for day laborers. This change has put pressure on the labor pools and forced dozens out of business. It also has meant an even tighter squeeze for workers, because many surviving day-labor firms have found a way to keep their profit margins up: by retrieving more of the money they pay out in wages.

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

For example, most Houston firms have started charging their laborers $1 a day or more for transportation to and from the job site. Many sell the workers used work clothing at a big markup. One company, called Anybody Anytime, even charges its laborers a $1-a-day "maintenance fee" for the cost of cleaning up its hiring hall.

On a recent afternoon, a pipe-yard crew is returning to Krash Cabin, the men's faces dark as charcoal and their skin stinging from hauling creosote-coated drill pipe in the hot sun. As the laborers line up at the bar to redeem their pay vouchers, Angelo, the gruff, barrel-chested bartender, asks each one what it will be.

"Nothing today, thanks," one young man says.

"Then that will be 75 cents," Angelo mutters, deducting it from his pay.

"But I need the money," the young man protests.

"That's your problem," says Angelo.

Some day-labor firms go one step further. At least one outfit deducts Social Security taxes from its employees' wages but doesn't report or turn over the taxes to the government. "It's very easy to do," explains the president of this firm, "because in the temporary-labor business, only about 5% of the W-2s are ever picked up and filed."

NO VACANCY

Taking advantage of a lack of low-cost housing in Houston, several day-labor outfits have leased old garages or warehouses and gone into the hotel business. At Krash Cabin, the bunkhouse for one of several labor pools in Texas controlled by a man named Charles Joekel, workers pay $5 a night in cash or $6 on credit, which is deducted from their wages.

To make sure the hotel is always full, Mr. McClarity, the bunkhouse boss, advises laborers they must stay there if they want a "guarantee" of work the next day. Yet after two nights there, many men find themselves still on the bench but now $12 deeper in debt. They will usually get a work ticket the third day, but it will bring in just enough to pay off their lodging debt, buy some dinner and get another bunk for that night.

When a laborer does get a ticket, it may involve more than he bargained for. A few years ago Rice University asked a firm called Peakload Temporary Services for some people to mop up a room in the basement of the physics building. What Peakload says it didn't know was that the room was commonly called the "hot room"—that it was a place where experiments in radioactivity were done.

"There was a lot of spillage in there, and it was pretty damn radioactive," says G. C. Phillips, the director of Rice's nuclear laboratories. But he insists the job wasn't dangerous and says the temporary workers were brought in only because Rice's maintenance people didn't know how to do it.

Day laborers, however, aren't apt to be specialists. They may find themselves demolishing a shaky building one day and cleaning out a chemical tank the next. "They generally receive no training and no supervision, and they work in the least-safe elements of a company," says Alfred Johnson, the general manager of an agency called the Texas Workers Compensation Assigned Risk Pool. As a result, he adds, "they have an extremely high rate of injuries."

Industry officials say that in many states, day-labor operators are forced to purchase workers' compensation insurance through government-run assigned-risk pools. Many private insurers simply refuse to cover them because of high injury rates.

Diane Follis, a caseworker at Ben Taub, a county hospital in Houston, says, "One of my biggest referrals are day laborers, because if they get hurt, they have no resources to fall back on."

HANDY ARRANGEMENT

This toll is viewed with indifference by most companies that use temporary laborers. "We have no background at all on these guys," says Robert Houlgrave, an executive of Hughes Tool Co.'s offshore division. "The labor pool just delivers them to us in a van and takes them back when we're done with them." It's a nice arrangement, he adds, "because we don't have the hassle of taking out insurance policies on them, paying benefits or handling a mountain of paper work. The labor pool takes care of all that."

At least, sometimes it does. Raymond Doman, a 33-year-old unemployed truck driver from Indiana, learned to his dismay that some labor pools choose not to carry workers' compensation coverage, as they are free to do in Texas. While lifting pipe at an oilfield-supply company two months ago, Mr. Doman herniated two spinal disks. A doctor told him never to do manual labor again.

Mr. Doman, who has a wife and child, went to his employer, Lone Star Labor. He says the firm's manager, Harold Pinley, refused to help and told him not to come back. Mr. Pinley says he doesn't remember anyone named Doman but confirms that Lone Star doesn't carry workers' compensation. It has "private insurance," he says, declining to explain further.

Mr. Doman now is attempting to collect from the oilfield-supply firm at which he was injured. Meanwhile, he faces a $1,900 hospital bill and a landlord threatening eviction. So what does he plan to do?

"What else can I do?" he asks, popping a pain pill. "I'm going to hit another labor pool."

About a year ago, some of the labor firms that do carry workers' compensation decided to start their own insurance company, called United Employers Insurance Co. They did so, says Hugh Plummer, a lawyer for the company, to reduce premium costs and "have more control over our own claims." But as Mr. Johnson of the Assigned Risk Pool sees it, such a situation "may intimidate (an injured worker) against filing a claim out of fear that he might lose his job."

PERSUASIVE BOSS

Although federal law requires overtime pay after 40 hours of work in a week, most day-labor operators at least in Houston, refuse to pay overtime unless all the hours are clocked on one job. Again, the fear of being blackballed apparently keeps laborers from complaining too loudly.

Occasionally, however, a worker is insufficiently deterred by this prospect. That is the situation late one night at Krash Cabin. It is midnight, and most of the weary residents are asleep in their Army-surplus cots, oblivious to the rain coming in through the roof, to the rats scouring the garbage on the floor, and to a raucous argument in the office of Bob McClarity, the bunkhouse boss.

"I want my money!" demands the disgruntled day laborer, who feels he has been cheated of his overtime pay after working two straight shifts at Hughes Tool Co.

"I don't owe you nothing!" bellows the boss.

But the laborer doesn't let up. Suddenly, a blast resonates off the walls of the bunkhouse, sending awakened residents to their feet and the protesting laborer fleeing out the door.

"What the hell was that?" blurts a shaken resident. "Was somebody shot?"

"Hell, no. I missed him," says the boss, swinging his pistol at his side and smiling at the hole in the ceiling. "But don't worry. He won't be back."

AUTO EMISSION WARRANTIES AND THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 years, Congress has attempted, so far unsuccessfully, to pass legislation reauthorizing the Clean Air Act. But, while the need for such legislation is all too evident, the consensus necessary to pass it has not, as yet, developed. Nor, by most accounts, is it likely to develop in the near future which, in turn, suggests that the time has come to introduce individual pieces of legislation to address those problems in the Clean Air Act which have developed since 1977 but which have not been resolved.

One such problem is the matter of auto emission warranties. When Congress first passed the current Clean Air Act back in 1970, it required that auto manufacturers provide, through their dealerships, a 5-year, 50,000-mile warranty on auto emission control system parts. The idea was to assure that the pollution control equipment just being installed on new cars would be properly maintained so that the envisioned air quality benefits could be realized. However, it soon became evident that this 5-year, 50,000-mile warranty requirement had an unintended and detrimental side effect; namely that it gave auto dealerships a competitive advantage over independent auto parts stores and repair shops. What person, knowing that the auto dealer from whom he or she purchased the car would fix the auto emission system for nothing, would go to an independent store or shop and pay for emission control parts or repairs? Moreover, once at the dealership for the free auto emission control work, how often would that person have the dealer make other repairs, again to the detriment of the independent auto supply or repair businessperson? The answers being obvious, Congress incorporated into the 1977 Clean Air Act Amendments a provision reducing the emission control system warranty requirement to 2 years or 24,000 miles for all parts except catalytic converters, thermal reactors and items having the sole or primary purpose of reducing vehicle emissions. The thought, and intent, clearly was that such a change would reduce the anticompetitive effects of the emission control system warranty in a way that would not be totally inconsistent with the purposes of the Clean Air Act. However, in making this change, Congress did not take into account what the EPA might do on its own.

The continuing role that EPA would play in this matter did not become evident until May 1980 when the agency sharply expanded the list of parts that it defined as being "solely or primarily" intended to reduce auto emissions. The net effect was to increase the number of parts subject to the 5-year, 50,000-mile warranty which, in turn, has renewed fears of an adverse business effect on independent auto parts stores and other independent businesses engaging in various aspects of auto repair. Indeed, this concern has developed to the point that, when the Energy and Commerce Committee was considering a Clean Air Act reauthorization bill last year, a number of my constituents contacted me in hopes that the provision could be altered. As things turned out, I was far from the only Member so contacted as independent service stations, auto parts stores, tire dealers—many of whom do repair work as well—and specialty repair shops all over the country expressed a similar concern. The result was that the Energy and Commerce Committee included in a draft Clean Air Act bill (H.R. 5252) language rolling back both the production and the performance warranty on all auto emission parts to 2 years or 24,000-miles—consistent with what Congress had intended back in 1977. The only exception was the State of California which was permitted to retain its own, tougher warranty provisions.

Had H.R. 5252 become law, there would be little need to introduce legislation on auto emission control system warranties. But it did not become law, as I need hardly remind any of my colleagues. Therefore, the problem remains with us and, to deal with it, I am today introducing a bill that would restore the 2 years, 24,000-mile auto warranty requirement to its rightful place in the law. Enactment of that measure would not only promote fair competition in the auto parts and repair industry, but it would save the consumer money. People may not think they are paying for warranties when they take their car in for covered repairs but, in fact, they have already paid for those repairs in the price they paid for their car and that price might be higher than it would have been if they had gotten the repair work done at an independent auto repair place. Moreover, enactment of this legislation would not compromise the basic objectives of the Clear Air Act. Auto emission inspection and maintenance (I/M) programs, the facilitation of which is the real objective of these auto warranty requirements, have not produced the expected results in States like Arizona and New Jersey where they have been tried and scientific studies indicate they will only reduce air pollution by 2 to 4 percent in certain areas where they have not been fully implemented, such as Los Angeles and Houston. Thus, there is much to be gained and little to be lost by adoption of 2 year, 24,000 mile auto emission system warranty legislation and I invite my colleagues to join me in pushing for its enactment.●

THE ELIMINATION OF HUNGER

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the following witnesses so clearly remind us, we not only have the capacity to address the problem of hunger, we are bound to do so by the most fundamental principles that define us as a nation.

THE ELIMINATION OF HUNGER—A NATIONAL OBLIGATION

In the Third World—in most under-developed countries—over 70 percent of the children under ten years of age are malnourished. Historically, the United States has been a beacon-light of hope and material assistance to hungry and homeless people in many places very far from where we sit

today. My basic request today would be that we affirm the full comprehensiveness of the hunger issue—and deal with hunger wholistically—both locally and globally.

For the past ten years, Bread For The World has insisted that local hunger and global hunger are inseparable concerns. In 1976 both Houses of Congress passed Right to Food Resolutions, affirming that enough food is an inalienable human right for every person. That continues to be our basic, central position today.

Over the past few years there have been drastic reductions in food aid made available by the Congress for hungry persons, both domestically and overseas. The tragedy of the present moment is that hungry people here at home are increasingly being pitted against hungry people in other lands—all being forced to squabble for a share of smaller and smaller funds available.

This competition among the poor for food enough to eat deflects attention from the fact that enormous transfers have been made of food dollars into military hardware. For example, U.S. Foreign Aid has historically been concerned about hunger and poverty in developing countries; yet the foreign aid budget is becoming increasingly imbalanced. For Fiscal Year 1984, President Reagan has requested $15 billion for foreign assistance authorization. Of the funding requested, 61 percent is for "security assistance" (arms), and only 38 percent for development—a virtual reversal in the priorities of U.S. Foreign Aid. The same kind of pattern is discernable in every domstic feeding program.

ROGER POHL,
Coordinator, Bread for the World, 12th Congressional District.

The right of all to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, flows from an even more basic ethical principle: the respect owed to the dignity of every human person. We have inalienable rights because of our dignity as persons. But among these rights the most basic is the right to food. For, as the "right to food" resolutions clearly argue, no other rights would have much meaning if persons are denied the food they need to adequately sustain and nourish life. Hence in speaking of society's responsibility to feed the hungry we are speaking of an essential, basic right upon which all other rights depend. Disputes may arise as to how society ensures this right, but our own government has already enunciated the right and society's ethical responsibility in its regard.

Fr. ARTHUR F. MCGOVERN, S.J.,
Professor of Philosophy, University of Detroit.

I appreciate this opportunity to speak at the hearing today on the subject of hunger. I would like to focus my remarks primarily on those people that I see being served by present programs and also say some things about the people that we do not serve at all.

At the outset, let me make it clear I do not believe our present methods of dealing with hunger are adequate, constructive or humane. It is my feeling that most of us really do not understand those people in our society who are outside the main stream. I am not speaking of the workers who are temporarily laid off or the people who have chosen a vagabond lifestyle. I am talking about the people in our society who, for the most part, may always be on the outside looking in.

At Grace Church we have a food shelf. In order to avail oneself of our service, the person must either go through the Macomb County Emergency Food program or come to our door and hope somebody will answer. To those of us in the middle class, it seems a simple procedure, but for many outside the structure it is not. Some of these people do not have telephones or even access to telephones. They are not great communicators; asking a stranger for food is not easy for anyone, but particularly difficult for those who find communication unnatural.

Once these people are received, they get between 3-5 days supply of food. Not only that, but the food they get is given to them, they are not allowed an opportunity to choose what they want. Can you imagine having to go to the store every three days and instead of picking out the food you want, being given an allotment by a total stranger. Some may think that people of this type do not deserve any better treatment and that is why I think our system needs radical change. Let me share with you two brief incidents:

One, a man came and asked for food. I started to put together a food package and he saw me putting rice into the box. He said, "I'm sorry, Reverend, but I don't eat rice." My initial reaction was extreme anger. In my heart I was saying, "We have collected all this food so you can eat and now you're being ungrateful." Upon deeper reflection, I realized that, first of all, he was expressing a truth—that is, he did not eat rice—and secondly, he was doing nothing more than I would do if I went into a grocery store; buying only those things that I enjoy eating.

The second incident involved a retarded couple, one of whom also has a severe physical handicap. Parenthetically, let me say that many of the people who come for food suffer multiple maladies—physical, emotional, and mental. This couple came around Christmastime and wanted a turkey. I was very busy and quite surely, but I was able to give them a turkey because we had a good supply on hand. Four days later I received a card in the mail, barely legible. It was a thank you from this couple for the kindness I had extended them. How ironic! I was barely civil and yet they experienced it as kindness. I'm afraid that says a lot about the way we treat the outsiders.

In both of these instances I have mentioned adults, because they are the ones who come for food, but in 90 percent of the cases, children are involved. I am sure there are some people who would take advantage of any system, however complex or simple, and I know there are people who take advantage of our present systems, but these people are definitely in the minority. It is my considered opinion that everyone in this society has a right to food, and the children of our culture should never be denied food whatever the status of the parents.

In addition to the people who come in, what about those we never see? What about the many people too proud to ask for food? What about those who have lost so much energy that they don't feel like walking down to the church where somebody may or may not answer the door? What about those who literally lack the skills to perform the simple tasks of carrying on a phone conversation or communicating with another human being? What of those with no means of transportation who cannot carry relatively heavy bags of groceries considerable distances?

I am not trying to glamorize people in need of food. As a matter of fact, they are not glamorous at all. They are usually unkempt, oftentimes they smell, and their manners aren't always the best. Again, they are not like you and me. They are on the outside. They will stay on the outside as long as we keep them there. Our present systems do that and because we do not deal adequately with these people and the problem of hunger, we continue to produce them in ever-increasing numbers.

In a western film that I saw some time ago, one of the characters—a wealthy woman—states that "the Indians are almost noble until you see them stoop to eat dog meat." The protaganist says to her, "Have you ever been hungry, lady? I don't mean just ready for breakfast!"

There are too many people in our society who think hunger is just being ready for breakfast and too many people who get no breakfast or lunch.

I know my time is up but I urge you, Congressman, to work for that day when all your constitutents think of hunger as just being ready for breakfast.

Thank you.

RICHARD SMITH,
Pastor, Grace Episcopal Church, Mount Clemens.

LIST OF WITNESSES

HUNGER HEARING—MAY 27, 1983

Opening—(10:00-10:15):

Congressman David Bonior—Statement concerning the economic situation in Macomb County and its hunger programs.

Overview—(10:15-10:30):

Sharon Gire—Director, Northeast Interfaith Center, Fair Federal Budget Coalition—Purpose of Hearing.

Maryann Mahaffey—Chairperson, Michigan Statewide Nutrition Commission—The scope of hunger in Michigan.

Rev. Roger Pohl—Pastor, First Bethany United Church of Christ, St. Clair Shores—Bread for the World—International implications of hunger.

Affected Individuals—(10:30-11:00):

Ms. Sandy DuBois—Chesterfield Township—Client of WIC Program—How WIC Program helped her.

Katherine Wectorek—Senior citizen—The necessity of home-delivered meals.

Tony Moscato—Clinton Townwship—Long-term unemployed auto worker—Impact of cuts in benefits.

Rev. Richard Smith—Pastor, Grace Episcopal Church, Mount Clemens—sponsor of food bank—Description of person seeking assistance from volunteer food bank.

Agencies—(11:00-11:30):

Connie Schultz—Registered Dietician, WIC Program, Macomb County Health Department—Facts and statistics as to how women and children are aided by the WIC Program.

Ms. Corliss Brown-Lloyd—Nutrition Services Coordinator, Area Council on Aging—Facts and statistics as to programs available to senior citizens and how they are utilized.

Kenneth Cettle—Coordinator, Emergency Food and Shelter Program, Michigan Department of Social Services—Facts and statistics as to what programs are available, who uses them, and how successful the various programs are.

Ms. Teri DeSchryver—Director, Macomb County Emergency Food Program—Weaknesses in the service of voluntary programs.

Ms. Chacella Russell—Food Service Consultant, Macomb Intermediate School District—Facts and statistics on children assisted through the School Lunch Program.

Long-range effects —(11:30-12:00):

Dan Lafferty—Health Officer, Macomb County Public Health Department—Long-range effects of poor nutrition on public health.

Will Ireland—Program Director, Macomb County Mental Health Department—Interrelationship of mental health and nutrition.

Karlene Harbor—Supervisor, Patient and Family Counseling, St. Joseph Hospital, Mount Clemens—Effects of poor nutrition on the sick and their recovery.

Ms. Margene Wagstaff—Nutritionist, Wayne State University—How learning capacities are enhanced or hindered by nutrition.

Recommendations—(12:00-12:30):

Marilyn Rudzinski—Program Director, Expanded Food and Nutrition Program, Macomb County Cooperative Extension Service—How nutrition education programs can be expended to prevent nutrition problems.

Rev. Art McGovern, SJ—Professor of Philosophy, University of Detroit—Moral and ethical reasons why a society should accept responsibility for feeding its hungry.

Beverly McDonald—Staff, Michigan Legal Services—Recommendations for making food programs cost-effective.

Margaret Szymanek—Planner, United Community Services—Ways for volunteer programs to augment governmental food programs on an organized, appropriate basis.●

POPE JOHN PAUL'S VISIT TO POLAND: A REBIRTH OF HOPE AND PATRIOTISM

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Pope John Paul II to Poland vividly illustrates the incredible effect that a determined and courageous man can have on the fate of a nation.

For 8 days the people of Poland experienced a rekindling of hope and pride as they lined the streets, crowded the stadiums, and flocked to the churches to see and hear their beloved Pope.

They risked the possible disapproval of their government to tumultuously welcome John Paul, not only as the spiritual head of their church, but as the defender of human dignity, a champion of human rights, and a compelling witness to the love of the Polish people for freedom.

To the Government of Poland, Pope John Paul preached that "the sovereignty of the state is deeply linked to its capacity to promote the freedom of the nation."

To the people of Poland he preached the need for spiritual renewal, patience, and greater solidarity in the continuing effort to bring Poland back to its place in the community of nations.

Urging a greater dialog between the government and the people, the Pope called for an end to martial law, for the release of political prisoners, and for closer ties between Poland and the West, particularly the United States.

Despite the government's determination to keep Lech Walesa in the background, the Pope demanded and received a meeting with the head of banned Solidarity movement. For Lech Walesa's courageous efforts to bring greater freedom and justice to the workers of Poland are of such a magnitude that none can ever forget his contributions, neither the Holy Father nor any lover of freedom could, nor overlook the sufferings he had endured. History may well record that it was the efforts of these two great men which literally rewrote the history of modern Poland.

But perhaps the greatest impact of the Pope's visit to Poland was to focus the world's attention on this tiny nation, and the brave and courageous Polish people who have endured centuries of oppression in their desire to remain a nation.

May the Holy Father's visit and the continuing courage and determination of the Polish people lead their government to allow greater freedom and to seek improved ties between our two nations.●

DENY RENEWAL OF MOST FAVORED NATION TRADE STATUS TO ROMANIA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to disapprove the President's request for a waiver under section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. The intention of this resolution is to deny renewal of most favored nation (MFN) trade status to the Socialist Republic of Romania.

As you know, under section 402 of the Trade Act, MFN for Communist countries is closely alined with improvement in emigration procedures in the country in question. A number of Members in both the House and the Senate have expressed concern regarding the granting of special trade status to Romania when they are aware of difficult emigration procedures and practices in that country and of numerous cases of suffering both by individuals and families wishing to emigrate and by political and religious dissidents. A substantial improvement in emigration procedures and practices and resolution of specific cases of suffering would be welcome by myself and my colleagues as we address the issue of special trade advantages for the Communist country of Romania.

President Reagan has based his request for renewal of most favored nation special trade status for Romania on assurances that the Socialist Republic of Romania "will no longer require reimbursement to the State of education costs as a precondition to emigration, and that it will not create economic or procedural barriers to emigration."

Mr. Speaker, not only words and assurances, but also deeds, are necessary to convince Members of the U.S. Congress of the validity of these promises regarding economic and procedural barriers to emigration. I and many of colleagues are frankly quite skeptical of these assurances provided by the Government of Romania. Romania has been granted special MFN status for the past 8 years, and we have no evidence of any significant improvement in its emigration procedures nor indeed of its human rights practices in general over that period of time.

Our concerns in this regard are supported by reports of a number of organizations reporting on emigration and human rights in Romania. For example, earlier this month, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe reported as follows:

> Last year, 12,972 people emigrated from Romania to the FRG; 1,512 to Israel; and 2,463 to the United States. Figures alone, however, do not give an accurate emigration picture. Behind virtually each one of these departures were months and *often years of harassment and procedural and economic obstacles* apart from the "education tax." (italic added; CSCE Digest, June 8, 1983)

The semiannual report by President Reagan to the Commission on Implementing the Helsinki Final Act by Romania, which covers the 6-month period between December 1, 1982 and May 31, 1983 was recently released; it states flatly that "* * * there has been no overall improvement in the Romanian divided family record during the 6-month reporting period," and that the number of unresolved cases involving divided families has actually increased since the last report. The report also discusses "repressive policies on human rights matters" and cites "extensive harassment in Romania of religious, political, and cultural dissidents;" active persecution of individual priests and pastors; and "the beating and harassment of ethnic Hungarian dissidents."

Regarding Romania's human rights practices, the report states that:

> Repressive policies on human rights matters makes its position more compatible with those of the Soviet Union and some other Eastern European countries.

We also have noted the report developed by staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee dated April 1983, which states that:

> It has been reported that often * * * individuals desiring to emigrate are harassed at their workplace or fired from their jobs and that their children and spouses are also harassed.

Mr. Speaker, these are disturbing observations reported by highly respectable organizations, and should be considered in a most serious light by all who may be tempted to believe that after 8 years of MFN based on promises, Romania's assurances this year will result in actual significant improvements.

There are other factors regarding the recent assurances of the Romanian Government which also give concern. One action that should be quite fresh in the memory of each of us here in the Congress is the imposition by the Romanian Government last year of the so-called education tax. This was a thinly disguised emigration tax imposed on prospective emigrants as the latest in a systematic campaign by the Government to harass and intimidate prospective emigrants. The tax amounted to a ransom, for the many thousands it amounted to was far beyond the means of most Romanians, and, importantly, it was decreed that it was only to be paid in convertible, that is, Western currency—and Romanians are prohibited by law from possessing convertible currency. My colleagues can draw their own conclusions on what effect the education tax had on any Romanian's hopes for emigration.

The action of the Romanian Government in imposing this tax last year, only a few months after MFN had again been assured by the Congress, was viewed by a number of us here as particularly provocative in light of the fact that only several weeks prior to the imposition of the tax, the Romanian Government had assured our Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs that rumors about imposition of an emigration tax were entirely unfounded.

The Romanian Government has recently given our President assurances that this tax will no longer be imposed as a precondition to emigration. This may be so; however, there is no indication that the decree issued last November imposing this tax has been abrogated or will soon be abrogated. It remains on the books. Further, there is no indication that there is to be any change in the requirement set forth in the same decree that persons whose emigration application has been approved must pay in convertable (Western) currency all medical expenses; or that there is any change in the requirement that the real property of such persons pass into State ownership. These provisions remain on the books.

In addition, there is no indication whatsoever that the very general assurances that it will not create any economic or procedural barriers to emigration are backed up by any concrete action on the part of the Romanian Government. Mr. Speaker, these assurances are simply not sufficient to convince me nor many of my colleagues that would-be emigrants are no longer evicted from their dwellings, nor subject to such actions as arbitrary arrest; arbitrary imprisonment (on trumped-up charges of economic crimes; including theft and parasitism): confiscation of ration cards; confiscation of ID cards (without which purchases cannot be made); harassment of family members, including children and spouse; harassment on the job; job dismissial and/or demotion; deprivation of place in school; confiscation of household goods without compensation; transfer to jobs in other areas of the country; military conscription; and—for persistent applicants for emigration—incarceration in psychiatric hospitals. All of these specific forms of harassment have been reported by the various interested Western organizations as late as this year.

We should ask ourselves why we here in the Congress have permitted renewal of MFN year after year for a country which continually violates not only the letter but also the spirit of section 402 of the Trade Act, also known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment; for the purview of section 492 is not confined solely to emigration practices. In the words of the U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee:

> The spirit of the (Jackson-Vanik) amendment has been interpreted to include the human rights situation as a whole.

In this regard, the U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee states earlier this month that "Romania's MFN status has become more and more unjustifiable," and that:

> Romania's internal policies have deteriorated to the point where Romania is now one of the worst human rights offenders in Eastern Europe.

The experience regarding the education tax, together with the disconcerting report of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), the President's semiannual report to the Commission on Implementing the Helsinki Final Act by Romania, the report of the U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee, and the report of the staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should be enough to give any of us serious reservations with regard to Romania's assurances to the United States in anticipation of another year of MFN.

In the past, some have argued in favor of granting special trade concessions to Romania in exchange for the leverage it might give our country in attempting to effect real improvements in their internal policies where those policies affect emigration and human rights. I believe that this year, those who make an effort to review all the information available will reach the conclusion that I and many of my colleagues have already reached: That there has been no appreciable long-range improvement by the Government of Romania in its emigration nor its human rights policies during the entire 8 years it has enjoyed MFN and the special trade concessions MFN allows.

The Romanians have a word for being exceptionally tricky which is used frequently by almost everyone. It is "smecher." Each summer, just prior to and during Congress MFN review, Romania has succeeded in being just that—smecher—visiting numerous congressional offices, assuring Members and staff that real reforms are being instituted, presenting frequent letters and lists showing the latest numbers of persons granted permission to emigrate. Once MFN is assured for another year, that government "lapses back into its previous disregard for human rights and for any assurances it may have made to the U.S. Government." (U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee) it seems to work every time.

If the carrot has failed (and indeed it has) the time is long overdue to apply the stick. After careful and extensive study, I and a number of my colleagues have determined that MFN status for Communist Romania should not be renewed again this year. If it is not, perhaps the United States may finally be taken seriously when it offers generous trade concessions to Communist countries in exchange for meaningful human rights and emigration reforms. Until now they have had no reason to think we mean what we say.●

THE PATENT TERM RESTORATION ACT OF 1983

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, for a decade or more, patent protection for medicines, pesticides, chemicals, and other innovations has been steadily eroding by lengthening premarket approval by Federal regulatory agencies. Today I am introducing the Patent Term Restoration Act of 1983 to correct this problem in patent law. I believe the effect of enactment of this legislation will be to encourage research and to provide American consumers with new and better medicines and foods.

The dimensions of the problem are serious. In 1981, for example, new drugs lost more than 10 years of the 17 years of patent protection enjoyed by virtually every other form of invention. Some new drugs actually entered the market with no patent protection whatsoever. The consequences of the problem are equally serious. Companies are discouraged from investing in research, the rate of new discoveries is

slowed, and the market effects of new product competition are delayed.

The United States is rapidly losing its preeminence in the field of drug research, an area in which we are traditionally the world leader. Twenty years ago the United States did 60 percent of the world's pharmaceutical research; today, it does less than one-fourth. In 1981 75 percent of the new drugs approved here were either compounds licensed by foreigners or compounds directly marketed by foreign firms.

Congress never intended that patent law disadvantage one form of innovation vis-a-vis others. The concept of encouraging innovation through patent protection is in our Constitution and for almost a century we have provided 17-year patent terms.

My bill offers a simple remedy: It would permit inventors to recover some of the patent protection lost while the new product clears tests required by the Federal Government. No product would get more than 7 years restored.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the importance and value of private sector research today. Patent protection is a vital component. I believe the Patent Term Restoration Act is a fair and needed solution to a growing problem. I encourage the House of Representatives to move quickly toward enactment.●

MAINTAINING DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE VATICAN

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege today to introduce what I believe is an historic piece of legislation providing for the maintenance of U.S. diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by a majority of the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on a fully bipartisan basis. It is also my understanding that the administration is encouraged by this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be the first to concede that this legislation may raise questions or concerns. For example, it could be misconstrued by some as somehow trespassing on a deeply rooted American principle and tradition embodied in the notion of separation of church and state.

On that count I want to reassure my colleagues and others potentially concerned that I fully support that cherished principle. It is not my intent—nor does this legislation have the effect—of violating that wise dictum which has governed this great democracy of ours for more than 200 years.

In taking this action I am motivated only by practical considerations, all of which culminate in what I firmly believe to be in the best national interests of the United States. That clear result will be evident from an objective review of the facts.

What are those facts? First, the United States is virtually alone in not having full and formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Currently some 106 countries in the world maintain such relations, including a broad cross section of Communist and non-Communist and developed and less developed nations from all corners of the world. By contrast, the United States maintains only an Office of Personal Representative in the Vatican.

Perhaps the most compelling fact of all supportive of this proposal resides in the overwhelming reality that the Holy See is an international focal point at which there is confluence of vital information and diplomatic contact. From the fact flows the many benefits with would result for the United States from a full diplomatic relationship.

There is one added fact rooted in history which also underscores this proposal. It is interesting to recall that the United States did maintain full relations with the Vatican from 1848 to 1868. For reasons no longer clear, we withdrew our ambassador and let relations lapse. Over the years, however, special temporary missions to the Vatican were appointed by Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and others. In 1970 President Nixon appointed Henry Cabot Lodge as Special Presidential Envoy to the Vatican. President Carter named Robert Wagner to the post in 1977. At present, William A. Wilson is President Reagan's Special Presidential Envoy.

For the many good reasons I have just outlined I believe it is time that we extend that effort by restoring full diplomatic status to our relations with the Vatican. To do so is in the best interests of the United States. It is surely in the best interests of world peace. I urge support of the joint resolution.●

HERE, OPPORTUNITY SPEAKS ENGLISH

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, are bilingual education programs and ballots printed in foreign languages helping new citizens adopt to American life, or are they in fact promoting division in American society and lost opportunity for a large segment of the population?

The answer, I firmly believe, is that here in America opportunity speaks English.

Having spent several years on diplomatic assignment in Latin America, I can testify to the importance of knowing the Spanish language, and the many cultural differences that go along with the Latin American lifestyle, as well as the nationality and other variations among the Latin countries. Being fluent in Spanish was a necessity for my service in each of these nations.

In the United States of America, the English language plays no less a role in our national heritage. Our Constitution was written in English, our Founding Fathers and early pioneers spoke in English, and our entire national history has been written in English. It is a well-known fact that one of the basic requirements for becoming a citizen in our country is a working knowledge of English.

And why not? Almost all political debate is conducted in English. Every major newspaper and most all media sources communicate in English. Without understanding of the English language, an American citizen could not even become involved in the political process or be able to make political choices with all the facts. Since almost all business activity is conducted in English, that citizen would also be left out of the mainstream of the American economy.

I have long opposed voting ballots printed in foreign languages and Federal bilingual education programs which go beyond the goal of teaching foreign language-speaking children learn English. If one chooses to be an American citizen, then you have to survive in a nation that conducts its entire process and legal system through the English language.

The preservation of the immigrants' national culture and language within the family unit is also important for the strength of this Nation. It keeps the family together.

But the real strength lies within the family, one's religious beliefs, and in the institutions that our Nation was built on. We have built the strongest, the freest, and the best government system on Earth through these institutions, and the English language has played a major role in the growth of each of these strengths. Immigrants seek a better life in the United States of America because of these long-established institutions and because America offers more to our citizens, and new citizens, than any other nation on Earth.

The importance of the English language was recently highlighted in the report by the 20th century fund task force on education:

Anyone living in the United States who is unable to speak English cannot fully participate in our society, its culture, its politics.

A recent column on this subject in the Washington Post, by Neil Pierce, "Here, Opportunity Speaks English—Will Bilingualism Condemn Immigrants to the Ultimate Racism," provides insight into this question, and I recommend its reading to my colleagues in Congress.

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1983]

HERE, OPPORTUNITY SPEAKS ENGLISH—WILL BILINGUALISM CONDEMN IMMIGRANTS TO THE ULTIMATE RACISM?

(By Neil Pierce)

This year the federal government is spending $138 million to subsidize bilingual education programs in schools across the land. State and local governments are publishing ballots in Spanish and many other languages. Philadelphia and the state of Florida are offering civil service examinations in Spanish. There are only 11 states in which one needs to know English to take a driver's license test.

And increasingly, the question is being asked—Why?

Critics say bilingual education programs—originally sold as a way to help foreign language-speaking children make a transition to English—have become an end in themselves. Behind the programs are bilingual education teachers (some with a shaky knowledge of English themselves) and cultural organizations with a vested interest in the ongoing bilingual school curricula financed by federal dollars.

There's even a National Bilingual Education Conference that draws hundreds of delegates from as far as our Pacific territories for national lobbying conferences in luxury hotels. The theme at the last meeting, in Washington, was "Bilingualism—In The National Interest"—a far cry from short-term, transitional programs in the schools.

Now a prestigious Twentieth Century Fund task force on education, headed by the University of Massachusetts' Robert Wood, asks what good all the bilingual education programs achieve. "Anyone living in the United States who is unable to speak English cannot fully participate in our society, its culture, its politics," says the panel. It recommends "that federal funds now going to bilingual programs be used to teach non-English-speaking children how to speak, read, and write English."

On a parallel track, the English language has finally acquired its own organized lobby. It's called U.S. English and it's open to all "who agree that English is and must remain the only official language of the people of the United States."

The proponents of "English first" have to know they're playing a dangerous game. All so easily, they can be labeled as racist, reactionary, xenophobic, anti-Hispanic.

But the leaders of U.S. English are hardly know-nothings. Their honorary leader is a semanticist of Oriental origin, himself an immigrant—former Sen. S. I. Hayakawa from California, who proposed a constitutional amendment affirming English as the official language of the United States. And the president is Gerda Bikales, who learned four languages—German, Yiddish, Flemish and French—before she was finally taught English after her arrival in America at the age of 16 when her family fled Nazi-occupied Europe.

U.S. English, which so far operates on a shoestring at its offices at 1419 21st St. NW in Washington, is not against Americans' full mastery of foreign languages. One of the most intriguing things about the group is its requirement that its board members be masters of at least one foreign language.

But on putting English first in the schools, the group is adamant. "As a child," says Bikales, "I found language barriers could easily be overcome. Arriving in America without knowledge of English, I nevertheless learned it very fast. So did my friends among the immigrant students in my New York City high school."

And so can, she claims, immigrant children today.

Where bilingual issues reach redhot Latin intensity is among those Hispanics who envision a large, independent Spanish-speaking nation within the American nation—an American Québec, as it were. Asked about taxpayer-supported Spanish education, Miami Mayor Maurice Ferré is quoted in the May issue of Esquire as responding:

"We demand this because we recognize that culture is vitally important if we are going to be able to solve our problems." But Ferré—who also boasts "you can go through your whole life without having to speak English at all" in today's Cuban-dominated Miami—doesn't necessarily speak for all Hispanics.

"Middle-class ethnics romanticize public separateness and trivialize the dilemma of the socially disadvantaged," writes the Mexican-American novelist, Richard Rodriguez, author of "Hunger of Memory." America is a place where you don't lose your culture—you gain one."

The questions that remain for us all—native English-speaking and modern-day immigrant alike—are these:

Why should ballots be printed in foreign languages when practically all political debate—the very essence of responsible citizenship—is conducted in English?

Why should driver-license tests be given in foreign languages—except for foreign visitors, or for a limited time—when road signs, warnings and the voice of the traffic policeman are all in English?

Why shouldn't bilingual education be limited—as U.S. English recommends—to "a program of short-term instruction that uses the child's home language to help him for the first few months"?

Any other choice consigns youngsters to segregated classrooms, to life-times of minimal of nonexistent English, outside the mainstream of American business and public life. It could be the ultimate racism.●

WHAT SHOULD OUR NATION'S POSTURE BE IN REGARD TO NATIONAL DEFENSE?

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, for months this House has heard many differing views concerning what our Nation's posture should be in regard to national defense. At this time we are making decisions which will affect our generation and those yet to come, I feel it would be wise for my colleagues to examine an analysis submitted by the Defense Intelligence Agency to Congress Joint Economic Committee, declassified and released on June 22, detailing the dangerous Soviet military advantage.

Many in Congress disagree with the administration's position that the Soviet military buildup in recent years has won the U.S.S.R. leadership in nuclear as well as conventional weaponry. They argue that we are stronger than the administration will admit, and that it is not necessary to spend as much as requested in order to regain arms equality with the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, an examination of this Defense Intelligence Agency study reveals that we are well behind the Soviets in armed strength, and they are ready and willing to increase their pressure for domination throughout the world. Moscow's commitment to military spending and achievement is not diminishing. Instead of leveling off or declining in the face of smaller rates of economic growth, defense spending continues to increase at its historical rate of 4 percent annually and is absorbing an even large share of total national resources. Military related industries receive the highest quality goods and they are given priority when it comes to capital investments. The Soviet's present 5-year plan calls for a 43-percent growth in defense machinery output by 1985 which will further strengthen the Soviet military industrial base, already the largest in the world.

Supporters of the nuclear freeze tell us that rough parity exists between Soviet and American arsenals. If this is the case, nuclear parity requires us to invest all the more heavily in conventional arms, since the time has long passed when we can rely on a preponderance of nuclear forces to deter Soviet adventurism. Furthermore, freeze proponents contend we and the Soviets already have enough weapons to destroy the world, and making more will not add to either side's strength. I would point out that such an argument cannot be made with regard to conventional weapons. Nuclear freeze advocates cannot ignore the DIA's corroboration that the Soviet Union is the world's largest weapons producer which surpasses the United States in all significant categories.

For example, the Soviets produced 750 tactical combat aircraft in 1981, just as they did in 1977. By comparison, the United States produced fewer than 300 aircraft, even below the annual attrition rate. During 1981, the Soviets produced more than twice as many tanks, 40 times more surface-to-air missles, and three times more naval vessels than the United States. As a result, the Soviet Union fields a growing number of modern and qualitatively improved weapons systems while

the United States is barely able to keep its own inventory from shrinking.

The danger we face from a military buildup throughout the world by a nation that has a consistent history of using the arms it produces is more serious, more potentially dangerous, than any we have ever before encountered. We cannot ignore it, and we have no alternative but to reduce that danger by increasing our deterent power.

If you recall the words of our first President George Washington:

> To be prepared for war is the most effective means of preserving peace.

Because we are committed to peace, we have a moral obligation to insure America's defense credibility.

As the DIA testimony before Congress indicates, the administration has no other choice if it is serious about insuring national security, and ultimately preserving world peace.●

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, EARL HAYS

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today is a special day for the faculty and student body at one of the great colleges in my district, Sue Bennett College in London, Ky.

For today marks an anniversary, and begins a countdown for another special day coming 2 years from now.

Today, Earl Hays, president of Sue Bennett College, marks his 66th birthday. Two years from now, on this same day, President Hays will step down as president, having served in that capacity for some 24 years already.

Mr. Speaker, President Hays has done much during his tenure at Sue Bennett to make it the outstanding institution of learning it is today. Since 1949, Mr. Hays has served in several capacities, and has seen both enrollment and the school's budget increase by some 400 percent. Not one to sit on his laurels, Mr. Hays has much left to accomplish during his final 2 years as president, including a new computer science program, and expansion of evening classes.

Earl Hays has accomplished much already during his many years of service to his school and community. He is without a doubt one of the finest college administrators in Kentucky. As a teacher, a leader, an academician, and citizen, Earl Hays has given service to his school and community above and beyond the call of duty.

On this, his 66th birthday, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the fine work and excellent record of Earl Hays of Sue Bennett College. I know you share my wish for him for a successful conclusion to his work there, and for health and happiness in the years ahead.●

UNIVERSAL TELEPHONE SERVICE AND PROTECTING TELEPHONE RATES

HON. BOB WHITTAKER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. WHITTAKER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable speculation in recent months that telephone companies, including Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., which serves my State of Kansas, may increase the rates they charge for local telephone service, and that these rate increases may be so drastic that numerous residents will decide to discontinue telephone service.

Predictions about skyrocketing phone rates have been rife since AT&T and the Justice Department reached an out-of-court settlement on the restructuring of the phone system—and the Federal Communications Commission issued additional rulings deregulating the telephone industry. Many experts have predicted that local phone rates could double or triple as a result of these actions—and that rural Americans, senior citizens, and other vulnerable groups could be priced out of the market.

As a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, the committee with jurisdiction over the telecommunications industry, I am alarmed by such predictions. It is imperative that telephone rates not be allowed to rise dramatically, because substantial rate increases would put an end to universal telephone service. In today's society, universal access to telephone service is essential for almost everyone. Steep rate hikes would threaten the continued availability of this essential service for many people. As Members of Congress, we must recognize that the telephone is not a luxury item, especially in our rural areas where it provides a very essential business and social service.

Unfortunately, predictions of impending rate hikes and consumer hardships are being made in the dark. Because the FCC has not gathered the necessary data, no one knows exactly what impact developments now occurring in the telecommunications industry will have on rates—or how many people will be forced to give up their telephone, or to choose between their phone and needed food or fuel—as a result of divestiture and deregulation.

That is why I have joined in sponsoring legislation, House Resolution 231, calling upon the FCC to begin an immediate investigation to determine the effect of the FCC rulings and the restructuring of AT&T on telephone rates and service. Once this study is completed, the resolution directs the FCC to provide Congress with estimates of how many Americans would suffer economic hardship or would be forced to disconnect their phones as a result of these changes. The resolution also requests that the House Subcommittee on Telecommunications begin considering legislation that will insure the affordability of basic phone service to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not the complete answer to rising phone costs. It is, however, an important first step to insure that all Americans have access to phones at a price they can afford. I am going to carefully monitor ongoing developments in the telecommunications industry and if it is necessary for Congress to intervene with legislation in order to keep telephone rates at reasonable levels, I will be out front urging passage of legislation.●

LABOR DEPARTMENT WOULD OUTLAW LABOR

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, recently, columnist Donald Lambro wrote an article entitled "Labor Department Would Outlaw Labor." It is not ironic for the Labor Department to outlaw rather than create jobs? I refer specifically, as does the article, to the Labor Department's ban on "homework"—on the right to make such products as women's clothing, handerchiefs, buttons, buckles, jewelry, gloves, and mittens, in the home. Mr. Speaker, these restrictions should be lifted. What we need in this country are more employment opportunities, not less. I therefore commend the following article to your attention, and to the attention of my colleagues, for it clearly reveals the absurdity of homework restriction.

LABOR DEPARTMENT WOULD OUTLAW LABOR

(By Donald Lambro)

While President Reagan and Congress wrestle over a jobs bill, the Labor Department is actually trying to take jobs away from a group of hardworking Wisconsin women.

This little-noticed story is not just another isolated bureaucratic nightmare which we have come to expect out of Washington. Rather, it is typical of numerous cases throughout the government in which obstacles thrown up by antiquated special-interest laws are preventing hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions—of jobs from being created.

Consider the plight of a group of Ripon, Wis., women who help to support their families by embroidering skirts and blouses in their homes. The Labor Department, in

spite of its name, wants to put them out of work.

Department bureaucrats are actively enforcing a 1943 regulation that forbids Americans from producing six crafts categories in their homes for profit: embroidery, women's apparel, gloves and mittens, buttons and buckles, jewelry and handkerchiefs.

A ban on knitted outerwear was erased from the books in 1981 by Labor Secretary Raymond Donovan. That decision was reached after angry Vermont housewives, who make a living knitting ski sweaters and hats in their homes, were compelled to go to Washington at their own expense to plead for their jobs.

Now another group of women who want to work in their homes instead of a factory are once more pleading with the feds not to take away what, in many cases, is their sole means of livelihood.

Championing their cause is the Center on National Labor Policy, a young, aggressive public-interest law firm that specializes in little-guy-fights-City Hall cases and whose lawyers successfully defended the knitters. Recently, the CNLP filed suit in District Court in Milwaukee against the Labor Department, whose actions would effectively shut down Silent Women, Inc., the company that buys the women's embroidery.

To his credit, Donovan originally had proposed repealing all regulations that forbid these cottage industries. However, bitter labor union opposition—particularly from the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU)—forced him to back down.

The unions say that they merely want to prevent "sweatshop" conditions. Yet, the real reason for their intense opposition is that these women are competing with union-dominated factories, often turning out work that is as good or better than that being manufactured in America's garment centers. Moreover, notes CNLP executive director Steve Antosh, "Homeworkers don't pay union dues."

What else do the unions fear? ILGWU President Sol Chaiken blurted out his confession during a heated debate last year with a Vermont knitter on Phil Donohue's TV show: "You want every worker to be free to work at home at whatever they desire to do, under whatever conditions they want to work." Exactly. But to Chaiken, "That's anti-social, it's wrong."

Tell that to the Vermont knitters, Sol—some of whom are still out of work today because a few firms refuse to buy their merchandise for fear of government reprisals. Tell that to Mary Clements of Ripon, Wis., whose livelihood would be denied if the feds and the unions have their way.

"I do this because I want to be with my kids," she says of her home embroidery work. "The No. 1 reason for doing a job like this is because you have children at home."

The average homeworker earns between $3,000 and $10,000 a year from embroidery work, depending on the time she spends on her craft. All of the workers for whom CNLP is suing the Labor Department earn more than the minimum wage, and in some cases they earn much more than local factory pay scales.

Indeed, Mrs. Clement's business has become so profitable that she and her husband have added a separate sewing room to their home.

Removing the ban on these home industries would legalize what is already being practiced in many low-income homes. More important, it would open up vast new employment opportunities for the jobless, would allow welfare mothers to free themselves from a life of dependency and would let working mothers keep their children at home instead of putting them in costly day-care centers.

It is estimated that by 1990 about 15 million jobs will be done at home in the United States, much of it through computers. But instead of encouraging this sensible trend, with all of the benefits it can bestow, the government is doing its utmost to discourage it.

CAPTAIN THOMAS BAYLEY; A MODEST HERO

HON. JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that ours is an age without heroes. But I rise to praise one of my constituents, Capt. Thomas Bayley of Scarborough, Maine, who has proved beyond a doubt that heroism is alive and well in America today. Captain Bayley, who is 23 years old, recently received the American Merchant Marine Seamanship Trophy for a daring rescue he accomplished at sea last December. Retired Adm. Harold E. Shear presented him with this coveted award in Portland, Maine, at the opening of a new fish pier. I am proud to recount the story of Captain Bayley's extraordinary bravery:

December 12 of last year found Captain Bayley and his crew aboard their fishing vessel the *Kathleen and Julie II* some 90 miles off Cape Cod; the winds were strong, the seas rough, and the constant freezing rain made the visibility poor. Shortly before noon another fishing vessel, the 124-foot trawler *Robert Powell*, began to take on water rapidly through a leak in her engineroom, and her captain ordered the crew to prepare to abandon ship in an inflatable raft. The captain of the sinking vessel radioed a "mayday" which Captain Bayley heard and to which he responded; the vessels were 30 miles apart, the wind was blowing at 50 knots, and there were 12-foot seas. By 2:45 the crew of the *Robert Powell* had abandoned the ship, which sank soon thereafter.

Captain Bayley pushed his boat without mercy most of the day in order to reach the crew of the sunken vessel in time. When he reached the scene, darkness had set in, and it was snowing hard. Visibility at this point was very bad, and only through good fortune did the crew of Captain Bayley's boat spot an emergency flare fired by the shipwrecked men. After several passes, Captain Bayley's crew was able to throw a line to the men in the raft, which by this time had become so deflated that the men inside were up to their waists in freezing water. Unable to winch the raft aboard, Captain Bayley left the wheelhouse and went aft. There he lay on his stomach and bellied down the stern ramp, and, with his crew holding his legs, he successively locked arms with each of the survivors on the raft and pulled them to safety.

Captain Bayley is a modest man, who maintains that any fisherman would have done the same thing for him, given the circumstances. He is, however, a most unusual man. At great risk to himself, he saved the lives of his fellow mariners. I join my colleagues, and all those who know the perils of going to sea, in congratulating Captain Bayley for his selflessness and heroism.●

COLEMAN INTRODUCES SODBUSTER LEGISLATION

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues and subcommittee chairman, Mr. JONES, in introducing the Soil Conservation Act of 1983.

Today we face a nationwide soil erosion problem which is, at least in part, the result of outdated Federal farm policy. In the 1970's, our national policy was to plow fence row to fence row in order to meet both domestic and international demands for our agricultural products. Today we face a twofold problem as a result.

First of all, as we all know, we have huge surpluses which continue to depress agricultural markets. Second, much of the soil that farmers plowed up during the 1970's to meet rising demand was highly erosive. In more conservation-oriented times, these lands would have been left as natural grass lands and pasture.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1983 is designed to turn millions of these acres of land back to a natural state. A great deal of our erosion problems could be solved by returning some 30 million acres now in cropland to grassland.

In my home State of Missouri, 3.1 million acres of farmland, about 8 percent of our State total, is eroding away at the rate of 42 tons of soil per acre per year.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1983 provides incentives for farmers to return some of their lands to pasture and to continue good crop rotation systems. There are mechanisms within the bill to protect farmers from losing out when the next land diversion or PIK program is announced. And, farmers who cropped highly erodible land prior to 1982 are grandfathered so they would not be penalized for following a Government-encouraged program in the last decade. However, our

act will discourage any further sod-busting on lands that have been identified as highly erodible by the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer, as a matter of Federal policy, allow agricultural methods and programs that encourage our fragile soil resources to be washed off our hills and into our lakes and rivers. I believe the Soil Conservation Act of 1983 addresses the concerns of both farmers and conservationists. I am hopeful that any flaws which the bill may have at this point can be ironed out so that we can come forth with a reasonable approach that will make for sound conservation policy and good farm policy, as well.●

HUNGER IN MACOMB COUNTY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a summary of hearings convened May 27, 1983, in my home district on the impact of hunger. We heard testimony from a variety of witnesses—experts as well as individuals who spoke of their own experience with hunger. The data we collected clearly document that hunger is a pervasive and growing problem in Macomb County. Its roots lie in the economic crisis that has devastated so many of our once thriving communities, and in the cutbacks in funds for social programs that once provided assistance to so many families struggling to make ends meet. The evidence gathered in Michigan confirms reports from elsewhere in the country and compels us to address hunger as an urgent national problem.

I would like to thank the Macomb County Fair Federal Budget Coalition/Interfaith Center for inviting us to conduct this hearing, and express appreciation to all who testified. I am sorry that space limitations prevent me from submitting everyone's testimony in full.

The summaries follow:

HUNGER IN MACOMB COUNTY—INDICATORS, CAUSES, EXTENT

In 1975, the Governor established a state nutrition task force which ultimately became the Michigan Statewide Nutrition Commission. It was created so that we could approach the issue of nutrition as a part of preventive health, as well as monitoring existing programs, making recommendations as to improvements in programs, and fostering nutrition education. We seemed to have made a great deal of progress. Then in 1981, with the federal budget cuts and the escalating unemployment, hunger began to return to Michigan. Hunger is not only evident in the lines of people waiting for surplus cheese, in the new soup kitchens with people in business suits and whole families now in line, but also in the more scientific and clear cut data from pediatric hospitals around the country as well as in the Detroit nutrition surveillance study. That study is now documenting lower weight, lower height for age, and more obesity—a disease of malnutrition resulting from eating foods that are cheap and high in carbohydrates.

Two years ago the Michigan Statewide Nutrition Commission initiated a study of the emergency food problem in the State of Michigan. We discovered that by the third week of the month most emergency depots were running out of food.—Mary Ann Mahaffey, Member, Detroit City Council, Chairperson, Michigan Statewide Nutrition Commission.

Basically, the majority of our clients are unemployed people, short term as well as structurally unemployed—the "new" as well as the "old poor".

Currently Macomb County holds 182,741 people, or 26.3 percent of the county's population, who are either unemployed or dependent on some kind of transfer payment. This group is 8.4 percent larger than it was fifteen months ago. The unemployment rate was 19.3 percent in March, 1983, a full 18 percent higher than it was January 1, 1982, and 13.5 percent higher than the state's rate for the same month. As a result of this situation, residents in large numbers have been forced onto assistance rolls; in March, 1983, $6.6 million in cash, emergency needs and food stamp benefits were provided to 47,245 needy people, representing an average total individual benefit for the month of $139. In the first quarter of 1983, the county Department of Social Services received 5,413 requests for cash assistance, and opened 2,574 cases—only 47 percent of the total requests. The other 2,839 applicants were denied. During this same period, 1,581 cases were closed but the county experienced a net increase in caseload of 1,000.

Federal decisions in the past two years to reduce assistance programs—including jobs programs—have worsened their condition and swelled their ranks in two interrelated ways: (1) their nutritional, shelter and other basic needs are not being met; and (2) the reduced amount of money which they have available to spend in the local economy on these basic needs is resulting in a reduction in the local activity which these expenditures generate, which in turn is having a domino effect, causing a further loss of jobs which forces an ever increasing number of people onto assistance rolls.

The seriousness of program cutbacks for children is realized when we consider that of the 72 million youngsters in the country, 10 percent are dependent on AFC and food stamps for survival. In Michigan the rate is higher: currently 16 percent of the state's children are dependent on these assistance programs, 488,999 of 3.1 million. Macomb County is more fortunate; only 8 percent of its children are thus dependent. However, 19,000 children is a large investment in the county's future, and their unmet nutrition, shelter, medical care and educational needs must be given consideration.—Mike Foley, Michigan Legal Services.

Clearly, in Michigan, the problem of hunger has been accentuated by a troubled economy. Additionally, the high cost of living, the rapidly increasing costs of medical care, and the red tape found in bureaucracy continually makes it difficult for all citizens of all ages to seek and receive aid for their problems. Hunger among our senior citizens, our unemployed, in pregnant women, infants, and children trying to grow, trying to mature to adolescence and adulthood is clearly evident.

Recently, the infant mortality rate in Michigan experienced one of the greatest year-to-year increases since World War II. Michigan was ranked as 36th worst among the 50 states relating to infant mortality. While it is difficult to specifically determine whether or not hunger was a key component of this increase, one can surely speculate that infant mortality is and was affected by the number of people unemployed, by the general decline in our economy and, subsequently, by the ability of families and individuals to adequately acquire necessary and essential subsistence.—(Daniel C. Lafferty, Health Officer, Macomb County Health Department.)

EFFECTS OF HUNGER ON HEALTH AND BEHAVIOR

Population groups known to be at high risk regardless of socio-economic status are women of child-bearing age, children and adolescents, and the elderly. There is no single test to quickly determine malnutrition. One cannot go out on the street in our society and see a starving child. People in the twenty to fifty-five year age range can withstand food withdrawal of the 10 percent to 20 percent level for long periods of time. Nothing will show up except that they will be hungry, irritable, less effective at their work, and short tempered. This can lead to spouse and child abuse, depression, substance abuse and suicide.

There are other groups with greater risks. A 10 percent to 20 percent food intake reduction for the elderly, will not only make them hungry, but will make them more susceptible to disease. They will die a little earlier.

Then there are the very young trying to grow, learn and socialize. Intake reduction slows their growth rate and their ability to learn. They sit in school and they are hungry. They have assignments to do and instead they are thinking about eating. Learning falls off tremendously. Every year we get three, five and seven year old grade level scores on math, reading, etc. We talk about the schools getting better or worse, when in fact it is sometimes simply that the kids are eating better or worse. It would often be more beneficial to look at the kids nutritional status when looking for reasons why a school district's test scores went down. Hungry kids do have school problems.

In summary, the first to go when there is hunger is learning; the second is socialization—the ability to interact and interrelate; the third is the ability to perform on the job; and the fourth is the increase in disease and illness.—(Mary Ann Mahaffey, Member, Detroit City Council, Chairperson, Michigan Statewide Nutrition Commission.)

Research on nutrition and learning capacity gives some idea of where the problems are. It gives a starting point for determining how to deal with the effects of hunger. It demonstrates the complexity of the relationships between mental performance and food intake.

A pregnant girl or women who does not eat properly is likely to have a low-birthweight infant whose mental and physical development is delayed.

An infant who does not get enough to eat during the first six months of life may experience general stunting of growth and reduced brain size. The nervous system is af-

fected. Even after successful treatment, developmental lags may still show—in hearing and speech, in eye and hand coordination, in problem-solving ability, in behavior. The degree of improvement depends as much on environmental and social stimulation as on food intake.

Children with poor food intakes over periods of months and years have lower scores on IQ and achievement tests. They lose the motivation to learn—are not curious about what goes on around them and they lack the desire to do anything new.

Children and adolescents who are malnourished develop iron deficiency anemia. Anemia is associated with behavioral disturbances and low achievement in school. Anemia and insufficient calories lead to infection and disease. More days are missed from school and the opportunities for learning are decreased.

It is important to be aware of short-term effects of hunger also—the impact of temporary food deprivation. In these situations, behavior patterns rather than IQ performance are affected. Nevertheless, disruption of behavior patterns in learning situations ultimately will adversely affect IQ performance.—(Margene Wagstaff, Director, Medical Dietetics, Wayne State University.)

There is extensive literature that discusses the relationship between diet and mental health. It is important for those of us who are working in the field of mental health to recognize that there is a direct relationship between "food" and "mood." Some of the correlations which have been observed in many patients between diet and psychological disorders include subnutrition, and abnormal conditions involving sodium and potasium metabolism, sugar metabolism, ascorbic acid, and vitamin B_6. These nutritional variables have been associated with behavior disorders such as depressive psychosis, affective illnesses, schizophrenia, and depression. Some of the less serious behavior disorders include irritability, fatigue, mental confusion and uncontrolled emotional outbursts.

Clinicians in our Macomb County Community Mental Health program who deal every day with individuals and families seeking counseling and treatment for emotional problems have indicated to me that there is a need when assessing clients to be very careful in exploring the areas of diet, nutrition, and history of unemployment in properly diagnosing and treating clients.—Willard Ireland, Program Director, M.I. Division, Macomb County Mental Health.●

DEMOCRACY: AMERICA'S BEST EXPORT

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my friends in the House a most interesting article concerning the new International Democrat Union in London. This group will concern itself with carrying on the great work of promoting democracy. I salute the President and Vice President BUSH for their fine efforts in supporting this institution. The free world has waited far too long to begin tooting its own horn about the strengths of our system.

For far too long, supporters of communism and socialism have very professionally and successfully extolled the strengths and benefits of their own systems. Their coordinated efforts to disseminate information about their systems is both aggressive and well orchestrated. Is there any wonder that many of the smaller countries of Africa, and in other parts of the world, are turning to communism or socialism rather than taking a good look at the benefits and proven strengths of democratic forms of government? The free world must go on the offensive. It is time that we commit ourselves as a nation to assisting democratic development. It is now or never.

The administration has been very active in promoting democratic institutions around the world. The genesis of many of these ideas was President Reagan's speech to the British Parliament last year. His original plan has grown and blossomed since that time.

Last November, I had the pleasure of attending the Conference of Free Elections here in Washington. Representatives of 34 democratic nations participated in this valuable and long-overdue effort to help show the world how to build democracy by the expansion of free elections. At that meeting, the President noted that the key to democracy was a free citizen placing his vote in a ballot box, and thereby directly affecting his own destiny. The Conference objectives included providing concrete assistance to countries interested in establishing free elections, advocating the right to free elections more actively, and expanding human rights discussions and activities, to include positive steps that foster free institutions.

As an outgrowth of the President's efforts, H.R. 7020 was introduced in the House last year. This effort is designed to establish the U.S. Academy of Freedom whose function would be the development and implementation of programs to promote the growth of democracy and the creation of free and open societies throughout the world.

Recently, a bill for the establishment of a National Endowment for Democracy was passed by us in the House. This program is part of the appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency and is a response to the felt need to increase the U.S. public diplomacy effort overseas in a manner which involves U.S. private sector initiatives to strengthen democratic values and institutions abroad.

I am certain that the United States will work closely with the newly established International Democrat Union to encourage the development of democracy around the world.

I again commend the President for his efforts in supporting the International Democrat Union. I am confident that America will play an active role in the group and will produce a positive program for international action to give new momentum to the spread of freedom. Although democracy is not a fragile flower, it needs cultivating. Let us hope that this international effort to promote democratic institutions will be successful in fostering the growth of democratic processes around the world.

With this in mind, let me recommend the following Washington Post article to all of you.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 25, 1983]

BUSH PROMOTES WORLD CONSERVATIVE GROUP

(By Peter Osnos)

LONDON, June 24.—Vice President Bush joined other leading conservative politicians from 19 countries today in launching the International Democrat Union, an organization, Bush said, to "carry on the great work of promoting democracy."

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and the prime ministers of Denmark and Norway were on hand. They were among representatives of parties in 14 European countries, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States that are members of the group.

In addition to Bush, the United States was represented by Republican National Committee Chairman Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr. His Democratic counterpart, Charles T. Manatt, was present, but only as "an observer."

For the Europeans especially, such intraparty organizations are nothing particularly new. The Socialist International is a longstanding group with members from 40 countries who meet regularly, and European conservatives formed a similar organization in 1978.

But American participation reflects an initiative that began with the Reagan administration and has drawn some support from Democrats as well for a more systematic effort to bolster democratic parties around the world. In his remarks today, Bush recalled that President Reagan pledged such an effort in a speech to the British Parliament a year ago.

The International Democrat Union's chairman, Alois Mock of the Austrian People's Party, picked up that theme in his opening statement, asserting: "Political ideas have no national frontiers, and we will not be slow to export ours. For too long many of us have left the promotion of ideas to the left."

Bush, Thatcher, Kohl, and other speakers stressed the contrast between their own democratic societies and the repression in communist nations. "Ten years ago," Thatcher said, "people were writing about the crisis of democracy. Today, attention has turned to the crisis of state socialism."

The vice president singled out U.S. support for the "free nations" of Central America, which he said are receiving "the aid they need to build and perfect democracies of their own."

Speaking at the start of an eight-nation European trip in which he will explain administration policy in Central America, Bush pointed out that U.S. economic assistance to the region is three times as great as

the military aid earmarked to help the countries "resist attempts at subversion by forces beholden to totalitarian powers."

Later, at a press conference, Bush acknowledged that many Europeans, including some from countries represented in the new conservative organization, are uneasy about U.S. intentions in Central America. "Our objectives are honorable," Bush said. "We just haven't gotten out as well as we should what motivates this president in Central America."

This morning Bush conferred with Thatcher and her new foreign secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe. Saturday he flies to West Germany and later will visit other countries including Scandinavia and Ireland.

The union brings together the European Democrat Union and a similar group formed last year by the Pacific countries. It will be based at the headquarters of Britain's Conservative Party and in time is likely to be one of the agents of the U.S. program to boost democratic parties. A bill for the establishment of a National Endowment for Democracy has been passed by the House, although its exact nature is still not fixed.●

THE TEMPLETON ADDRESS BY ALEXANDR SOLZHENITSYN

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn delivered a very significant address in England on May 10, 1983. In his talk he developed the theme that the cause of Russia's troubles was that she had forgotten God and that this applied to the rest of the world, also. He stressed that there was still time to turn the situation around if people would return to God and give up their material goods. He is quite correct when he stressed that the ideological battle in the world is between things spiritual and material. The Soviet Union knows this and that is why they fear the Bible more than our ICBM's. I commend the text of this Templeton Address to the attention of my colleagues.

THE TEMPLETON ADDRESS

(By Alexandr Solzhenitsyn)

Over half a century ago, while I was still a child, I recall hearing a number of older people offer the following explanation for the great disasters that had befallen Russia: "Men have forgotten God; that's why all this has happened."

Since then I spent well-nigh fifty years working on the history of our revolution; in the process I have read hundreds of books, collected hundreds of personal testimonies, and have already contributed eight volumes of my own toward the effort of clearing away the rubble left by that upheaval. But if I were asked today to formulate as concisely as possible the main cause of the ruinous revolution that swallowed up some sixty million of our people, I could not put it more accurately than to repeat: "Men have forgotten God; that's why all this has happened."

What is more, the events of the Russian revolution can only be understood now, at the end of the century, against the background of what has since occurred in the rest of the world. What emerges here is a process of universal significance. And if I were called upon to identify briefly the principal trait of the entire twentieth century, here too, I would be unable to find anything more precise and pithy than to repeat once again: "Men have forgotten God." The failings of human consciousness, deprived of its divine dimension, have been a determining factor in all the major crimes of this century. The first of these was World War I, and much of our present predicament can be traced back to it. It was a war (the memory of which seems to be fading) when Europe, bursting with health and abundance, fell into a rage of self-mutilation which could not but sap its strength for a century or more, and perhaps forever. The only possible explanation for this war is a mental eclipse among the leaders of Europe due to their lost awareness of a Supreme Power above them. Only a godless embitterment could have moved ostensibly Christian states to employ poison gas, a weapon so obviously beyond the limits of humanity.

The same kind of defect, the flaw of a consciousness lacking all divine dimension, was manifested after World War II when the West yielded to the satanic temptation of the "nuclear umbrella." It was equivalent to saying: Let's cast off worries, let's free the younger generation from their duties and obligations, let's make no effort to defend ourselves, to say nothing of defending others—let's stop our ears to the groans emanating from the East, and let us live instead in the pursuit of happiness. If danger should threaten us, we shall be protected by the nuclear bomb; if not, then let the world go to hell! The pitifully helpless state to which the contemporary West has sunk is in large measure due to this fatal error: the belief that the only issue is that of nuclear weapons, whereas in reality the defense of peace reposes chiefly on stout hearts and steadfast men.

Only the loss of that higher intuition which comes from God could have allowed the West to accept calmly, after World War I, the protracted agony of Russia as she was being torn apart by a band of cannibals, or to accept, after World War II, the similar dismemberment of Eastern Europe. The West did not perceive that this was in fact the beginning of a lengthy process that spells disaster for the whole world; indeed the West has done a good deal to help the process along. Only once in this century did the West gather its strength—for the battle against Hitler. But the fruits of that victory have long since been lost. Faced with cannibalism, our godless age has discovered the perfect anaesthetic—trade! Such is the pathetic pinnacle of contemporary wisdom.

Today's world has reached a stage which, if it had been described to preceding centuries, would have called forth the cry: "This is the Apocalypse!"

Yet we have grown used to this kind of world; we even feel at home in it.

Dostoevsky warned that "great events could come upon us and catch us intellectually unprepared." That is precisely what has happened. And he predicted that "the world will be saved only after it has been possessed by the demon of evil." Whether it really will be saved we shall have to wait and see: this will depend on our conscience, on our spiritual lucidity, on our individual and combined efforts in the face of catastrophic circumstances. But it has already come to pass that the demon of evil, like a whirlwind, triumphantly circles all five continents of the earth.

We are witnesses to the devastation of the world, be it imposed or voluntarily undergone. The entire twentieth century is being sucked into the vortex of atheism and self-destruction. This plunge into the abyss has aspects that are unquestionably global, dependent neither on political systems, nor on levels of economic and cultural development, nor yet on national peculiarities. And contemporary Europe, seemingly so unlike the Russia of 1913, is today on the verge of the same collapse, for all that it has been reached by a different route. Different parts of the world have followed different paths, but today they are all approaching the threshold of a common ruin.

In its past, Russia did know a time when the social ideal was not fame, or riches, or material success, but a pious way of life. Russia was then steeped in an Orthodox Christianity which remained true to the Church of the first centuries. The Orthodoxy of that time knew how to safeguard its people under the yoke of a foreign occupation which lasted more than two centuries, while at the same time fending off iniquitous blows from the swords of Western crusaders. During those centuries the Orthodox faith in our country became part of the very patterns of thought and the personality of our people, the forms of daily life, the work calendar, the priorities in every undertaking, the organization of the week and of the year. Faith was the shaping and unifying force of the nation.

But in the seventeenth century Russian Orthodoxy was gravely weakened by an ill-fated internal schism. In the eighteenth, the country was shaken by Peter's forcibly imposed transformations, which favoured the economy, the state, and the military at the expense of the religious spirit and national life. And along with this lopsided Petrine enlightenment, Russia felt the first whiff of secularism; its subtle poisons permeated the educated classes in the course of the nineteenth century and opened the path to Marxism. By the time of the revolution, Russian educated circles had virtually lost the faith; and amongst the uneducated, its health was threatened.

It was Dostoevsky, once again, who drew from the French Revolution and its seething hatred for the Church the lesson that "revolution must necessarily begin with atheism." That is absolutely true. But the world had never before known a godlessness as organized, militarized, and tenaciously malevolent as that preached by Marxism. Within the philosophical system of Marx and Lenin and at the heart of their psychology, hatred of God is the principal driving force, more fundamental than all their political and economic pretensions. Militant atheism is not merely incidental or marginal to communist policy; it is not a side effect, but the central pivot. To achieve its diabolical ends, communism needs to control a population devoid of religious and national feeling, and this entails a destruction of faith and nationhood. Communists proclaim both of these objectives openly, and just as openly put them into practice. The degree to which the atheistic world longs to annihilate religion, the extent to which religion sticks in its throat, was demonstrated by the web of intrigue surrounding the recent attempts on the life of the Pope.

The 1920s in the USSR witnessed an uninterrupted procession of victims and martyrs amongst the Orthodox clergy. Two metropolitans were shot, one of whom, Veniamin

of Petrograd, had been elected by the popular vote of this diocese. Patriarch Tikhon himself passed through the hands of the Cheka-GPU and then died under suspicious circumstances. Scores of archbishops and bishops perished. Tens of thousands of priests, monks, and nuns, pressured by the Chekists to renounce the word of God, were tortured, shot in cellars, sent to camps, exiled to the desolate tundra of the far North, or turned out into the streets in their old age without food or shelter. All these Christian martyrs went unswervingly to their deaths for the faith; instances of apostasy were few and far between. For tens of millions of laymen access to the Church was blocked, and they were forbidden to bring up their children in the faith: religious parents were wrenched from their children and thrown in prison, while the children were turned from the faith by threats and lies. One could argue that the pointless destruction of Russia's rural economy in the 1930's, the so-called dekulakization and collectivization, which brought death to fifteen million peasants while making no economic sense at all, was enforced with such cruelty, first and foremost, for the purpose of destroying our national way of life and of extirpating religion from our peasants. The same policy of spiritual perversion operated throughout the brutal world of the Gulag Archipelago, where men were encouraged to survive at the cost of the lives of others.

And only atheists bereft of reason could have decided upon the ultimate brutality being planned in the USSR today, to be perpetrated against the Russian land itself, whereby the Russian North is to be flooded, the flow of the northern rivers reversed, the life of the Arctic Ocean disrupted, and the water channelled southward, toward lands already devastated by earlier, equally foolhardy, "feats of communist construction."

For a short period of time, when he needed to gather strength for the struggle against Hitler, Stalin cynically adopted a friendly posture toward the Church. This deceptive game, continued in later years by Brezhnev with the help of show-case publications and other window dressing, has unfortunately tended to be taken at its face value in the West. Yet the tenacity with which hatred of religion is rooted in communism may be judged by the example of their most liberal leader, Khrushchev: for though he undertook a number of significant steps to extend freedom, Khrushchev simultaneously rekindled the frenzied Leninist obsession with destroying religion.

But there is something they did not expect: that in a land where churches have been levelled, where a triumphant atheism has rampaged uncontrolled for two-thirds of a century, where the clergy are utterly humiliated and deprived of all independence, where what remains of the Church as an institution is tolerated only for the sake of propaganda directed at the West, where even today people are sent to the labor camps for their faith, and where, within the camps themselves, those who gather to pray at Easter are clapped in punishment cells—they could not suppose that beneath this communist steam roller the Christian tradition would survive in Russia! It is true that millions of our countrymen have been corrupted and spiritually devastated by an officially imposed atheism, yet there remain many millions of believers: it is only external pressures that keep them from speaking out, but, as is always the case in times of persecution and suffering, the awareness of God in my country has attained great acuteness and profundity.

It is here that we see the dawn of hope: for no matter how formidably communism bristles with tanks and rockets, no matter what successes it attains in seizing the planet, it is doomed never to vanquish Christianity.

The West has yet to experience a communist invasion; religion remains free. But the West's own historical evolution has been such that today it, too, is experiencing a drying up of religious consciousness. It, too, has witnessed racking schisms, bloody religious wars, and enmity, to say nothing of the tide of secularism which, from the late Middle Ages onward, has progressively inundated the West. This gradual sapping of strength from within is a threat to faith that is perhaps even more dangerous than any attempt to assault religion violently from without.

Unnoticeably, through decades of gradual erosion, the meaning of life in the West ceased to stand for anything more lofty than the pursuit of "happiness", a goal that has even been solemnly guaranteed by constitutions. The concepts of good and evil have been ridiculed for several centuries; banished from common use, they have been replaced by political or class considerations of short-lived value. It has become embarrassing to appeal to eternal concepts, embarrassing to state that evil makes its home in the individual human heart before it enters a political system. Yet it is not considered shameful to make daily concessions to an integral evil. Judging by the continuing landslide of concessions made before the eyes of our very own generation, the West is ineluctably slipping toward the abyss. Western societies are losing more and more of their religious essence as they thoughtlessly yield up their younger generation to atheism. What other evidence of godlessness does one need, if a blasphemous film about Jesus is shown throughout the United States, reputedly one of the most religious countries in the world? Or if a major newspaper publishes a shameless caricature of the Virgin Mary? When external rights are completely unrestricted, why should one make an inner effort to restrain oneself from ignoble acts? . . .

Or why should one draw back from burning hatred, whatever its basis—race, class, or zealous ideology? Such hatred is in fact corroding many hearts today. Atheist teachers in the West are bringing up a younger generation in a spirit of hate for their own society. Amid all the vituperation, it has been forgotten that the defects of capitalism represent the basic flaws of human nature, freed from all limitations just as the various human rights are; that under communism (and communism breathes down the neck of all moderate forms of socialism, which are unstable)—under communism the very same flaws become completely unbridled in any person with the least degree of authority; and that everyone else under that system truly does attain "equality"—the equality of destitute slaves. Such incitements to hatred are coming to characterize today's free world. Indeed, the broader the personal freedoms are, the higher the level of prosperity or even of abundance, the more vehement, paradoxically, is this blind hatred. The contemporary developed West thus demonstrates by its own example that human salvation can be found neither in the profusion of material goods nor in merely making money.

This unquenchable hatred then spreads to all that is alive, to life itself, to the world with its colors, sounds and shapes, to the human body. The embittered art of the twentieth century is perishing from this ugly hate, for art is fruitless without love. In the East art has collapsed because it has been forcibly knocked down and trampled, but in the West the fall has been voluntary, a decline into a contrived and pretentious quest where the artist, instead of attempting to make known the divine plan, tries to put himself in the place of God.

And here again, the same result is produced both in East and West, through a world-wide process, by the same cause: that men have forgotten God.

Confronted by the onslaught of world-wide atheism, believers are disunited and frequently bewildered. And yet the Christian (or post-Christian) world would do well to note the example of the Far East. I have recently had an opportunity to observe in Free China and in Japan how, despite the apparently lesser precision of their religious concepts, and despite the same unassailable "freedom of choice" that exists in the West, both the society and the younger generation have preserved a moral sense to a greater degree than is true in the West, and have been less affected by the destructive spirit of secularism.

What can one say about the lack of unity among the various religions, if Christianity has itself become so fragmented? In recent years the major Christian Churches have taken steps toward reconciliation. But these measures are far too slow: the world is perishing a hundred times more quickly. No-one expects the Churches to merge or to revise all their doctrines, but only to present a common front against atheism. But for such a purpose the steps taken are much too slow.

There also exists an organized movement for the unification of the Churches, but it presents an odd picture. The World Council of Churches seems to care more for the success of revolutionary movements in the Third World, all the while remaining blind and deaf to the persecution of religion where this is carried through most consistently—in the USSR. Not to see the facts is impossible; must one conclude, then, that it is deemed expedient not to see, not to get involved? But if that is the case, what remains of Christianity?

It is with profound regret that I must note here something which I cannot pass over in silence. My predecessor in receipt of this prize last year—in the very months that the award was made—lent public support to communist lies by his deplorable statement that he had not noticed the persecution of religion in the USSR. Before the multitude of those who have perished and who are oppressed today, may God be his judge.

It seems more and more apparent that even with the most sophisticated of political maneuvers, the noose on the neck of mankind draws tighter and more hopeless with every passing decade, and there seems to be no way out for anyone—neither nuclear, nor political, nor economic, nor ecological. That is indeed the way things appear to be.

Before the mountains, nay, the whole mountain ranges of such global events, it may seem incongruous and inappropriate to recall that the primary key to our being or non-being resides in each individual human heart, in the heart's preference for specific good or evil. Yet this remains true even today, and it is, in fact, the most reliable key. The social theories which have promised so much have demonstrated their bankruptcy, leaving us in a dead end. The free

people of the West could reasonably have been expected to understand that their environment includes numerous freely nurtured falsehoods, and not to allow lies to be foisted upon them so easily. All attempts to find a way out of the plight of today's world are fruitless without a repentant return of our consciousness to the Creator of all: without this, no exit will be illumined, and we shall be unable to find our way. The means we have left for ourselves are too impoverished for the task. We must first recognize the horror perpetrated not by some outside force, not by class or national enemies, but within each of us individually, and within every society. And particularly in a free and highly-developed society, for in that case we have surely done everything by ourselves and of our own free will. We ourselves, in our daily unthinking selfishness, are pulling tight that noose.

Let us ask ourselves: Are not the ideals of our century false? And is not our glib and fashionable terminology just as unsound, a terminology which leads to superficial remedies being proposed for each difficulty? In every field of endeavor they all must be subjected to a clear-eyed review while there is still time. The solution of the crisis will not be found along the well-trodden paths of conventional notions.

Our life consist not in the pursuit of material success but in the quest of worthy spiritual growth. Our entire earthly existence is but a transitional stage in the movement toward something higher, and we must not stumble and fall, nor must we linger fruitlessly on one rung of the ladder. Material laws alone do not explain our life or give it direction. The laws of physics and physiology will never reveal the indisputable manner in which The Creator constantly, day in and day out, participates in the life of each of us, unfailingly granting us the energy and existence; when this assistance leaves us, we die. In the life of our entire planet, the Divine Spirit moves with no less force: this we must grasp in our dark and terrible hour.

Instead of the ill-advised hopes of the last two centuries, which have reduced us to insignificance and brought us to the brink of nuclear and non-nuclear death, we can only reach with determination for the warm hand of God, which we have so rashly and self-confidently pushed away. If we did this our eyes could be opened to the errors of this unfortunate twentieth century and our hands could be directed to set them right. There is nothing else to cling to, in the landslide: all the thinkers of the Enlightenment can give us nothing.

Our five continents are caught in a whirlwind. But it is during such trials that the highest gifts of the human spirit are manifested. If we perish and lose this world, the fault will be ours alone.●

EFFECTIVENESS OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, bilingual instruction in a limited English-speaking student's native language, as a way of helping that student gain competence in the English language, continues to be a debatable issue. What facts we do have on the subject appear not to be conclusive, and oftentimes title VII funded research provides us with contradictory findings and conclusions.

With this in mind, I continue to be amazed by those who are opposed to bilingual education instruction, who keep referring to research studies which they say suppport their view that no single approach is best.

The most quoted of recent research on bilingual education is a 1981 review of national and local evaluations performed for the Department of Education by Keith Baker and Adriana de-Kanter, titled "Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature." The Baker-deKanter review is often misinterpreted to suggest that such English-only approaches as "immersion" or English as a second language (ESL) are superior to transitional bilingual education (TBE).

Baker-deKanter analyzed some 150 evaluation reports on programs for limited-English-proficient children and found 28 studies that met their criteria for relevance and technical quality. Of these 28, 25 involved transitional bilingual education evaluation studies, comparing TBE with other approaches for teaching English. There were also analyses that compared children on achievement in mathematics. What Baker-deKanter actually found was that:

Eleven out of 25, or almost half of the evaluation studies, when comparing TBE and other approaches, favored bilingual programs as a strategy for teaching English.

There were effects favoring TBE on mathematics outcomes in 9 out of 15 comparisons.

In summary then, when comparing the different approaches in teaching limited-English-proficient children with transitional bilingual education approaches, the evidence favoring bilingual instruction over other approaches was more consistently significant and favorable across a range of studies than was the evidence for any other single strategy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a chart which summarizes and substantiates my remarks. The chart is adapted from the Baker-deKanter review. I would also like to include a narrative which further explains the chart in more detail.

NUMBER OF COMPARISONS SHOWING EFFECTS FAVORING TRANSITIONAL BILINGUAL EDUCATION (TBE) FOR OUTCOMES IN ENGLISH AND MATHEMATICS

[In 25 studies reviewed by Baker and de Kanter [1]]

Type of comparison and effect	Type of outcome [2]	
	English language	Mathematics
TBE versus Submersion (standard English medium instruction):		
Positive	10	2
No difference	15	9
Negative	5	3
TBE versus English as a second language:		
Positive	1	1
No difference	3	NA
Negative	1	NA
TBE versus Immersion:		
Positive	0	0
No difference	1	1
Negative	1	0

[1] Adapted from K. Baker and A. de Kanter, Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature. Final Draft Report. Office of Planning and Budget, U.S. Department of Education, September 1981.

[2] More than 25 results are shown in the table because some studies contained more than a single comparison.

STUDY FINDS EFFECTS FAVORING BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN ALMOST HALF THE EVALUATION STUDIES REVIEWED

Results from a recent Department of Education report indicated that 11 out of 25 or almost half of the evaluation studies looking at comparisons between transitional bilingual education and other approaches favored the bilingual program as a strategy for teaching English. Further, of the remaining studies, most showed no differences between bilingual education and other approaches, while only a few showed differences favoring other types of instruction. A small number of studies conducted on English as a Second Language were found to show inconsistent results, while the one relevant study performed on immersion approaches favored the immersion strategy. Nevertheless, the evidence favoring bilingual instruction over other approaches was more consistently significant and favorable across a range of studies than was the evidence for any single other strategy for teaching English to limited English proficient children.

These results are contained in a 1981 review of national and local evaluations performed for the Department of Education by Keith Baker and Adriana de Kanter titled "Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature." The authors analyzed some 150 evaluation reports on programs for limited English proficient children and found 28 studies that met their criteria for relevance and technical quality. Of these, 25 involved transitional bilingual education (TBE), some with more than one analysis that compared children on English language outcomes, and some with analyses that compared children on achievement in mathematics. A summary of the comparisons between TBE and other types of programs across the 25 studies is contained in the accompanying table, which reveals the number of findings favoring the bilingual programs. The table also shows the number of findings by the type of program with which TBE was compared. Among other results there were effects favoring TBE on mathematics outcomes in 9 out of 15 comparisons even though there were no differences between TBE and submersions programs on English language outcomes.●

HOLLAND, MASS., CELEBRATES ITS BICENTENNIAL

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, I had the pleasure of attending a bicentennial celebration in the town of Holland, Mass. The festivities, highlighted by a stirring performance by the U.S. Coast Guard Band, were an exciting beginning to a community-wide bicentennial observance that will last until September.

Holland is a typically beautiful New England town that has its roots deep in the history of our country. It was settled in 1730 by Joseph Blodgett, a pioneer of courage and vision whose descendants are still active in the daily life of Holland. In 1783, Holland became a distinct municipal entity and took its name from Lord Holland, a British nobleman who was a staunch defender of the rights of the American colonies in the debates held in the British Parliament prior to the American Revolution.

Holland's proximity to the Quinnebaug River has colored much of its history. Farms, tanneries, and various types of mills lined the river providing food and jobs for the town's residents. In 1865, a dam was constructed to provide water for the mills, and Holland Lake was created. In 1955, when a flood destroyed the dam, a cooperative effort by the Federal and State governments, and the people of Holland, resulted in a new dam being built.

Since the turn of this century, Holland has been a bustling resort community. The waters of Holland Lake provide ample opportunity for swimming, boating, fishing, and other forms of summer recreation. Anyone who has visited the town, as I have had the pleasure of doing on many occasions, cannot help but be impressed by its beauty, the friendliness of its citizens and their obvious pride in, and love for, their town.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the people of Holland on their town's 200th birthday. The bicentennial committee, chaired by Leo Gelineau, has done a magnificent job in planning a number of events to commemorate this historic occasion. The spirit that was evident to everyone who attended last Sunday's concert was a clear indication that not only will the bicentennial celebration be a success, but that there will be many more happy birthdays in Holland's future.●

SOVIET ESPIONAGE ON THE RISE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the countries change, but the headlines remain the same, "Soviet Official Expelled for Spying."

Already in the first 6 months of this year, 96 Soviets have been asked by 15 host nations to leave their diplomatic posts and return to the Soviet Union. Most often these expelled diplomats are charged with spying. They were known to have stolen or purchased sensitive military secrets, technology, or microfilm. Soviets have also been expelled for conducting effective active measures campaigns aimed at discrediting host nations.

The Swiss Government ordered in April that the director of the Bern bureau for the Communist publication Novosti be expelled because the bureau "served as a center for disinformation, subversion and agitation." Swiss authorities also said the bureau was used for the "political and ideological indoctrination" of young members of the Swiss peace and antinuclear movements and for planning street demonstrations.

The American people should not be fooled into believing this only happens in other nations. As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I regularly receive information from the CIA and FBI concerning the activities of Soviet agents in the United States. FBI Director William Webster estimates that 1,000 or more of the 3,000 Soviet diplomats working in the United States are Communist agents or spies. Three Soviet agents were expelled from our country on April 21, for recruiting Americans as spies, purchasing secret documents about our weapons and aerospace systems, and obtaining other classified information.

The Soviets who are apprehended in the United States and other nations represent only a small number of those who actually are involved in spying activities and the amount of information that is confiscated from these agents is negligible compared to the amount the Soviets successfully smuggle out of these countries.

It is important that the American people know that the Soviets are aggressively engaged in espionage and active measures operations in the United States and throughout the world. The Intelligence Committee I have the privilege of serving on has held a series of hearings to examine these types of Soviet activities. The committee heard testimony in February 1980 from Ladislv Bittman, the former deputy chief of the Disinformation Department of the Czechoslovakia intelligence service, who was the first high ranking Communist disinformation officer to provide information to our committee about the variety and extent of Soviet propaganda and forgery efforts. At my request, the committee last July held another hearing on Soviet disinformation activities and heard testimony from Stanislav Levchenko, a former KGB active measures officer in Japan. Testimony about his experiences in Japan expanded our insight into Soviet active measures operations.

The testimony of these two former high-level Communist agents, as well as information we receive from other witnesses and U.S. intelligence officials confirms that the Soviet methods and aims of their disinformation and espionage operations are essentially the same in all countries, including the United States. Although much of the information we receive is classified, I have been able to release declassified portions of some of these hearings so the American people can be aware of the lengths to which the Soviets will go to achieve their ultimate goal of world domination. Without this type of information, Americans cannot fully understand the serious threat the Soviets pose to world peace.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my effort to help inform my colleagues and the American public, I would like to submit for the RECORD, following my remarks, a list of Soviet officials who have been expelled this year from nations throughout the world.

EXPULSIONS OF SOVIET OFFICIALS, 1983

SWITZERLAND

January 7, 1983: Two unidentified Soviet diplomats, one a member of the Soviet Consulate General in Geneva and the other an official of the Permanent Soviet Mission to the United Nations in Geneva, were expelled on espionage charges.

The Swiss Foreign Ministry charged the two diplomats with gathering information about papers required for "settling or getting married" in Switzerland. The ministery did not cite the signficance of such data, but Swiss media speculated that it could have been used by Soviet intelligence in establishing illegal agents in the country.

Since World War II, Switzerland has expelled more than 100 foreign diplomats and officials for espionage. Four-fifths of the deportees were from the Soviet bloc. The Swiss Government has said that since 1948 it has uncovered 240 spying cases, of which 160 were connected with East European countries.

GREAT BRITAIN

January 12, 1983: Vladimir Chernov, a translator at the International Wheat Council in London since 1978, was expelled for espionage.

DENMARK

February 10, 1983: Evgeniy Motorov, first secretary at the Soviet Embassy in Copenhagen since 1979, was expelled on espionage charges. Motorov had collected classified information on advanced military technology.

NETHERLANDS

February 13, 1983: Dutch authorities expelled Alexander Konoval, third secretary at the Soviet Embassy in the Hague, on espionage charges.

ITALY

February 14, 1983: Viktor Pronin, deputy commercial director in Rome for Aeroflot, and Italina microfilm expert Azelio Negrino were arrested on espionage charges. The two were apprehended as Pronin was about to pick up microfilmed plans of NATO installations in northern Italy and of the European-designed Tornado aircraft which was due to come into service with NATO air forces. Pronin, reported to be a KGB colonel, and other Soviet intelligence officers has approached Genoese industrialist Negrino a year ago and offered him "huge sums of money" in exchange for microfilms and other documentation of political and military secrets.

February 16, 1983: Two unidentified Soviet officials employed in Italy by the Soviet merchant marine organization "Morflot" were expelled on espionage charges, according to press reports. It is not known if they were involved in the Pronin affair.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

February 17, 1983: West German officials arrested Gennadiy Batashev, a KGB operative and Soviet trade mission member in Cologne. Batashev was charged with trying to buy documents on secret coding machines used in NATO countries and reportedly had offered his contact $2,000 for the documents.

ITALY

February 24, 1983: Viktor Konayaev, deputy commercial director of the Italian-Soviet petroleum shipping company Nafta-Italia, was arrested by Italian police for complicity in the Pronin affair.

SWITZERLAND

March 3, 1983: Swiss authorities expelled Lt. Col. Vladimir Lugovoy, Deputy Soviet military attache in Bern, for espionage. Lugovoy was detained by police as he was trying to make contact with a possible informant in Lausanne. Lugovoy's predecessor was deported last April after Swiss authorities apprehended him carrying classified documents concerning a third country.

FRANCE

Late March 1983: The French Government ordered the expulsion of 45 Soviet diplomatic and military officials and two Soviet correspondents based at various Soviet installations throughout France. Investigations by the French counterespionage service had found the Soviets "engaged in a systematic search on French territory for technological and scientific information, particularly in the military area," according to a French Interior Ministry statement. All 47 Soviets, known to Western intelligence agencies to be affiliated with either the KGB or the GRU, left France on April 15, 1983.

The Interior Ministry statement noted that the number of Soviet residents in France had increased by about 1,400 over a 10-year period, standing at 2,406 at the beginning of 1982. Of that group, about 700 were believed to hold official passports, an increase of about 500 over the 10 years. News agencies quoted French counterespionage officals as saying that about one-third of the 700 were considered professional intelligence agents.

The Soviet Embassy in Paris issued a statement on April 5 protesting the "totally unfounded and arbitrary" expulsion order. The statement said that the French Government would have to bear full responsibility for any "adverse consequences" for bilateral relations.

GREAT BRITAIN

March 31, 1983: British authorities expelled Soviet Embassy assistant air attache Lt. Col. Gennadiy Primakov and Soviet New Times correspondent Igor Titov for espionage. Another Soviet diplomat not in the United Kingdom at the time, second secretary Vladimir Ivanov, was declared persona non grata and will not be permitted to return.

SPAIN

April 1, 1983: The Spanish Foreign Ministry confirmed the expulsion sometime in March of an unidentified Soviet Embassy official for espionage. He was the 11th Soviet diplomat to be expelled from Spain since the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Madrid and Moscow in 1977.

GREAT BRITAIN

April 15, 1983: British authorities expelled Soviet Embassy Third Secretary Anatoliy Chernaev in retaliation for the USSR's April 8 expulsion of a British air attache and correspondent.

UNITED STATES

April 21, 1983: Three Soviet diplomats—Soviet Embassy Military Attache Lt. Col. Yevgeniy Barmyantsev, and UN Soviet Mission employees Aleksandr Mikheyer and Oleg Konstantinov—were expelled on espionage charges. Barmyantsev, an identified military intelligence (GRU) officer who the FBI said was known to have tried to recruit Americans as spies, was apprehended April 16 as he retrieved eight rolls of undeveloped 35-millimeter film from a dead drop in rural Montgomery County; the film was reported to have contained photographs of classified US documents. Mikheyev, reportedly attached to the USA/Canada Institute in Moscow, was expelled for trying to obtain highly classified information from a congressional aide. Konstantinov, an identified intelligence operative, was apprehended by authorities April 2 on Long Island when he met an American from whom he was trying to obtain secret info about US weapons technology and the US aerospace industry.

AUSTRALIA

April 22, 1983: Soviet Embassy First Secretary Valeriy Ivanov, identified by Foreign Minister William Hayden as a KGB operative, was expelled on espionage charges. Foreign Minister Hayden said that Ivanov "threatened Australia's National Security" and in an April 29 interview charged Ivanov with "seeking to recruit spies," according to Australian radio.

SWITZERLAND

April 27, 1983: Soviet Embassy First Secretary and press attache Leonid Ovchinnikov departed Switzerland; newspaper accounts reported that Swiss authorities wanted him to leave.

April 29, 1983: The Swiss government ordered the closure of the USSR's Bern-based Novosti bureau, charging in a statement that it had been used as a center for the "political and ideological indoctrination" of young members of the Swiss peace and antinuclear movements and for planning street demonstrations. The director of the bureau, Alexi Dumov, was ordered expelled.

Swiss authorities said that the Novosti bureau had "served as a center for disinformation, subversion and agitation" rather than as a news agency.

IRAN

May 7, 1983: Eighteen Soviet diplomats—Nikolay Kozyrev (counselor), Gennadiy Avrilov (first secretary), Anatoliy Kachekov (counselor), Guseyn Guliyen (first secretary), Valeriy Samanyan (second secretary), Valeriy Markov (third secretary), Vyacheslav Zarya (first secretary), Viktor Kiselev (third secretary), Vladimir Kabalev (attache), Colonel Yevgeniy Sherifanov (military attache), Col. Andrei Verbano (military attache), Anatoliy Lapashin (deputy commercial attache), Yuriy Ogarev (commercial assistant), Vladimir Plakhtin (counselor), Major Aleksandr Pantelev (military attache), Mikhail Sharov (commercial assistant), Barkhas Artynov (consul in Esfahan) and Allakhverdi 'Asadollayev (first secretary)—were expelled for "interference in the internal affairs" of Iran through "establishing contacts and taking advantage of treacherous and mercenary agents," according to Tehran radio. Another broadcast reported that Soviet diplomats were told to restrict their activities and to try not to leave their homes, while the TASS bureau had been closed and Soviet banks and economic installations in Iran nationalized.

BELGIUM

May 13, 1983: Yevgeniy Mikhailov, director-general of Elorg, a joint Belgian-Soviet company specializing in the planning and organization of computer and information systems, was expelled on espionage charges. Mikhailov's predecessor, a Mr. Christoph, also was expelled from Belgium in 1976 for espionage. Mikhailov's expulsion was the result of illegal activities aimed at obtaining classified industrial and military information.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

May 17, 1983: Four Soviet officials—second secretary Yevgeny Shmagin, Col. Viktor Marchenko (both with the Soviet Embassy in Bonn), Boris Kozhevnikov and Oleg Shevchenko (both attached to the Soviet trade mission in Cologne)—were identified in a West German weekly as intelligence agents and reportedly recalled to Moscow. Shmagin was reported to have sought to enlist agents and influence the West German antinuclear movement; Marchenko (described as a GRU operative) sought secret data from electronics companies; Kozhevnikov had gathered secret information on medical research and sought to bribe industry officials with offers of trade and cash to gain secrets; and Shevchenko was reported to have recruited students as agents.

THAILAND

May 20, 1983: Soviet Embassy commercial officer Viktor Baryshev, identified as a GRU lieutenant colonel, was expelled by Thai authorities on espionage charges. Baryshev was apprehended May 19 while in possession of secret documents on Thai military installations and forces along the Thai-Kampuchean border.

JAPAN

June 21, 1983: Arkadiy A. Vinogradov, first secretary at the Soviet Embassy in Tokyo, was expelled for attempting to steal computer secrets and set up an industrial spy ring.

NORWAY

June 22, 1983: Lt. Col. V. F. Zagrebenev, assistant military attache at the Soviet Embassy in Oslo, was expelled for military espionage.●

H.R. 1242

HON. VIRGINIA SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on the day that H.R. 1242 was reported out of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee to Merchant Marine and Fisheries full committee, 19 agriculture organizations sent a letter to the Members of Congress opposing expansion of maritime cargo reservation (preference). I urge every Member of Congress on both sides of the aisle to take special note of the contents of this letter and to cosponsor my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 136 opposing further expansion of cargo preference.

The material follows:

JUNE 29, 1983.

Dear Representatives:

The undersigned agricultural organizations urge you to join a growing, bipartisan group of members of Congress in opposition to expanded maritime cargo reservation. We invite you to become an original cosponsor of the attached sense-of-the-Congress resolution, soon to be introduced by Representative Virginia Smith.

Expanded cargo preference on farm and fertilizer exports will increase consumer costs, eliminate jobs, depress producer income, and reduce foreign sales of U.S. agricultural commodities, value-added products and fertilizer.

Cargo reservation guarantees that a fixed percentage of U.S. cargoes must be shipped in U.S. commercial maritime vessels, which charge up to 300 percent above the world average. This additional transportation cost amounts to about 30 percent of the value of agricultural exports.

If passed along to our foreign customers, increased cargo preference costs will render American bulk farm exports uncompetitive. When added to U.S. import costs, foreign products, such as fertilizer, will become more expensive for consumers. The agricultural marketing chain will be forced to pass cargo reservation costs back to producers in the form of lost income.

When the U.S. Treasury is forced to underwrite cargo preference for government shipments, valuable tax revenues are lost. Last year, preference subsidies contributed at least $150 million to the widening federal deficit.

Lost farm trade also means lost jobs. Each $1 billion in agricultural exports employs 30,000 Americans. In fiscal year 1982, farm exports created $41 billion in additional business in the nonfarm community, business that would not have existed without those exports.

We urge you to support U.S. agriculture to prevent Congress from "taxing" American producers to pay for expanded maritime cargo preference programs. To become an original cosponsor of Representative Virginia Smith's resolution, please phone her office at 225-6435.

Sincerely,

Gary D. Myers, The Fertilizer Institute; Macon Edwards, National Cotton Council of America; Tim Clarke, Florida Phosphate Council; Elbert Harp, Grain Sorghum Producers Association; Roy Henwood, Millers' National Federation; George Watts, National Broiler Council; John Baize, American Soybean Association; Wayne Boutwell, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Alvin E. Oliver, National Grain & Feed Association; Robert E. Petersen, National Grain Trade Council; Carl Schwensen, National Association of Wheat Growers; Ed Anderson, National Grange; Michael Hall, National Corn Growers Association; Stephen Gabbert, Rice Millers' Association; Robert D. Fondahn, Protein Grain Products International; Joseph Halow, North American Export Grain Association; Sheldon Hauck, National Soybean Processors Association; Larry W. Kleingartner, National Sunflower Association; and Al Pope, United Egg Producers.

H. CON. RES. 136

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the United States balance of merchandise trade was a negative $31.8 billion dollars in 1982;

Whereas the United States share of world exports has declined from 15.4 percent in 1970 to 13 percent in 1982;

Whereas one out of every eight United States manufacturing jobs is for export production and 20 percent of our industrial production is exported;

Whereas agriculture is the nation's largest employer with approximately 1,300,000 export-related jobs;

Whereas the value of agricultural exports has dropped 18.9 percent since 1981 and United States agricultural market share has dropped precipitously for such commodities as course grains, wheat, cotton, soybean meal and oil, * * * poultry;

Whereas increased ocean shipping costs will negate numerous United States efforts to promote exports;

Whereas current world market conditions translate increased export prices into reduced income for domestic producers and lost United States sales abroad for such goods as agricultural products, coal, forest products, fertilizers, chemicals, ores and metals, and pulp and paper products;

Whereas increased import costs for such goods as petroleum and other bulk materials will increase energy costs and production costs for the agricultural, fertilizer, iron and steel, rubber, textile, chemical, non-ferrous refining, and paper industries;

Whereas trade barriers have proven harmful to United States industry, labor and consumers in the past;

Whereas world bulk shipping capacity is currently in excess and is expected to remain so for at least the next decade;

Whereas national defense interests will not be served by increased US-flag bulk capacity;

Whereas the Effective United States Controlled Fleet, which is controlled by United States companies and subject to requisition by the United States government, remains a strong and competitive force in the world's ocean shipping industry;

Whereas the U.S. Merchant Marine is uncompetitive in the world market with US-flag bulk shipping costs as much as 300 percent higher than the world average;

Whereas ocean shipping costs comprise a significant portion of import and export costs and these costs will be increased by expansion of cargo preference requirements; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that further expansion of cargo preference, whether for commercial or other trade, is not in the interest of the United States and should not be imposed.

JOHN BRADEMAS COMMENTS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I have earlier commented on President Reagan's ill-advised request for no funds for international education in fiscal year 1984 budget.

I have read that the Secretary of Defense has even expressed shock at such a devastating move, a move that would, if followed by Congress, seriously damage the Nation's ability to understand people and events in the rest of the world.

The time for action on the 1984 appropriation for education is fast approaching. I urge my colleagues to read carefully the excellent testimony of the author of the International Education Act, our former colleague and now president of New York University, Dr. John Brademas.

John Brademas speaks from two decades of experience on the House Education and Labor Committee and from his knowledge of the world generally and of the needs of the academic world. We are indebted to him for his comments on the crucial issue of international education funding.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN BRADEMAS, PRESIDENT, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, I address you today from the dual perspective of one who served as a Member of Congress for twenty-two years and is not a university president.

During my time in the House of Representatives, I served on the Committee on Education and Labor, where I took part in shaping most of the legislation enacted during the last two decades to strengthen education at all levels. Since July of 1981 I have been president of New York University, the largest private university in the nation.

I should like to direct my comments today to a subject that was my principal concern during my former career, continues to be in my new one and, moreover, is a subject that deserves far more attention than it has received—international education.

It must be obvious to us all that none of the challenges of our time is more urgent—or more difficult—than building a structure of relationships among the nations of the world that will prevent war and encourage peace.

I firmly believe that one of the ways to achieve this objective is through greater knowledge and understanding of other peoples and cultures of this planet.

My intention in this statement, therefore, is to present the strongest case possible for funding of international education in fiscal 1984 at a level of $35 million: $30 million for

the range of programs and activities supported by Title VI of the Higher Education Act; and $5 million, the current level of funding, for a small but critical component of the Fulbright-Hays program.

In making this request, I am joined by higher ecucation institutions and associations, including the following:

American Council on Education.

Association of American Universities.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Association of American Colleges.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Council of Independent Colleges.

Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities.

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities.

National Association of Schools and Colleges of the United Methodist Church.

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education.

Association of Urban Universities.

Additional, this testimony is being submitted with Princeton University, with whom NYU participates in a nationally recognized Center for Near Eastern Studies and with the endorsement of several sister New York Universities who share this concern, such as Columbia University.

As you know, Title VI of the HEA, currently funded at $21 million, constitutes the entire Federal effort in the sphere of international education. Through the 90 National Resource Centers located at institutions of higher learning throughout the United States, and through fellowship programs, research grants and outreach services, Title VI seeks "to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel for international study, international research and foreign language study."

Mr. Chairman, as a legislator I felt keenly the need to improve the capacity of our institutions of learning to produce the scholars and the research that could help us, as a nation, to better understand and communicate with other peoples of the world.

The justification for federal support of such efforts is straightforward and compelling: without a sure knowledge of other languages and cultures, the United States will not be able to compete effectively in the world marketplace, to ensure a strong defense posture, to conduct a rational and viable foreign policy.

Now, as the head of a major university, I have been impressed by the substantial progress our colleges and universities have made in developing and maintaining programs to meet the nation's needs for knowledge of foreign areas.

If I may refer to the university I know best, New York University has several strong language and area study programs. Prominent among them are the Hagop Kevorkian Center for Near Eastern Studies, the Institute of French Studies, Deutsches Haus, and the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies. New York University offers courses that focus on 34 foreign countries and sponsors 20 programs abroad. The NYU-Princeton Joint Center in Near Eastern Studies has been designated as a National Resource Center, one of twelve Middle Eastern Studies Centers in the country.

When I delivered my inaugural address as thirteenth president of New York University, I said that one of my principal objectives for our University would be to strengthen our programs in international studies and research.

I cite just two examples of new initiatives at New York University: We have just announced the creation next fall of a Center for Japanese Business and Economics at our Graduate School of Business Administration while this month we are starting an NYU Executive Management Training Program in Athens to provide business administration courses to senior level managers from Greek business and industry, both from private firms and public enterprises.

But, Mr. Chairman, New York University and other colleges and universities cannot be expected to assume this full burden of strengthening international studies and research for the Nation. Federal support is crucial to our efforts.

Let me outline for you the pressing need I see for an enhanced commitment to international education. I shall also demonstrate how the drastic cuts proposed by the Administration will severely impair our capacity to advance our knowledge of other nations of the world and thereby endanger our economic health and national security.

We live in a time when information, trade and people move with unprecedented speed across national borders. We can all prosper—indeed, survive—only if we have a deeper and broader knowledge of the countries and cultures of this planet. Americans need to advance their understanding of other peoples and countries and help them—in turn—better understand us.

The globe on which we live is, in the universal scheme of things, small and interdependent. As one commentator has noted ". . . what was until recently the American century has turned into the global century." Conflicts in the Middle East, civil war in Central America, unrest in Poland, a poor grain harvest in the Soviet Union, the invasion of Afghanistan—these are all events that reach far across international borders.

In such a world, how well are we preparing the Americans to understand other nations, other cultures, other peoples? And how well are we preparing other peoples to understand us?

In my view, we are not doing very well.

There is simply no question that the people of the United States, in whose lands, for better or for worse, lies much of the responsibility for building a peaceful and stable world, must do a far better job of learning about the rest of it.

Four years ago, let me recall, a 25-member Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, chaired by James Perkins, former President of Cornell University, reported to President Carter on what the Commission described as America's "scandalous incompetence" in foreign languages.

The Commission members declared themselves profoundly alarmed by the results of their inquiry. Here are two of their findings:

1. Over 40 percent of twelfth graders were unable to place Egypt correctly on a map while 20 percent were equally ignorant about the location of France or China.

2. Only 15 percent of American high school students studied a foreign language, down from 24 percent in 1965; and the decline continues.

The recent report from the National Commission on Excellence in Education said that in 1980 only eight states required that high schools offer foreign language courses and no state required that students take them.

The hostage crisis in Iran provided a dramatic illustration of our failure to understand another country and its culture. An analysis published in the New York Times noted that "for ten of the hostages' fourteen months in captivity, the United States negotiated with the wrong leaders in Iran, the secular, titular leaders rather than the religious leaders who held the real power."

Moreover, the United States is neglecting to educate other peoples about our values, purposes and policies.

Richard Gardner, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy, asserts that such neglect is the reason that "so many students, workers, and intellectuals in Europe, Japan and the developing countries are convinced that both the Soviet Union and the United States represent threats to their interests."

Misperceptions increasingly distort our relations with our European allies. Growing anti-American tendencies have been documented among Europe's young leaders, the so-called "successor generation," whose perceptions of America are shaped by Vietnam and Watergate rather than by Care packages and the Marshall plan.

How have such situations come about?

There is no single explanation for this costly and dangerous ignorance.

But whatever the reasons it seemed clear at one time that we as a nation were willing to extend our commitment to overcome that ignorance.

I was first elected to Congress in 1958, the year the National Defense Education Act became law, under the leadership of President Eisenhower and with support from both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. That, of course, was the year after the Soviets had launched Sputnik and shocked Americans into a reevaluation of the state of education in our country.

Our response to Sputnik was NDEA, a massive education effort to regain our international leadership in science and technology. Through Title VI of NDEA, we sought to strengthen our national expertise in foreign languages and area studies.

I am sorry to say that we have consistently failed to fund this Title adequately. In its first twenty-two years, the average annual authorization for Title VI was nearly $37 million but the average annual appropriation was less than one-third that amount. And despite an annual authorization of $75 million in the years from 1974 to 1980, the appropriation for Title VI programs never exceeded $17 million for any of those years.

Three years ago, when Title VI was expanded to embrace new activities and placed in the legislative vehicle of the Higher Education Act, the authorization for Title VI was cut by more than half. These cutbacks came at the same time that the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, after a year-long survey of international education needs across levels of learning, was calling for an immediate Federal expenditure of $178 million.

If you would allow me a personal reminiscence, I also recall that the International education needs across levels of learning, was calling for an immediate Federal expenditure of $178 million.

If you would allow me a personal reminisence, I also recall that the International Education Act of 1966 of which I was author and which called for grants to colleges and universities in the United States to support study and research about foreign people and cultures and important issues in interna-

tional affairs, was similarly ignored in the funding process.

Although President Lyndon Johnson signed this Act into law, Congress never voted one penny to turn our sound intentions into effective action.

Yet I believe that had these commitments to international education we sought been carried through fully, we might have been far better prepared to deal with problems we have suffered in Iran, Vietnam, Central America and elsewhere.

Now I have been speaking up to this point of what I perceive to be the problems of inadequate support for programs of international education. Most distressing of all is that the present Administration is embarked on a drive to eliminate entirely funds for international education and research.

The Administration's proposed budget for fiscal 1984 calls for "zero-funding" of all foreign language and international studies in Title VI of the Higher Education Act.

I do not believe that Mr. Reagan has considered fully the devastating consequences of this drastic proposal.

Let us look more closely at what the impact would be for international studies in our country.

The Reagan budget would eliminate Federal funds for the 90 National Resource Centers for Foreign Language and International studies, depriving the Centers of the critical margin of support needed to maintain their activities.

Approximately 80 percent of the training in less commonly taught languages—such as those of Africa, Asia, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe—is conducted through these Centers.

I do not think that anyone would dispute the success of Title VI in improving foreign language skills. The number of less common languages offered in American colleges and universities has increased from 37 in 1958 to 100 today. And despite declining enrollments in language programs overall, from 1968 to 1977 enrollments for less commonly taught languages increased by nearly 40 percent.

In the past five years, however, in the face of static funding, such enrollments have again started to spiral downward. It is especially distressing to witness the decline in the number of students learning the crucial languages of the Soviet Union, Africa, and Asia. A further cut in funds will only aggravate this bleak situation.

Federal funds have never supplied more than 10 to 15 percent of the actual operating costs of the language and area studies programs of the National Resource Centers. Yet this amount is crucial in enabling the Centers to attract other funds from institutional, state and private sources. Moreover, Federal support provides the margin of survival for critical center functions, such as the maintenance of costly library collections and support services.

The Administration's proposed cut-off of Title VI funds would also eliminate 700 graduate fellowships for intensive study of the languages and cultures of Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Because such study often requires long-term research and training in the country of specialization, it is particularly expensive. Students, therefore, genuinely need these fellowships. The loss of these fellowships could also mean the loss of the next generation of faculty to teach foreign languages and international studies on our nation's campuses.

Yet another result of the Administration's ill-conceived proposal would be the elimination of support of programs to strengthen international studies at our colleges and universities through curriculum revision and faculty development. Currently, under Title VI, 35 institutions are receiving 2-year grants to improve the teaching of international studies. The Reagan budget would end such support. If you consider that the average college student takes just one course with international content and that only 5 percent of prospective teachers do so, the need for these programs becomes painfully obvious.

The Reagan requests would also cut Federal funds for university outreach and extension programs to upgrade precollege international studies, and would slash grants to send school administrators and teachers abroad to help them develop new curricula.

Finally, the Reagan budget would end Federal funds for programs to improve the international understanding and expertise of our country's businessmen and women.

A survey by D. Richard Lambert, Director of the Southeast Asian National Resource Center at the University of Pennsylvania, provides graphic and specific evidence of what such budget cuts would mean for our colleges and universities.

If Mr. Reagan has his way:

At the University of Illinois, the professional library staff that administers one of the country's few Soviet Reference Services will be disbanded. The facility and its staff are an invaluable resource for business, government and other sectors, annually training some 280 librarians from across the country in biblographic work on the Soviet Union and serving as a clearing house of all information—economic, military, political—on the U.S.S.R.

Indiana University would be forced to discontinue training in the Sino-Soviet, Soviet-Afghan and Soviet-Iranian border languages, a program so important that intelligence agencies hire students away before they complete their program.

At the University of Texas the work of a publisher which for years has provided the most reliable information available on Latin America will be severely impaired. If one considers our problems in El Salvador, Nicaragua and elsewhere, the need for this service is apparent.

At the University of Pittsburgh courses on international security analysis and public policy would disappear while at Georgetown University, one of the country's few training centers for translators and interpreters, activities would be severely hampered.

Let me observe here that the value of the services and programs I have cited are not restricted to the higher education community. Title VI supports a range of activities to aid elementary and secondary schools, businesses, government and the media.

For example, the Princeton-NYU Center on Near Eastern Studies, one of the 90 National Resource Centers supported by Title VI, not only offers a formal academic degree program but sponsors informal lectures, films, and exhibitions and provides information and service to businesspeople, journalists, government officials, and the wider public.

Because of the dramatic events of the last few years in the Middle East—the taking of American hostages in Iran, the Iraq-Iran war, the resurgence of Islamic fundamentalism, the crisis in Lebanon—the Princeton-NYU Center has received and responded to an unprecedented number of inquiries and requests for information from our faculty, from business and government groups.

It is ironic that Mr. Reagan is urging steep cuts at a time of increasing evidence of the need for more rather than less international education and exchange.

The National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies issued a report last year—"National Manpower Targets for Advanced Research on Foreign Areas"—that in a careful and comprehensive way documented our need for more well-educated specialists concerned with foreign languages and areas.

The Task Force which prepared this document said, "As measured by any reasonable standard of what we need to know about the rest of the world, we (the United States) are faltering badly."

The Task Force warned that "the vulnerability we invite by neglecting fundamental and applied knowledge and research about foreign areas threatens our security and our commercial, diplomatic and cultural interests. Though less visible, it is no less serious than the vulnerability we would face through neglect of our military preparedness."

Another recent report from the International Research and Exchanges Board noted that the Soviet Union probably has three times as many academic specialists working on American foreign policy as we have working on Soviet foreign policy.

It is dismaying to learn that the Soviets annually offer Latin Americans nearly 5,000 fellowships, 10 times the number the United States makes available to Latin America. In 1980-81 for example, the Soviet bloc countries provided 105 fellowships to students from El Salvador, compared to 18 offered by the United States.

Now everyone knows that a cornerstone of President Reagan's programs is voluntarism. I for one would be delighted if the corporate sector and private foundations were able to fill the void left by the elimination of Title VI funding. But you and I know that this is impossible.

A wholly unprecedented and impossible level of corporate and foundation support would be necessary even to approach replacing all Federal dollars cut by Mr. Reagan—cuts for education, the arts, social welfare and other programs.

Let me make yet a different point.

I do not believe that it is even appropriate public policy for our national government to abdicate its responsibility to help strengthen international studies and research. This is now an established national purpose that is far too vital to our economic strength and defense posture to be left to private philanthropy.

I remind you that the National Commission on excellence in Education in its recent report said, "The Federal government has the primary responsibility to identify the national interest in education."

I would further observe that I and my colleagues in the higher education community are not alone in our concern about the adverse impact of a cutback in funding for international education and foreign language studies.

Only two months ago, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger wrote to Secretary of Education Bell urging restoration of Title VI funding to at least its current level. In that letter (attached to this statement), Mr. Weinberger reminds Mr. Bell that our Armed Services Committees were so concerned about the erosion of our national ex-

pertise in foreign language and international studies that they mandated a Defense Department study to assess the need for "a national research resource base" to promote the study of foreign languages and nations. Mr. Weinberger further notes that the defense and academic leaders conducting this study agree with him about the seriousness of cutting Title VI.

"Consequently, I would urge you to consider restoring, and if possible, increasing the funds for International Education and Foreign Language Studies," concludes the Secretary of Defense.

Let me then close my remarks by saying simply that it must be evident that so perilous is our common life on this precious earth that we must, all of us, commit every fiber of our minds and spirits to the quest for a stable peace and a world of freedom and justice.

To be able effectively to pursue this most important of objectives, however, we must know and understand one another, at least know more and understand more than we do today.

I believe that this is a special responsibility of our colleges and universities—even as it is of our elected leaders.

I urge you to appropriate $35 million for Title VI programs for fiscal 1984.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, March 11, 1983.

Hon. T. H. BELL,
Secretary of Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TED: I recently learned that the proposed 1984 budget for "International Education and Foreign Language Studies," (Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1980 as amended and Sec. 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act), has been reduced from its 1983 level of $26 million to zero.

I am seriously concerned about the zero-funding of this program, and would urge you to consider restoring these funds at least to the 1983 level. My concern is shared by other officials within the Department of Defense, and members of the academic community on whom we depend for both a solid research base in area studies, as well as for production of foreign language specialists.

The erosion of our national expertise in foreign languages and area studies is also of concern to House and Senate Armed Services Committees. The Conference Report accompanying the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1983 requires Defense to undertake an assessment of the need for "a national research resource base which promotes the study and understanding of foreign languages and nations, in particular, the Soviet Union. . . ."

We are now in the process of conducting this study as required by the conferees, and expect to have a report of our findings and recommendations available within a year. We will be happy to keep you or your staff informed of our progress. Working with us on this project is a group of distinguished leaders in this area, drawn equally from the defense and adademic communities. It was the consensus of this group that the elimination of funds for International Education and Foreign Language Studies will seriously impair the nation's ability to maintain even a modest program in this area. I understand that this cut eliminates funding for the nation's 90 Foreign Language and Area Studies Resource Centers, 14 of which focus on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; 700 fellowships for students to pursue advanced degrees; the nation's entire research program devoted to developing teaching materials for 170 different foreign languages; and funding for four Fulbright-Hays programs that in the past have annually supported more than 1000 scholars, teachers and prospective teachers in foreign languages and area studies.

Consequently, I would urge you to consider restoring, and if possible, increasing the funds for International Education and Foreign Language Studies.

Sincerely,

CASPAR WEINBERGER.[1]

FRUITS OF THE REVOLUTION: ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN TODAY'S NICARAGUA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a press release from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith regarding persecution of the Jewish community in Nicaragua. In addition, my friends in the House will also find a recent communique concerning the Catholic Church in Nicaragua equally interesting. I have provided the text of the statement concerning the church in Nicaragua.

It is truly unfortunate that the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua has chosen to force the small Nicaraguan community of Jews into exile. The Sandinistas have confiscated Jewish-owned property, and have taken over the only synagogue in Managua. I am certain that all of us will agree that this uncalled for action is inexcusable and represents blatant anti-Semitism.

The forced exodus of the Nicaraguan Jewish community, numbering about 50, took place after the Somoza regime was overthrown. Their ouster was reportedly effected by subtle and direct threats or by forcible measures. After the 1979 Sandinista victory, the president of the Nicaraguan Jewish community, a 70-year-old man, was jailed. He was falsely accused of stealing land and was forced to sweep streets during his confinement. Six months later, the Sandinistas summarily ousted him from his factory and took it over. A Jewish engineer who was traveling outside of Nicaragua when the Sandinistas took control, was told by the Government that he should not return to his country "for his own safety because he and his brother-in-law were considered enemies of the revolution."

In addition, the Sandinistas converted the synagogue in Managua into a childrens' social club, covering exterior Stars of David with propaganda posters and adorning the inside walls with anti-Zionist propaganda.

Even though there is no longer a Jewish community in Managua, a Nicaraguan newspaper, which often reflects Government policy, published articles which were filled with anti-Semitic statements. The Sandinista Government was unresponsive to the B'nai B'rith's Anti-Defamation League's appeals to end these human rights violations. Why has that troubled government turned on a small helpless ethnic group?

Perhaps Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Miquel d'Escoto Brockman's problems with the Jews in Managua stem from his perception of Israel and its so-called role in Central America. The Foreign Minister recently said:

> There is without a doubt a real danger in Latin America, and particularly in Central America, actually stemming from Zionist infiltration and intrusion.

Although I am shocked at what the Sandinista Government has done to the small Jewish community in Nicaragua, I really should not be surprised. The blatant anti-Semitism of the Soviet Union and the Cuban Government has been exported to its friends and allies across the sea in Central America. It would appear to me that the salesmen of communism should change their sales pitch. They should say that a true Communist revolution brings opportunities and benefits to everyone except the Jewish community.

In addition to expelling the Jews from Nicaragua, the Sandinistas have launched an all out attack on the Catholic Church in that almost completely Catholic land. After gratuitously insulting the Pope during his recent visit to Managua, and cat calling while His Holiness was saying mass, the regime is now trying to eliminate Catholicism from that country. Just recently, a high Sandinista official told the head of the Vatican delegation that Nicaraguan Archbishop Obando y Bravo was "an enemy of the revolution." Others in the Government have described him as a "counterrevolutionary."

I believe that the regime is striking out at the church and at the Jews because that revolution has failed. To draw attention away from its own failings and broken promises, the Sandinistas are attacking so-called external and internal enemies. Let us think about the unfulfilled promises of that revolution. Where is the pluralistic government and the free elections that were promised? Where are the real and effective social and economic reforms that the poor masses were guaranteed? Why are the stores in downtown Managua bare and basic consumer items hard to find? Where are the moderates in the present Government? All forced out of the regime? Why have so many active supporters of the revolution left that Government to take up arms against it? Where is the mixed economy that the

original revolution promised? Why did they court the West in the early days of the revolution to the tune of $1.6 billion in economic aid from Western nations, to include $124 million in assistance from the United States, and then run to the Cubans and the Soviets?

The Sandinistas have radicalized the revolution and are trying to convince all Nicaraguans that communism is the answer and the ultimate panacea which will cure the nation's ills. The so-called representative government in Managua is feeding communism to the poor and unsuspecting peasants in that country, and the peasants and others are now beginning to realize that they have been sold a bill of goods. Let the buyer beware. In spite of the Sandinistas' efforts to convince the masses in their country that the United States, the "Contras," the Catholic Church, and Nicaraguan Jews are the real enemies of the revolution, the basic facts show that the revolution has failed and that no amount of crying wolf about external and internal enemies will save that shabby effort.

With these thoughts in mind, let me recommend the following Nicaraguan bishops' statement, which refers to the Sandinistas' efforts to disrupt the Pope's visit, to all of my friends in the House.

We, the Bishops of the Episcopal Conference of Nicaragua, together with the priests, religious members and laymen, with faith in Christ and His church, wish to express our feelings concerning the Pope's pastoral visit to our country.

First, once again, we are thankful to the Lord for the invaluable grace of having among us the vicar of Christ, who with paternal kindness wanted us to share the richness of his enlightening word, full of faith, hope and love, in order to give us courage and strengthen our faith in God and His church.

It is therefore, a great consolation to know that the Pope's word has been received with gratitude, veneration and hope by the Nicaraguan Catholics, and undoubtedly will produce fruits in our Catholic people, who distinguish themselves by their generosity and love toward the church.

In contrast to these wonderful and growing attitudes, we have to regret and strongly disapprove the unparalleled lack of respect shown against the eucharist sacrament and the vicar of Christ himself, not by the Catholic people—who were the vast majority—but by a minority who acted with the idea of turning a solely religious and church act, as is the sacrifice of the mass, into a political party act on the afternoon of the fourth of March in Managua.

We are also glad to verify that the attitude of the Catholic people—who were the majority—and its priests, who spontaneously and quickly responded by expressing their discontent through acts of penance and vindication, and we wish that this attitude, proof of the great faith of our Catholic people, be a stimulus to consolidate and confirm their traditional devotion to the eucharist sacrament and their strong and absolute support of the Pope, pastor of the world's people.

We call upon all the faithful Catholics of our diocese, so that they remain intimately united with the Pope, to offer through sacrifices, prayers and the study of his messages, a true expression of the Gospel, the true bread of the word of God, to give them life.

May the Virgin Mary's meditation help us, the Nicaraguans to be always constant in our vocation of unity and fidelity to the true church.

Issued in the city of Managua, on the twenty fifth day of the month of March, nineteen hundred and eighty-three. Feast of the ascension of the Lord.●

JESUS WAS A COMMUNIST: MARYKNOLLS ARE AT IT AGAIN

HON. LARRY P. McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Patrick J. Buchanan recently wrote a very interesting column on a book being touted by the Maryknoll Order of the Catholic Church by one, Jose Miranda. This column appeared in Human Events of July 2, 1983. The book, according to Buchanan, describes how we all have misunderstood Christ's teaching all these years. He really preached revolution on Earth. Mr. Buchanan describes how this book appears to fit the predilection of the Maryknoll Order revolution and revolutionaries. I commend the item to the attention of my colleagues, who I feel should weigh Maryknoll testimony on Capitol Hill accordingly.

MARYKNOLLS ARE AT IT AGAIN

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

Upon some religious teachings, it has seemed heretofore all Catholics were in concurrence: That Jesus Christ, the son of God, was sent by the Father to redeem mankind through his agony, suffering and death. That he came not to establish a temporal kingdom, but to lead men to the Kingdom of Heaven.

Well, apparently, we had it all fouled up. So claims a new "Biblical manifesto" lately published by Maryknoll, the foreign missionary service of the American Catholic Church. Jesus, you see, "had the character of a hardened revolutionary," he engaged in "revolutionary political activity," he "was executed for political sedition." "Without a doubt, Jesus had placed himself at the head of a burly group of his followers in an action which can only be characterized as an assault on the temple."

The title of this manifesto from which the above is a representative sampling is "Communism in the Bible." Its author, Jose Miranda. Its message: Jesus of Nazareth was the first Sandinista, an avowed Communist whose revolution collapsed because it was a "Communist island in an economic sea characterized by exploitation" of the poor. "For any Christian to claim to be anti-Communist," writes Jose, "without a doubt constitutes the great scandal of our century."

What of the Polish pope, his Holiness John Paul II? Well, in opposing communism, the "pope and the other powerful ones are not fighting atheism, but us who are Christians, who believe in God and Jesus, and who only want to see the Gospel become reality."

And that often quoted passage in which Jesus tells the disciples, "My Kingdom is not of this world"? Well, we must understand, Jose explains, this is a Biblical mistranslation, hoked-up by "escapist theologists" who wish us to focus on some future paradise.

"Jesus never said his kingdom is not of this world. It is so simple that it is unthinkable that this text can have been appealed to in good faith for centuries in order to place the kingdom in another world when the exact opposite is explicitly taught in all the other texts of Old and New Testaments. Including the Lord's Prayer. . . ."

"To speak of a kingdom of God in the other world is not only to found new religion without any relationship with the teaching of Christ. . . . It is to assert exactly the contrary of what Christ teaches. . . . The fact that tradition has taught for centuries that the Kingdom is in the other world only demonstrates that the tradition betrayed Jesus and founded another religion completely different."

"For Jesus, whether Conservatives like it or not, was in fact a Communist. . . . Judas 'carried the purse,' so they had everything in common, and each received according to his need."

While I had never thought of Judas as a bag man for Judean Bolsheviks, let us not impede this pilgrim's progress. Jesus enjoined us to feed the hungry, did he not. Jose asks. "How are we going to get food to all who are hungry, if we leave the means of production in private hands, which necessarily destines these means to the augmentation of capital, not to the satisfaction of the needs of the population?"

Who are the enemies of true Christianity? The answer is repeated and repeated: the rich, who are indistinguishable from the "unjust." Where many of us were taught that evil resides in the human heart, Miranda patiently instructs, in his chapter, "The Problem of Evil: A Social Problem," that "this so-called problem of evil has served exegesis as a pretext for distracting itself from the true message of the Bible, which is a tightly packed condemnation of wealth."

Indeed, the Bible fairly commands us to become active revolutionaries: "To the extent that one does not participate in the revolutionary struggle, one participates in the benefits of a society which lives essentially by exploiting and oppressing the poor. Merely abstaining from the struggle continues aiding and abetting criminal acts, and therefore, constitutes complicity."

But, surely, Jesus of Nazareth, the Prince of Peace, did not preach violent revolution. Wrong, again. Violence "is not only permitted, it is commanded, by the one true God." "Jesus explicitly approves and defends the use of violence. It is dogmatic theology, not Jesus, which has decreed that the characteristic of Christianity is non-violent, nonvindictive justice."

"It is criminal to defend repression by the procedure of quoting to the oppressed the verse about 'turning the other cheek.' Supporters of official theology will have to be punished for discouraging the struggle against injustice with this verse."

One gets the impression that Jose, who preaches violent revolution from an academic armchair in Mexico City, is unlikely to do much of the punishing, or revolutionizing for that matter, other than with the foolscap in his typewriter.

But Jose's doctrine that Fidel is following in the footsteps of Jesus is not the issue here. What is the Maryknoll Order of the Catholic Church doing funding publication of a book that preaches class hatred, exalts violence, denigrates transcendence, contradicts church dogma concerning the nature of Christ, mocks church tradition, and insults the pope?

Why do the American bishops continue to permit the Castroite fathers of the Maryknoll Order to spread their heretical horse manure right where the flock is supposed to graze? Why have the publishers of Orbis Books, Maryknoll House, not been sent packing with Sister Mansour? ●

AIRCRAFT FIRE DANGERS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, since the Air Canada fire earlier this month, Americans have been more aware of the dangers of fire on aircraft carriers. Recently, the Federal Aviation Administration indicated that they will be issuing new regulations requiring a protective coating on airplane seats to make them more fire-retardant. I commend the FAA actions, but there is still more that can be done by individuals and legislators. I recommend to my colleagues an article in the Christian Science Monitor by Mr. William N. Plymat. His correlation between drinking, smoking, and fires is especially noteworthy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 22, 1983]

HOW TO REDUCE FIRE DANGERS ON PLANES

(By William N. Plymat)

Investigators may finally conclude that an electrical short and not a carelessly discared cigarette caused the fire in the Air Canada jet earlier this month. But still there is a severe fire danger to the public from the combination of smoking and drinking on planes.

In the past few months a number of new bars have been constructed on concourses at the Chicago airport and I have observed many persons drinking before boarding planes. It may be true elsewhere. I've seen such a new bar in the Des Moines airport.

Thus in many cases a drink or two is obtained before boarding. Then on the plane first-class passengers get offered free drinks. Rep. Charles E. Bennett, Democrat of Florida, has a bill in Congress to ban free drinks and cigarettes from airplanes (HR 54). Some years ago there was a limit of "two drinks." Now attendants may refuse drinks only to person who appear intoxicated.

By the time lunch or dinner is served many passengers have had four or five drinks within an hour. In the air at 35,000 feet cabins are pressurized to an altitude of 6,000 to 8,000 feet and oxygen is limited so it takes longer to metabolize drinks. Some say that one drink at such altitude is equal to two on the ground at 1,000-foot altitude.

A passenger may have drinks before lunch or dinner and then have a cigarette. The passenger then goes to the restroom on the plane and remembers that a flight attendant reminded passengers at the start of the flight that smoking is not permitted in the toilet for safety reasons. And so an alcohol-impaired passenger looks for a place to drop his cigarette. And in such a case is very apt to be careless and drop it in the bin for waste paper towels.

This danger is further increased by the fact that cigarettes contain chemicals put there to keep them burning until usually they burn out in an ash tray after about 20 minutes. A bill to stop manufacturers from doing this is in Congress but appears to be locked up in a committee. Many wonder if campaign contributions to committee members from the tobacco industry have had an influence. In the New York Assembly recently such a bill passed by a vote of 123 to 13, in spite of extensive lobbying by tobacco interests, and it is hoped it will pass in their Senate.

What should be done?

The government or carriers could ban smoking and/or drinking on planes, and airports could close down their new bars. One Texas airline bans all smoking on its planes and seems to be doing well. Carriers could cut out the free drinks in first class and in several ways reduce the overall consumption on the planes.

A special reason for cutting out drinking on planes is the danger that exists in the case of crash landings. In such cases everyone is supposed to be off the plane in 90 seconds under Federal Aviation Administration rules. In the case of a packed plane there is real danger that an impaired passenger may move slowly or stumble and block aisles.

Automatic fire extinguishers and smoke detectors can be placed in all toilets on planes. And new inflammable materials can be used inside planes. Passengers can reduce their own personal risk too. They can start their flights on planes taking off early in the morning, enabling them in most cases to reach their destinations before the noon lunch period when drinking usually starts. Passengers can also advise one airline flying from St. Louis to Washington to drop its wine-tasting parties in flight. The airline serves three small glasses of different wines with refills offered to each passenger. And after that, they can buy drinks.

The public can also advise one carrier that brags about its new flying cocktail lounges on its large planes that it does not approve of this feature. And in some cases it can elect to travel on Amtrak.

(William N. Plymat, chairman emeritus of Preferred Risk Insurance Company, is a member of the U.S. Commission on Drunk Driving.)●

RODINO INTRODUCES BILL TO HELP INNOCENT VICTIMS OF CRIME

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducting today, along with my colleague from California, HOWARD BERMAN, legislation that will authorize the Federal Government to assist State and local efforts to aid the innocent victims of crime.

For many years public concern about crime translated primarily into efforts directed at criminals—apprehending them, prosecuting them, and punishing them. While there was sympathy and concern for the victims of crime, for a long time little of a tangible nature was done to improve the lot of crime victims. Indeed, it has been pointed out that the criminal justice system actually victimized them again.

This bleak picture began to improve in recent years. Some 38 States established crime victim compensation programs to reimburse victims for out-of-pocket expenses incurred as the result of a physical injury caused by crime. In addition, in many places throughout the country, crime victim assistance programs have been established to provide victims with services designed to offer emotional support and to insure that victims are treated humanely. Some assistance programs focus on particular categories of crime victims—as is the case with rape crisis centers and domestic violence shelters—and some of them deal with crime victims generally as is the case with victim/witness assistance units in prosecutors' offices.

Last year the President appointed a Task Force on Victims of Crime to recommend steps that could be taken to insure better treatment for crime victims. That task force released its final report late last year, and I am happy to note that it recommended enactment of Federal legislation along the lines of the legislation that I am introducing today. The legislation will provide Federal aid for crime victim compensation and crime victim assistance programs and will do so with revenues from a crime victims fund that is largely raised from criminal wrongdoers—through criminal fines, forfeitures, and penalty assessment. In addition, as suggested by the President's task force, the excise tax on handgun transfers will go into the fund.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation will enable the Federal Government to aid programs that provide the innocent victims of crime with badly needed services and assistance. I urge my colleagues to support it.

A section-by-section analysis of the Victims of Crime Act of 1983 follows:

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT OF 1983

TITLE I—CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATION

Title I of the legislation authorizes federal assistance for crime victim compensation. Section 101 authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to eligible state crime victim compensation programs. The grant is for up to 50 percent of the "covered costs" (defined in section 103) of compensating the victims of state crimes, and for 100 percent of the "covered costs" of compensating the victims of crime that occur within the state that are subject to exclusive federal jurisdiction.

Section 102 sets forth the 6 criteria that a state crime victim compensation program must meet in order to be eligible for federal assistance:

First, the program must offer compensation for medical expenses and loss of wages attributable to a physical injury resulting from a "compensable crime" (which is defined in section 103 of the bill), and for funeral expenses attributable to a death resulting from a "compensable crime".

Second, the program must promote crime victim cooperation with the reasonable requests of law enforcement authorities.

Third, the program must be able to reduce an award to a victim to the extent of the victim's contributory misconduct.

Fourth, the state must be subrogated, to the extent of any award made to a victim, to any claim that the victim has against the person who committed the crime that gave rise to the award.

Fifth, the program must not, in the making of awards, discriminate against persons who are not residents of the state.

Sixth, the program must compensate victims of exclusively federal crimes occurring within the state to the same extent that it compensates victims of state crimes.

Section 103 of the legislation defines 3 terms used in title I. Section 103(1) defines "covered costs" to mean amounts awarded to crime victims as compensation, but it does not include any amount that is awarded for pain and suffering or property lose or that is double recovery for loss. Section 103(2) defines the term "state" to include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of United States. Section 103(3) defines "compensable crime" to mean any crime that the state designates as covered by that State's crime victim compensation program.

TITLE II—CRIME VICTIM ASSISTANCE

Title II of the legislation authorizes federal assistance for crime victim assistance programs.

Section 201(a) authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to the chief executive of each state for the purpose of financially supporting qualified crime victim assistance programs. The chief executive, in carrying out section 201(a), is directed to promote the goal of providing the greatest possible number of crime victims and their families with the services described in section 202(2). Section 201(b) sets forth how grants under section 201(a) are to be allocated. Each state will receive a pro rata share of the first $7,200,000 available for victim assistance grants. The remaining money available will be distributed on the basis of state population.

Section 202 sets forth the 5 criteria that a crime victim assistance program must meet in order to qualify for financial support.

First, the victim assistance program must be established exclusively to provide services directly to crime victims generally or to any specific category of crime victims generally or to any specific category of crime victims and must be a nonprofit private organization, a program of a state or local government, or a combination of such organizations or governments or both.

Second, the program must provide crisis intervention services on a 24 hour a day basis without regard to the financial status of the victim, mental health counseling, and information about and referrals for (1) medical and mental health treatment, (2) victim assistance and compensation, and (3) the investigation and prosecution of crime.

Third, the program must promote coordinated community efforts to aid crime victims and their families.

Fourth, the program must utilize volunteers in performing services for which grants can be made under Title II.

Fifth, the program must demonstrate independent support by receiving financial support from sources other than grants under Title II.

Section 203 defines 2 terms used in Title II. Section 203(1) defines "state" to include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any other territory or possession of the United States. Section 203(2) defines "crisis intervention services" to mean counseling to provide emotional support to crime victims in crises arising from the occurrence of crime.

TITLE III—CRIME VICTIMS FUND

Title III of the legislation sets up a crime victim fund for use in making grants under Titles I and II.

Section 301(a) establishes in the Treasury of the United States a Crime Victims Fund. Section 301(b) provides that this Fund consist of: (1) all fines collected in federal criminal cases; (2) the proceeds of all forfeitures in federal criminal cases; (3) the taxes imposed on pistols and revolvers under section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code that are received in the Treasury; and (4) penalty assessments under section 3013 of title 18, United States Code, that are collected from defendants convicted of federal offenses.

Section 302(a) provides that grants under Titles I and II of the legislation can be made only from the Fund. Section 302(b) divides the revenue in the Funds between grants for victim compensation and grants for victim assistance. For any fiscal year, not more than 80 percent of the Fund may be expended for victim compensation. The remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the Fund that remains after grants for victim's compensation are made, are to be used for grants for victim assistance.

Section 303 ensures that states are treated equally in receiving victim compensation grants. It provides that each state shall receive the same percentage of its covered costs for compensating state crime victims.

TITLE IV—CHANGES IN CRIMINAL FINE LEVELS AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 401 amends chapter 229 of title 18, United States Code, to increase the maximum fines that can be imposed upon defendants convicted of federal crimes. The maximum fine levels will be the greater of the amount set forth in the provision defining the offense or the following:

(1) if the offense is a felony or a misdemeanor resulting in the loss of life, $250,000 if the defendant is an individual and $1,000,000 if the defendant is an organization;

(2) if the offense is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment of up to one year, $100,000 if the defendant is an individual and $250,000 if the defendant is an organization;

(3) if the offense is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment of up to 6 months, $50,000 if the defendant is an individual and $150,000 if the defendant is an organization;

(4) if the offense is a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment of up to 30 days, $25,000 if the defendant is an individual and $75,000 if the defendant is an organization; and

(5) in any other case, $15,000 if the defendant is an individual and $50,000 if the defendant is an organization.

In addition, if the offense resulted in pecuniary gain to the defendant or death or serious bodily injury or loss, damage or destruction of property, the court may fine the defendant up to twice the gain derived or loss caused, if that amount is greater than the above. Finally, the court is directed, when determining whether to impose a fine (or the amount of a fine), to consider several factors, including the defendant's ability to pay, the pecuniary loss caused by the offense, and the need to deprive the defendant of illegally obtained gains.

Section 402 of the bill requires federal courts to impose a penalty assessment on all persons convicted of federal offenses. The assessment is $50 in the case of a felony and $25 in the case of a misdemeanor, and it is to be collected in the same manner in which criminal fines are collected.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATES

Title V of the legislation provides that the Act takes effect on October 1, 1983 and that grants under the Act may be made with respect to the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984 and succeeding fiscal years.●

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I learned long ago that no matter how much we talk or how many pages of the RECORD we fill with sage comments, we are not the experts. We might like to think so, but we are not. The real experts are the people back home who have to live with the laws we dish out by the carload. They know our laws from daily experience. They know our regulations on a firsthand basis. When we do a good job, it is their success—and when we make a mistake, it is their misfortune.

This year again I asked the experts, the people of the Fourth District of Kentucky, to share their opinions with their Congressman through a questionnaire. Once again the response of the level-headed people of the Fourth District evidences that they care and are concerned about the direction of their Government. Thirteen thousand of them filled out and returned the questionnaires and many of them added their own personal comments and suggestions on a wide range of topics. Their thoughtful remarks have reconfirmed my belief that we would have more answers, fewer problems, and be in much better shape if more of us took the time to listen to the people we represent.

Since the questionnaire dealt with issues which are national in scope, my colleagues should find the results interesting. It is even quite likely that the opinions of the people in Kentucky's Fourth District might reflect the views of a good many of their own constituents.

The tabulations are self-explanatory but one point, in particular, caught my attention. That is, that in the Fourth District of Kentucky, there does not seem to be any overwhelming mandate for massive cuts in defense spending or for tampering with the tax cuts enacted in 1981. However, there is convincing support for cuts in food stamps, SSI, AFDC, et cetera, and even more overwhelming support for cuts in foreign aid.

Listening to the budget debate here on the floor over the past few weeks and months one could get the distinct impression that a good many of my colleagues have missed this message. Defense alone has been singled out for budget reductions. Foreign aid has been treated with kid gloves and the welfare budget has been padded with billions of extra dollars over and above the amounts requested by the President.

The results of this questionnaire indicate that my constituents do not accept the theme that has been bandied about ad nauseam here in the House that suggests that welfare programs have already been slashed to the bone and can stand no more cuts. These results indicate that my constituents do not accept the idea that foreign aid is some untouchable spending progarm that should be exempt from restraint. I suspect that if my colleagues checked, they would find that their constituents, by and large, agree with the people of the Fourth District.

Questionnaire results follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

[Figures in percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. To reduce the deficit, should Congress postpone tax cuts scheduled in existing law?	47.4	51.2	1.4
2. Congress is in the process of approving a $4 or $5 billion jobs bill. Should Congress follow up on this with another, larger jobs program?	25.6	73.2	1.2
3. Should Congress again propose the equal rights amendment to the Constitution and start the ratification process all over?	20.3	78.2	1.5
4. Do you approve of the way President Reagan has handled his job?	61.0	33.1	5.9

When Congress works on a budget, the budget is broken down into "functional areas." The following list outlines the amount of money President Reagan proposes to spend in 7 of the largest functional areas in fiscal year 1984. Together, these 7 functional areas (plus the interest on the national debt) account for 95 percent of all Federal spending. Indicate with an "S" if you would spend the same or more; or an "L" if you would spend less than the President has proposed.

[Figures in percent]

	More/Same	Less	Undecided
5. Income security: $282.4 billion:			
a. Social security and civil service retirement—$207.8 billion	73.9	24.8	1.3
b. Food stamps, SSI, AFDC, unemployment compensation, and housing assistance—$74.6 billion	32.9	65.4	1.7
6. National defense: $245.3 billion	55.7	42.8	1.5
7. Health: $90.6 billion	65.7	31.7	2.6
8. Veterans' benefits: $25.7 billion	73.2	24.4	2.4
9. Education and training: $25.3 billion	66.2	32.4	1.4
10. Transportation: $25.1 billion: Highways, airport development, etc. (much of the jobs bill mentioned in question 2 falls in this area)	60.1	38.5	1.4
11. International affairs: $13.2 billion: Category includes foreign aid, international financial organizations, etc	13.4	84.6	2.0

DEMOCRACY AND TOTALITARIAN COMMUNISM

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday and Saturday, July 1-2, 1983, the Captive Nations Vigil Committee, a project of The National Center for Public Policy Research, has scheduled a commemoration of those people who have lost their freedom to Communist totalitarianism.

The first major activity to be celebrated on the Washington Mall is a 24-hour "Chronology of Betrayal" beginning at noon which will provide the history of those nations which have fallen to communism. Then at 1 o'clock on Saturday, the Committee will sponsor a "Commemoration Ceremony," at which time, captive national ethnic groups will be able to relate their own experiences in the loss of freedom.

I commend this effort in the days before our own Nation's celebration of Independence, and wish to submit my letter to the Captive Nations Vigil Committee in testimony to the importance of these activities:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1983.

MS. AMY MORITZ,
Director, Captive Nations Vigil Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. MORITZ: Allow me to commend your efforts, and those of your colleagues at The National Center for Public Policy Research, for your commitment to freedom and the commemoration of the victims of communism since 1917. I refer, of course, to the Captive Nations Vigil Committee's planned activities on the Washington Mall over the July 1-2 period, which will underscore America's moral obligation to support the efforts of free peoples resisting communist tyranny.

As we approach our own day of national celebration over the independence which we enjoy, it is fitting to recognize the plight of the people who have found themselves on the vanguard of communist oppression. Thomas Jefferson, who understood better then most the concepts of freedom upon which our nation was conceived, stated, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Fortunately, when America first called for help, the French, the Dutch and others were there to respond.

Not long ago, the United States Capitol was filled with shocking photographs depicting the mass murders carried out by the communist government in Cambodia during the last five years of the 1970s following the American troop withdrawal from Southeast Asia. These murders took place without regard for any legal or judicial process. The victims were often abducted and tortured before they were killed. While, perhaps, the worst example of communist atrocity since the Stalinist purges of the 1930s, it, nevertheless, graphically illustrates the real promise of communist "freedom fighters" elsewhere in the world.

Against the background of Cambodia, Ethiopia, South Yemen, Angola, Afghanistan, the Sudan, and earlier the countries of Southeast Asia and Eastern Europe, we will hear ample testimony from the victims of these countries. But we must remember that the tide has not yet turned. What is today happening in Central America is but the latest chapter in this ongoing saga. The Free World looks to America for hope. It is through our recognition of the experiences of these victims that we will meet this challenge, and uphold the cherished ideals and love of freedom of our forefathers.

For this reason, I offer my wholehearted endorsement of your activities on the Washington Mall, and encourage others to do likewise.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

BOB MCEWEN,
Member of Congress.●

JAMES C. MILLER'S COMMONSENSE FTC LEADERSHIP

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Business Week contained a profile of the new leadership at the Federal Trade Commission. Under the leadership of James C. Miller III, the FTC has taken a more responsible approach to its consumer protection and procompetition missions. By substituting sound, thorough economic analysis for social theory as Commission decisionmaking criteria, Chairman Miller has gone a long way toward restoring commonsense to Commission deliberations, planning, and actions.

However, I must remind my colleagues that Chairman Miller is but one vote on a five-member Commission. There is still the prospect for unwarranted or ill-advised Commission action, despite the best efforts of the Chairman and his staff. Therefore, we must continue to devise means and procedures to protect against FTC regulatory excesses, a job we started with the 1980 FTC Improvements Act; and, a job which we may continue, and improve upon when we consider the FTC's reauthorization this year.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman Miller for his efforts to get the FTC back on the right track, as discussed in the following Business Week article:

[From Business Week, June 27, 1983]

THE FTC'S MILLER PUTS HIS FAITH IN THE FREE MARKET

One of the best-known statues in Washington stands outside the Federal Trade Commission building. It depicts a man reining in a rampaging horse, and it is supposed to represent the FTC curbing the excesses of business. But of late it could well symbolize commission Chairman James C. Miller III checking the agency itself.

"I didn't come here to do business as usual," Miller declares. "I have strong views about what should be done." He says he wants neither to fire up the agency nor close it down. "I am trying to eliminate the excesses of the past and change the adversarial atmosphere," he says. He hopes that stance will appease critics so that the FTC can "retain the authorities that [it] needs to operate."

Its operations were broadly defined when Congress set the agency up: to go after "unfair methods of competition" and "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce." The wording is so general that the FTC has often wandered into areas more social than economic. Miller wants to sharpen the focus, using strict economic analysis to bring specific cases rather than impose detailed rules on an entire industry.

SAFE, SENSIBLE, SOUND

The agency must rule shortly on the proposed joint venture of General Motors Corp. and Toyota Motor Corp. to build a small car in the U.S. The deal's size—$300 million—and opposition from other U.S. auto makers ensure that whatever the commission decides will be criticized. Antitrust ambiguities befog the case, but Miller devoutly believes that adequate data and economic analysis can pierce any gloom. "I anticipate that when I finish my review," he says, "I'll make up my mind quite strongly."

Such bedrock faith in economic analysis is at the heart of Miller's approach. That is not surprising. He earned a doctorate in economics from the University of Virginia in 1969, served on the staff of President Ford's Council of Economic Advisers, and was a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. Since coming to the FTC, he has beefed up its Bureau of Economics and installed young lawyers who share his faith as heads of the consumer protection and antitrust operations. "What he's done is return the commission to where it can be viewed as a safe, sensible, and sound agency," says Alan H. Silberman, the Chicago lawyer who heads the American Bar Assn.'s committee on the FTC.

Miller's way is to move cautiously. He believes in prosecuting only when economic analysis proves that the marketplace is being harmed—and that the FTC can do something about it. That often means deferring to corporate judgment as to what is best for the marketplace. "[The regulators] are going to give more credence to the analysis businessmen make on how to promote their own self-interest," says Silberman.

But the agency cannot always bow to the wisdom of business. Although Miller rails at those who measure an FTC chairman by the number of cases brought, cases do have to be brought. The difference is that the staff now looks for ones where an economic injury is direct and demonstrable.

COOPERATION

As a result, FTC economists are assuming a bigger role. Wendy Lee Gramm, who heads the economics bureau, makes sure that proposed lines of attack really will make the marketplace more efficient. In the antitrust area, "we're particularly concerned about restraints on innovation," says Timothy J. Muris, head of the FTC's Bureau of Competition.

In consumer protection, the emphasis is on out-and-out fraud rather than such social problems as television advertising aimed at children. Under Miller, the commission has moved against such schemes as selling diamonds on the promise that they will go up in value, assuring investors that a particular agent can guarantee winning marketable oil and gas leases in government lotteries, and running help-wanted ads that are come-ons for questionable training programs.

The Miller FTC tends to opt for solutions that rely on industry cooperation. "An economic analysis can tell you what the incentives or disincentives are for a given industry or particular company to provide [for instance] more information to consumers," notes Carol T. Crawford, chief of the Bureau of Consumer Protection. "Is there some little way we can tinker that will flip the incentives to get what we want to get?"

If the market itself will solve a problem, then it should be allowed to work, Miller and company believe. However, Congress has given the FTC specific laws to enforce, such as the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. The commission used that law to attack finance companies that refused to lend to the elderly. But if the companies' refusal created a market vacuum for other finance companies to promote loans to the elderly, why didn't Miller simply let the market do so? "There just may well be some times when our judgment is better," the chairman ruefully admits.

A NEW MAJORITY

Miller is constrained by the fact that he is merely one of five commissioners. He can pick the bureau chiefs who oversee agency staffs, but the staffers themselves often have independent views. For instance, the commission is considering curbing finance companies' ability to collect overdue debts. The heads of the FTC bureaus argue that it would also raise costs and pinch off credit to the poorest risks. But staff members of the Consumer Protection Bureau are pushing for the measure anyway.

They may be successful. Many times, Miller has found himself on the losing side. Former Chairman Michael Pertschuk and the two non-Reagan Republicans on the commission, David A. Clanton and Patricia P. Bailey, do not share Miller's view that they must prove economic damage before acting. Their majority has approved what Miller calls "obvious departures from the agenda I have set," such as imposing extensive disclosure obligations on funeral directors, a move Miller says is not justified by the record. He also disagrees with an antitrust finding against Du Pont, Ethyl, and PPG Industries declaring that in a concentrated market it may be unlawful to warn customers—earlier than contracts require—of planned price hikes.

But the opposition is likely to dwindle. Clanton's term runs out in September. President Reagan's choice as a successor will probably be in the Miller mold. The most junior member of the commission, economist George W. Douglas, not only tends to agree with Miller but also co-authored a book on deregulation with him in 1974.

And the commissioners who differ with the chairman have little power to shape the agenda. Says Miller: "I probably do a lot less horsetrading than has typically been the case." The big question, however, is whether he really has broken the horse—whether he has redirected the agency in fundamental enough ways so that a change in the White House and at the FTC will not wipe away his reforms.●

TRIBUTE TO ENSIGN PAM CORWIN

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, it is indeed a great pleasure to call to the attention of this Congress and our Nation the achievements of Ens. Pam Corwin and her recent victory in the Women's Intercollegiate Dinghy Championship.

Ens. Pam Corwin, USN, 1983 graduate of U.S. Navy Academy, Annapolis, Md., won first place in the Women's Intercollegiate Dinghy Championship. Ensign Corwin sailed to victory in division A, comprising the Nation's top female sailors.

The championship was held in Corpus Christi, Tex., June 3–6 with 16 colleges and over 90 sailors competing in the two division round robin finals. Ensign Corwin was the skipper of a 420 and M1c. Melanie Kirby crewed the winning sailboat.

The U.S. Naval Academy took first place with 126 points, followed by Tufts University with 140 points; third place was taken by Yale University with 147 points. The Perpetual Trophy is on display at the U.S. Naval Academy, Sailing Hall of Fame.

Following the championship, Ensign Corwin's election to honorable mention All-American Intercollegiate sailor was announced.

Ensign Corwin's next competition will be the U.S. Women's Double Handed Championship. The first and second place winners of the U.S. Women's Double Handed Championship will be sponsored by the U.S. Yacht Racing Union in the Women's Double Handed World Championship to be held during November in New Zealand.

Ensign Corwin has been sailing since the age of 5, entered and won her first regatta at the age of 9 and has been a member of the U.S. Naval Academy Sailing Team since 1980.

Ensign Corwin graduated from Mattituck High School and follows the family tradition of sailing. Her grandfather, Richmond S. Corwin of Southold, sailed actively on the Great South Bay as a young man. Her father, Richmond S. Corwin, Jr., better known as

Mike, has raced competitively on the east coast for over 35 years.

The Corwin family is one of Long Island's oldest families dating back to before the American Revolution. Ensign Corwin's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Richmond S. Corwin, Jr., are residents of Mattituck, Long Island, N.Y. and Annapolis, Md.●

MEDICARE'S FUTURE

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the financial health of the medicare system is the next crisis the elderly and Congress will have to face.

Many articles have been written about solutions to the crisis. For the elderly there is nothing more frightening than to hear repeatedly that a program upon which they depend for their health care will reduce benefits and cost them more. Recently, the Miami Herald published a three-part series concerning medicare. I would like to share the concluding article which focuses on the human element that sometimes gets lost in the debate over cost. I hope that my colleagues will consider the suggestions made in this article as we consider the future of medicare.

The article follows:

[From the Miami Herald, May 4, 1983]

IN FUTURE, PATIENTS TOO "COSTLY" MAY DIE

(By Robert D. Shaw, Jr., and Jane Daugherty)

Rhythmic green blips on the heart monitor offer silent testimony that Medicare patient Celia Bate lives.

Her yellowed, motionless face on the white pillow prompts a second, reassuring glance at the blinking machine. Then a thin hand, a single black bruise from fingers to wrist, flutters as she turns to view the surgeon.

She tries to smile, but manages only to erase the grimace of pain for a moment. "He's the most wonderful thing," Bate, 70, says of Dr. Leon Manheimer.

Once, twice, three times in the last three weeks he has rescued Bate, a retired accountant, from almost certain death. Her pain is impossible to measure. The cost to Medicare so far amounts to $33,668.82 for hospital charges alone.

"Unfortunately, this is a big expense for Medicare," Manheimer says as he reviews her chart. "But what is a human life worth?"

His question foreshadows what promises to be a major national debate: Will America, through Medicare, ration health care to its old?

Everyone seems to agree that the geometric growth of Medicare spending is the fast track to bankruptcy of the federal health-care fund; costs must be controlled.

But at whose expense? That of patients? Doctors? Hospitals? Are the days of limitless Medicare spending over?

Will America tell some sick, old people that certain operations are too expensive, certain technologies unavailable, that their life expectancy is too short to warrant certain costly procedures?

Celia Bate did not have to face those questions. On April 13, Manheimer, 69, the respected chief of general surgery at Miami Beach's Mount Sinai Hospital, cut a 12-inch slash across her abdomen to expose a life-threatening tumor.

Two minutes into the surgery, the green-clad surgeon froze. "I was shocked when I saw the extent of the cancer," he says frankly. "The question was, should we do anything or not? There was no way to get it all."

Excising the half-pound tumor required an intricate triple bowel resection and cutting a temporary colostomy. In intensive care later, Bate almost died of respiratory failure. Then, potentially lethal juandice struck.

"She's still very sick. She's miserable. But she has a chance to go on to complete recovery with chemotherapy and radiation therapy," Manheimer said.

In a hoarse whisper, Bate said, "I've always been a fighter. I got polio when I was 18 months old. Need I say more? But I'm tired of fighting."

Manheimer agonizes almost daily over such suffering, such life-and-death decisions.

Working at a hosptial with one of the highest percentages of Medicare patients in the state, he estimates that three out of four of his surgical patients are covered by Medicare.

Like many doctors, he questions whether the federal government, through regulations and restrictions on Medicare coverage, should make such decisions.

"If Medicare tells you. 'For this type of operation, we'll cover [expenses] for two weeks,' what would happen to Celia Bate?" Manheimer worries. "What would a private, for-profit hospital say to her then? She is a valuable person, a lovely person. She has a good life. I think she's going to survive this. . . ."

UNNEEDED SURGERY

But there are some knife-happy surgeons, who, for the love of Medicare money, subject elderly patients to unneeded operations, Manheimer acknowledges.

"There's no question that there is some unnecessary surgery." he says. "But another case I have of a rabbi with a nonemergency hernia repair is an example of (some) so-called unnecessary surgery."

The rabbi is "young-old" by Manheimer's definition, an active 66-year-old with a pacemaker.

"There's no question that his hernia was not life-threatening, not an emergency, but I was able to use a local anesthetic subjecting him to less stress and minimizing the risk to his heart," he said.

Medicare will pay an estimated $1,730 for the rabbi's hospital stay.

Yet Reagan Administration officals say that there is simply not enough money to go around, that some way has to be found to staunch Medicare's outpouring of cash. And while few want to talk about it, a major dilemma that cost-cutters must confront is summarized in one staggering statistic:

Just 8.8 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries account for about 70 percent of Medicare's total annual outlays. This year, that amounts to $40.1 billion of the program's projected spending of $57.3 billion.

Of these, more than half—or 5.2 percent of all beneficiaries—are dying, most of chronic illnesses like cancer, congestive heart failure and emphysema:

Death comes slowly and expensively. One recent Medicare study said 28 percent of the program's outlays—or $16 billion based on this year's budget—was spent on people in their last year of life.

GADGETS GIVE LIFE

The remaining "high cost" patients—who will use a projected $24.1 billion in medical care this year—are by and large the beneficiaries of the revolution in technology and new procedures that has swept through American medicine. In many cases, they owe their lives to it.

They are literally kept alive on dialysis machines—at a cost of $17,500 a year. Their clogged arteries have been bypassed at a cost of $20,000; their heartbeats are regulated by a $10,000 pacemaker. Or, like Celia Bate, the ravages of cancer are held at bay by surgery, radiation and chemicals.

Some can see again because of a $1,500 cataract operation; others walk thanks to a $4,500 hip replacement. As more and more of the elderly live longer and longer—85 and older is the fastest-growing age group in America today—the demand for these services is certain to grow.

William Hsiao, professor of public health at Harvard University, defines the situation in these terms: "The present blank-check [Medicare] system is giving everyone a Rolls-Royce."

"I will argue that you want to give everybody a Volkswagen, but I do not necessarily see that America is rich enough yet to give everyone a Rolls-Royce [in medical care]."

The former chief actuary for the Social Security Administration's health-care programs, Hsiao projected that Medicare spending could be cut by 10 percent without "any decrease in the care that will restore people to some reasonable quality of life."

He suggests that by eliminating heroic measures in the care of people who have no hope of surviving to live an "enjoyable life," much pain and suffering could be saved in addition to Medicare millions.

But who decides?

Dr. Joanne Lynn, a professor of geriatric medicine at George Washington University, says, "Unless the patient and his family vigorously reject it, I, as a doctor, have more incentive to provide every service than to raise the issue of whether society can afford it.

"All I get for my troubles (if I limit care) is trouble—potential malpractice or criminal charges. But there's every incentive to treat vigorously: I make a lot of money."

To Lynn, who was the assistant director of the President's Commission on Medical Ethics, what's needed is "some shared notion of what is fair." But devising such a notion—particularly in the context of a politically aware and active elderly population—borders on the impossible.

"We can't—and we won't—be making decisions on who can have dialysis or heart bypasses or whatever," says Sen. David Durenberger (R. Minn.), chairman of the Senate health subcommittee. Instead, he advocates letting Medicare beneficiaries decide those issues by adopting a voucher system.

Vouchers, also advocated by the Reagan Administration, would give every Medicare recipient what amounts to a check in an amount roughly equal to the program's average expenditure for people of similar ages and geographic location. The recipient

could then purchase as much—or as little—health-insurance coverage as he believed he could afford.

"People are going to have to make these decisions for themselves. I don't think I should be making them (for them)." Durenberger says. "The marketplace is somehow going to have to tackle that."

Harvard economist Marc Roberts insists that the debate must focus on how to allocate scarce resources.

"Certain kinds of rationing are politically and morally unacceptable," Roberts says. "On the other hand, there are lots of ways that we spend (health care) resources that are not beneficial."

Roberts cited the widespread remodeling of still-serviceable hospital bed space as an illustration. Medicare now allows hospitals to "pass through" capital costs, that is, include in their charges the cost of such projects and their financing.

"That's total craziness," Roberts said, noting that one Massachusetts hospital elected to replace a 30-year-old building with a fancy new one. That will push the daily rate Medicare will pay for capital costs from $10 a bed to $250.

"That's not saving any lives," he said. "But Medicare will pay for it."

Dr. Robert Butler, former head of the National Institute on Aging, said he fears that Medicare rationing "may occur in a covert, non-deliberate manner" when people can't get into hospitals when they need to.

"Some of the rationing should occur at the expense of doctors' incomes," said Butler, a psychiatrist who now heads the geriatrics department at New York's Mount Sinai Hospital.

Instead, the Reagan Administration is taking a "blame-the-victim approach" that will have dire consequences for some older Americans, Butler said.

Perhaps so—but the likelihood for the immediate future is that neither the Reagan Administration nor any of its critics will be able to muster anything close to a political consensus on what to do about Medicare's costs.

"There's a basic element of human dignity involved here," says Rep. Henry Waxman (D., Calif.), who is considered one of the ranking congressional experts on health care. "Denying health care to people who are sick is inconsistent with our values."

What, then, is his solution?

"I don't hold out any hope for an absolute solution to Medicare's costs," Waxman retorts. "And frankly, I'm very skeptical right now of anyone who claims he does have the answer. We haven't even thought out the questions very clearly—yet." ●

HUNGER'S IMPACT

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we can comprehend the true impact of hunger and the import of programs designed to alleviate it only when we take the time to listen to the personal experience of others. At the Macomb County hunger hearing, we were privileged to hear from several people who told of the despair that hunger can bring and the hope offered by the W.I.C. program, meals for the aged, the care and share program, and others.

I know it is very difficult for people to reveal this kind of personal experience, and I want to express my deep appreciation for their testimony. It is statements such as the following that I believe can move this country to a greater understanding of the problem of hunger and to a commitment to eliminate it.

HUNGER'S IMPACT—PERSONAL TESTIMONIES

First of all I'd like to thank you for your efforts in bringing this to Washington for all of us here. I've been laid off a year and a half. I've been a taxpayer for over 25 years. The last layoff was Christmas of '81. I went on ADC. I am an ADC father. I have a 14 year old son at home. It began in March when I first got on ADC. It took me almost a month and a half—we were out of everything. They were, they had no concern for some reason that we were not in need. They started job club program for us to pay us $1.80/day. It was a requirement to go to school for six weeks otherwise we would lose our ADC. There is about 25 people in there and their incentive was to find work is to pay you $1.80 for every job interview you went on. And the cost to go find work at a minimum wage is less money than you're making on ADC to spend $10 worth of gas to seek several jobs for minimum wage to receive $1.80 for each interview seems awful ridiculous to me, but this is their program or else you're off.

My car insurance has expired. I can't renew it, I haven't got the money. My license, it's on renewal, I can't buy that either. My phone is off. I have no transportation to go look for work if I wanted to. I have electrical shut-off notice here $102. They don't care. They want their money. I bet my Allstate is cancelled. I get $92 a month for my son and myself for food stamps. You don't have to be a mathematical genius to know that's $1.50 for each of us a day to live on. At the end of the month, it's pretty scant. If it wasn't for the Care and Share Program, the UAW put out, to give me some food for the last three months, I was beyond the end of it * * *

At the end of the month, it's hectic and when you bring this hunger back to Mr. Reagan, I wish you would tell him not to visit an average family in San Clemente—to come to Michigan and visit an average family at the end of the month and break bread in the house with no bread to be broken. And if he wants to fight my kids over the last box of Kraft Macaroni and Cheese, he's welcome to try. Because that's what it's down to. And it's ridiculous.

I'm not begging for money. I paid my dues. Over a quarter of a century I've worked and through no fault of my own economically we are down the tubes because of his policies and I'm not buying it. We need more, we don't need less. We have to raise our standards of living, not lower our standards of living. We're American citizens. We're not second class citizens, and I thank you again, and that's about all I have to say. —Tony Moscato's personal testimony.

I'm Catherine Wechorek and I live in Mt. Clemens, in one of those housing projects. I'm here to talk to you about what happened to me and my husband, Steve. We are both 64 and live in Mt. Clemens. We were starving last year. We lived in Warren in an upper flat that cost $380 including gas and electricity. Our income was $433 a month from SSI and social security. That left us with $53 a month. Before we moved, we didn't have much money. A lot of food we had to go without. We ate very little meat. Mostly ate canned goods. We didn't know what to think. We sat in the living room. I sat in the kitchen and our stomachs growling. In the middle of the month we just ate potatoes and macaroni. We didn't call anyone. We tried to pull the best we could. We didn't want to talk. We figured that we would be doing the wrong thing.

We never told our families much. I have a mother in a nursing home. A sister who is good to us. Two brothers in Detroit and Southfield. Steve has a sister in Florida who bought us three bags of groceries once. Friends helped us. They gave us cupcakes and on valentines day gave us a cake with a heart on it. But we still felt out of place because those stairs were so steep. Steve walks with a walker. He only got out of the apartment twice in two years, so we were castout.

Then we met Evelyn Powers who is an angel from the Council of Ages. She got us home delivered meals. When we first got the meals it was hard to get used to the food. We couldn't eat as much as before. I don't know. Maybe my stomach got smaller. When we got the meals, every day was a party. We were excited to see what the meal was. The volunteers were good, real polite and nice. Another nice one is Mr. Fox and Sandra Becks in the Mt. Clemens housing. Evelyn got us a real nice apartment and we now pay $79 a month. We get food stamps and take dollar rides to go shopping. We can even walk home using my little market cart to carry the food. I freeze frozen fruit in the summer and can cook my own meals. I am happier now. I joined the Y and went swimming. I joined the church and we have real nice times. We have parties, pick strawberries and have pancake breakfasts. Instead of going down hill, I feel myself coming up. My sister knows the change too and is glad. I can't forget what happened to us, but I can hope that it won't happen again. I am very grateful to the meals, Evelyn Powers, and the Council of Ages. Thank you.—Catherine Wechorek's personal testimony.

Hi, my name is Sandy. Speaking to you today is terrifying, but what scares me even more is the possibility of the WIC program being cut.

As a cashier in a grocery store I was familiar with the program for quite some time, but I never dreamed I'd be on it. It wasn't until I was without of a job and seven months pregnant that a neighbor suggested I apply for the program. I had lost 3 pregnancys and was having trouble with this one too.

I learned alot on my first visit at the WIC office. When I got pregnant I was 5 feet 6 inches tall and weighed 95 lbs. At 7 months I weighed 120 lbs. What my weight should have been when I got pregnant. The nutritionist there set up a balanced meal program for me. Six weeks later Luke was born weighing 6 lbs. 15 ozs.

Although my diet had improved, Luke and I were still having problems. Luke was not gaining enough weight and my body was not producing enough milk. I stopped nursing and Luke was started on the program.

At one year Luke weighed 13 lbs. and for awhile we were afraid that he would be diagnosed as failure to thrive. At this point it doesn't sound like the program works very well. What I have learned and now under-

stand is that it takes time to rebuild your body after you have depleted it. My body could not give to Luke what it did not have and that put Luke on a deficit. There are no quick miracles in nutrition.

I know the WIC program is successful. To me the WIC program is a complete program. They do more than just give information. Knowing that you should drink milk when you're pregnant doesn't help when you can make 3 gallons of Kool-Aid for the same price of a gallon of milk. What the WIC program does is also supply what you need for a balanced diet. But they don't stop there either. They also provide you with follow up visits with a nutritionist who helps you check on your progress and encourages you in the areas that your doing well. They also suggest alternatives in the areas you fall short in. This reinforces and gives you positive goals to work towards.

I know that the program works. When I became pregnant again I got right on the program. I weighed 120 lbs. at the beginning and gained 81 lbs. through the pregnancy. I didn't have a single problem in the whole 9 months. Rachael weighed 8 lbs. 5 oz.

Till the day I die I will always feel bad about the slow start Luke had. At 4 months Rachael weighed 13 lbs. At 2 years Luke weighed 26 lbs. Luke has always been small and I tried to accept that he would always be small. But because of the continued help from the WIC program he makes progress. We can't imagine what would have happened if he wasn't on the program. The sweetest words I've ever heard and the best testimony WIC could ever get happened twice in the same week. Last week while talking to other mothers on 2 separate occasions someone commented on how big Luke was for his age. I thought I was going to cry.

If the WIC program were cut today I would be part of a sad success story. Because the WIC program does work right, I know too much to go back to poor eating habits at the expense of my children. Whats sad is the many women who have not had the chance to learn what I have and the many children who will not have the chance to grow like Luke has.

I don't know how I would pay for the milk-eggs and cheese. I don't smoke, drink. We don't have desserts and we buy our clothes at the thrift shop. Something would have to be cut. I don't know where, and I hope I never have to find out.—Sandy Du Bois' personal testimony.●

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS ON NICARAGUA

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I am today submitting the first of certain documents which I feel will be useful to the ongoing discussion by this House of current developments in Nicaragua. The material consists of statements by Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, in the Security Council, in response to complaints against our country by Nicaragua during March-April 1982.

The commentary follows:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK, MARCH 25, 1982

In his letter requesting this meeting, the coordinator of the Nicaraguan government, Mr. Daniel Ortega Saavedra, made some extraordinary charges against the government of the United States. We naturally desire to respond to the grave charges that Mr. Ortega has leveled against our policies and our intentions.

The essence of Mr. Ortega's complaint is that the United States is about to launch a "large-scale military intervention" against his country. Thus he wrote, in the letter in which he requested the meeting, of "an ever increasing danger of a large scale military intervention by the armed forces of the United States [which] constitutes a grave threat to the independence and sovereignty of the Central American countries and to international peace and security." He spoke of the "interventionist strategy of the government of the United States" and of statements and "concrete actions that clearly evidence an intervention to attack Nicaragua and intervene directly in El Salvador." To support his arguments, Mr. Ortega charges us with the "systematic repetition of . . . aggressive statements [which] seriously affects the normal conduct of international relations . . . with bellicose statements." The United States' actions, Mr. Ortega asserts, violate the Charter of the United Nations, the "principles and goals" of the United Nations, and constitute a "grave threat to the independence and sovereignty of the Central American countries and to international peace and security."

The attack made by Nicaragua is not haphazard; its charges are not random: The government of Nicaragua has accused the United States of the kinds of political behavior of which it is guilty—large-scale interventions in the internal affairs of neighbors, persistent efforts to subvert and overthrow by force and violence the governments of neighboring states, aggressive actions which disrupt the "normal conduct of international relations" in the region—acts and intentions inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations. These charges—as extravagant as they are baseless—are an interesting example of projection, a psychological operation in which one's own feelings and intentions are simultaneously denied and attributed—that is, projected—to someone else.

Hostility is the dominant emotion and projection the key mechanism of the paranoid style of politics which, much to our regret, has characterized the political behavior of the Sandinista leadership. The principal object of Sandinista hostility, I further regret to say, is the government and people of the United States.

Nigaragua's new politicial elite—which calls itself Sandinista—has constructed a historical myth to justify its demand for full power. According to this myth, the United States is responsible for all problems and disasters—natural and social—that Nicaragua has ever suffered; the Sandinista anthem describes us as the enemy of mankind; and Sandinista ideology defines us as implacably opposed to national independence, economic development, and peace. Since the moment of their arrival in power the Sandinistas have predicted that the United States was about to overrun them. The Yankees are coming, they have reiterated. The counter revolutionaries will get us if we don't silence criticism, mobilize the population, destroy freedom.

The familiar totalitarian assertion that they are surrounded by enemies internal and external has been heard again and again to justify the elimination of opponents and the concentration of power in a tiny, one-party elite.

In the past two and one-half years, Nicaragua's hopes for greater freedom, democracy and security from government tyranny have very nearly died as the new rulers moved expertly first to establish and then, progressively, to exercise control over the various sectors and institutions of Nicaraguan society. The extension and consolidation of power has followed the pattern of "coup d'etat by installments" (Konrad Heiden's description of the Nazi seizure of near total power of German society).

One step at a time the Sandinista directorate moved against the faint-hearted "bourgeois" democrats in their ranks. One sector at a time they have moved against Nicaraguan society—now seizing radio, television stations, newspapers, now nationalizing new industries, now tightening control of the economy, now moving against the independent trade unions, now banning a bishop from access to television, now organizing and reinforcing the Sandinista Defense Committees that bring the revolution, with rewards, demands, and surveillance, into every neighborhood.

Alongside it all came a dramatic, extraordinary expansion of Nicaragua's army, militia and international role. Today's National Guard is many times the size and strength of the one that reinforced Somoza's regime. It reinforces a political machine many times more sophisticated than Somoza's.

A political scientist describing the Nazis' consolidation of power in a single German town noted, concerning that process of destruction of society and politicization of human relations:

"Hardly anyone in Thalburg in those days grasped what was happening. There was no real comprehension of what the town would experience if Hitler came to power, no real understanding of what Nazism was."

It is no easier to understand what is happening to Nicaragua. And at each stage the government's demand for power has been accompanied by new changes concerning enemies without and within.

We are confronted in Nicaragua with the familiar patterns of doublespeak with which would-be totalitarian rulers of our times assault reality in the attempt to persuade us, and doubtless themselves, that making war is seeking peace; that repression is liberation; that a free press is a carefully controlled one. Thus on February 19, 1982, Daniel Ortega solemnly assured the opening session of an international conference (COPPAL) that the forced, violent tranfer of Miskito Indians was naturally carried out only to protect their human rights.

In their statement of February 18, 1982, Nicaragua's Bishops described these forced relocations as involving grave violations of the human rights of individuals, families, and entire populations of peoples. These include:

Relocations of individuals by military operations without warning and without conscientious dialogue;

Forced marches, carried out without sufficient consideration for the weak, aged, women and children;

Charges or accusations of collaboration with the counterrevolution against all residents of certain towns;

The destruction of houses, belongings and domestic animals;

The deaths of individuals in circumstances that, to our great sorrow, remind us of the drama of other peoples of our region.

Given this pattern, it is no surprise that last week, as Commander Ortega levelled new charges against the United States, the Nicaraguan government suspended its constitution and promulgated a new Law of National Emergency that threatens to eliminate the limited liberty and pluralism that remains.

All discussions in the Sandinista-controlled Council of State of the proposed media and political parties laws have been suspended.

The Ministry of Interior has made an unspecified number of "preventive arrests" of people who are suspected of having ties with counterrevolutionaries.

Radio Catolica has been closed down indefinitely and all radio news programs, except official statements, are prohibited.

La Prensa and all other media are required to submit news stories for prior censorship. Yesterday it was unable to publish since 50 percent of the paper was found objectionable.

Opposition political leaders have been informed that they cannot leave the country; the passport of one politician was seized when he attempted to make a routine trip abroad.

A new "patriotic tax" is to be imposed on businesses to help finance its latest mobilization campaign.

Thus the dialectic of revolution unfolds; liberation has already produced its antithesis in Sandinista Nicaragua. Old familiar arguments are invoked to justify new, more effective repressions.

It did not need to be thus. Nicaragua's new government could have satisfied the longing of its people for peace instead of making war on the people. They could have accepted the United States' offer of friendship. The United States government did not oppose the Sandinista rise to power. It has not attempted to prevent its consolidation. With our help, the government of Nicaragua received more loans in two years from the International Development Bank than the Somoza government had received in any decade. The fact that the United States government gave the Sandinistas moral and political support in the crucial phases of the civil war, cut off their opponents' supply of arms, ammunition and gasoline, and negotiated the resignations of Somoza and Urcuyo, did not affect the Sandinista leadership's view of the United States' attitudes—neither did the 75 million dollar supplemental aid bill rushed through Congress to assist in the job of reconstruction nor our active support for Nicaragua's credit applications in multilateral lending institutions. The United States provided more aid than any other government to the Sandinista regime during its first 18 months in power.

Did this support from the United States alter the Sandinista leadership's hostility? Alas, it had no such effect.

By its words and deeds, the United States government—the Congress and the Executive branch—demonstrated not only its respect for the sovereignty of the Nicaraguan political process, the right of Nicaraguans to detemine their own government, but also our desire to give a boost to Nicaragua's new government, to help it overcome the devastation of civil war. But Sandinista ideology overcame the reality of United States assistance. The fact of United States support for economic reconstruction and national independence in Nicaragua proved less powerful than the stereotype—we remained the Yankee enemy of mankind.

Like others in this century who have seized power by force, the Sandinista leaders are haunted by the expectation that they will fall victim to the violent intrigues by which they won power and exercise it.

It is, of course, they who systematically seek to subvert and overthrow neighboring governments. El Salvador has the misfortune to be the principal target.

A clandestine support system established in 1978 at the time of the Nicaraguan civil war continued to operate after the fall of Somoza in July 1979 with a new final destination—El Salvador. The existence of this support system has been repeatedly and vigorously denied by Nicaraguan and Cuban spokesmen. Yet a considerable quantity of solid information shows that those denials are false.

Nicaragua offers a support system with three major components: external arms supplies, training, and command and control.

Within weeks after the fall of Somoza in July 1979, the Sandinistas began to cooperate in support of the Salvadoran insurgents by establishing training camps and the beginning of arms supply networks. This clandestine assistance initially involved local black markets and relatively limited resources. In 1980, after meetings in Havana had unified Salvadoran Marxists into a single military command structure, the Sandinista leadership agreed to serve as a conduit for an arms trafficking system of unprecedented proportions, originating outside the hemisphere. That structure remains in force today.

Arms and ammunition for the Salvadoran insurgents reach Nicaragua by ship and occasionally by direct flights from Havana to Nicaragua. Three Nicaraguan ships, the Monimbo, the Aracely and the Nicarao, frequently transport arms and ammunition to Nicaragua from Cuba in their cargo. Salvadoran guerrilla headquarters near Managua arranges for their shipment into El Salvador. The timing of the resupply operations appears to be coordinated with the planned level of fighting, since before each surge in the fighting we have detected large deliveries.

When a clandestine shipment of arms is captured or a safehouse is found containing arms and terrorist supplies, it is often impossible to know with certainty whether the ultimate recipients are Guatemalan, Honduran, Costa Rican or Salvadoran terrorists, since the arms supply networks established by Cuba and Nicaragua are funneling lethal military supplies to terrorists and guerrillas in all four countries.

A few examples, chosen from among dozens, will illustrate the pattern of arms flow.

The Papalonal airfield provides a clear case of the direct airlift of weapons from Nicaragua to guerrillas in El Salvador. Papalonal is a commercially undeveloped area 23 nautical miles northwest of Managua, accessible only by dirt roads. In late July 1980, the airfield was an agricultural dirt airstrip approximately 800 meters long, but by early 1981 the strip was lengthened by 50 percent to approximately 1,200 meters. A turnaround was added to each end. A dispersal parking area with three hardstands—a feature typical of a military airfield—had been constructed at the west end of the runway. Three parking aprons were cleared, and six hangar/storage buildings were constructed on the aprons; the hangars were used to stockpile arms for the Salvadoran guerrillas. C-47 flights from the airbase corresponded with sightings in El Salvador, and several pilots were identified in Nicaragua who regularly flew the route into El Salvador. This particular route was closed in March 1981, but some air infiltration continues to this day, despite difficulties in pilot recruitment.

Weapons delivery by overland routes from Nicaragua passes through Honduras. Several examples of this arms traffic can be identified. Honduran authorities have intercepted various shipments of arms en route from Nicaragua and in concealed caches in Honduras. In early January 1981, for example, Honduran police caught six individuals unloading weapons from a truck enroute from Nicaragua. The six identified themselves as Salvadorans and as members of the International Support Commission of the Salvadoran Popular Liberation Forces (FPL). They had in their possession a large number of altered and forged Honduran, Costa Rican, and Salvadoran passports and other identity documents. This one truck contained over 100 M-16/Ar-15 automatic rifles, fifty 81-MM mortar rounds, approximately 100,000 rounds of 5.56-MM ammunition, machine gun belts, field packs, and first-aid kits.

In April 1981, Honduran authorities intercepted a tractor-trailer truck which had entered Honduras at the Guasule crossing from Nicaragua. This truck was apparently heading for Guatemala. Ammunition and propaganda materials were hidden in the side walls of the trailer. The same arms traffickers operated a storehouse in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, with a false floor and a special basement for storing weapons.

A special legislative commission established in June 1980 by the Costa Rican legislature confirmed in its May 1981 report that a clandestine arms-supply link between Costa Rica and Nicaragua was established during the Nicaraguan civil war, and that the link continued to function between Costa Rica and El Salvador once the Sandinistas had come to power in Nicaragua.

In April and July 1981, Guatemalan security forces captured large caches of guerrilla weapons at safehouses in Guatemala City. Several of the vehicles captured at the Guatemala City safehouses bore recent customs markings from Nicaragua, thus suggesting that the operation was part of the well-established pattern.

Within the past three months, shipments of arms into El Salvador reached unprecedented peaks, averaging out to the highest overall volume since the "final offensive" last year. The recent Nicaraguan-Cuban arms flow into El Salvador has emphasized both sea and—once again—overland routes through Honduras.

Last month, A Salvadoran guerrilla group picked up a large shipment of arms on the Usulutan Coast after the shipment arrived by sea from Nicaragua.

On March 15, 1982, the Costa Rican judicial police announced the discovery of a house in San Jose with a sizeable cache of arms, explosives, uniforms, passports, documents, false immigration stamps from more than thirty countries, and vehicles with hidden compartments—all connected with an ongoing arms traffic through Costa Rican territory to Salvadoran guerrillas. Nine people were arrested: Salvadorans, Nicaraguans, an Argentine, A Chilean and a Costa Rican. Costa Rican police so far have seized 13 vehicles designed for arms smuggling. Police confiscated some 150 to 175 weapons from mausers to machine guns, TNT, fragmentation grenades, a grenade launcher, ammunition, and 500 combat uni-

forms. One of the captured terrorists told police that the arms and other goods were to have been delivered to the Salvadoran guerrillas before March 20, "for the elections."

Nicaragua's fraternal assistance to its neighbors is not limited to arms. Training is also provided. This coordinated Nicaraguan and Cuban political and military training creates the framework for the use of the arms by guerrillas operating within El Salvador and elsewhere in Central America. Since at least mid-1980, Salvadoran guerrillas have been trained in Nicaragua in military tactics, weapons, communications, and explosives at temporary training schools scattered around the country and on Sandinista military bases. At several military sites in Nicaragua, Salvadorans receive training under guidance from Cuban and other foreign advisors. For more specialized training, guerrillas transit Nicaragua for Cuba. They are provided false identity documents to help them transit third countries. Guerrillas trained in Cuba are reinfiltrated through Nicaragua back into El Salvador. The attacks on Ilopango Airport in January 1982 and on the El Oro bridge in October 1981 were clearly performed by saboteurs who had employed the benefits of such sophisticated training.

Honduran police raided a safehouse for the Moranzanist Front for the Liberation of Honduras (FMLH) on November 27, 1981, in Tegucigalpa. And while the Honduran police were attempting to search the house, a firefight broke out. The police ultimately captured several members of this group. This cell of the FMLH included a Honduran, a Uruguayan, and several Nicaraguans. The captured terrorists told Honduran authorities that the Nicaraguan government had provided them with funds for travel expenses, as well as explosives. Captured documents and statements by detained guerrillas further indicated that:

The group was formed in Nicaragua at the instigation of high-level Sandinista leaders;

The group's chief of operations resided in Managua; and

Members of the group received military training in Nicaragua and Cuba.

Guerrillas at one safehouse were responsible for transporting arms and munitions into Honduras from Esteli, Nicaragua.

Command and control services are also provided by Nicaragua. Planning and operations are guided from this headquarters where Nicaraguan officers are involved in command and control. The headquarters coordinates logistical support for the insurgents to include food, medicines, clothing, money—and most importantly—weapons and ammunition. The headquarters in Nicaragua decides on locations to be attacked and coordinates supply deliveries. The guidance flows to guerrilla units widely spread throughout El Salvador.

The pattern is clear. It continues to this day. We very much wish the government of Nicaragua would cease its efforts to repress its people and overthrow neighboring governments. We thought perhaps progress to this end was in sight. Frankly we are surprised by the Nicaraguan government's decision to expand and embitter regional conflict at this moment.

Mr. Ortega says it is because Nicaragua fears that the United States government is about to invade. But, of course, that is ridiculous. The United States government is not about to invade anyone. And we have so stated on many occasions.

It is true that once it became aware of Nicaragua's own intentions and actions, the United States government undertook overflights to safeguard our own security and that of other states who are threatened by the Sandinista government. These overflights, conducted by unarmed high-flying planes, and for the express and sole purpose of verifying reports of Nicaraguan intervention, are surely no threat to regional peace and stability. No, the threat to regional and world peace lies in the activities these photographs expose. One can understand the government of Nicaragua's preference that no such photographs exist.

The United States is frankly surprised and puzzled by Nicaragua's appeal to this Council. As most members of the Security Council understand, Mr. Ortega's contentious charges come at a time when we and others are looking for a basis on which to settle peacefully the differences of the parties involved. The government of Nicaragua has attempted to broaden and deepen the conflict. Only last week the government of Nicaragua stated a desire to negotiate but then, after two high government officials visited Cuba, called for this meeting to air baseless charges in this most public and important forum.

The United States seeks peace in Central America. We have repeatedly attempted to explore ways with the Nicaraguans in which our governments could cooperate in alleviating the tensions in the area. We have submitted proposals to the Nicaraguan government, and we have received no response. Instead, the Nicaraguan government replied—in October—as it has today—by sending Daniel Ortega to the United Nations to deliver an attack on the United States.

Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Enders went to Managua last August, to try to communicate with the leaders of the government of Nicaragua, to offer a way out of confrontation if they would restrain their military buildup and cease their support for insurgencies in neighboring countries. At that time we offered a specific agenda for discussions; we offered to consider their concerns if they would consider ours. We also agreed to restrain public rhetoric while this proposal was considered.

The response was not long in coming. On September 15, Humberto Ortega made a major speech in Managua during which he vilified the United States, and on October 5, Nicaraguan Junta Coordinator Daniel Ortega addressed the United Nations General Assembly, attacked the United States for past intervention in Central America, accused the United States of causing the world's economic problems, and attacked us laughing.

In recent weeks our Secretary of State has met with the Foreign Minister of Mexico in yet another attempt to engage the Nicaraguans in a meaningful dialogue. And how has the Nicaraguan government again responded? By again sending Mr. Ortega to the United Nations, apparently in search of a propaganda victory—and an exacerbation of conflict.

The Nicaraguan government has said it wants peace; it has stated that it wishes better relations with the United States. But, unfortunately, its actions do not match its pretentions. If the Nicaraguan government was genuinely interested in alleviating tensions, would it continue to act as a conduit for war material aimed at subverting the government of El Salvador? Would it have undertaken a campaign of systematic violence against the Indian communities on the East Coast, displacing 25,000 Indians from their ancestral homes on the pretext of a security threat from a peaceful, democratic neighbor? Would it have doubled the number of Cuban military and security advisors in the past year? Would it have continued seeking to augment its military forces and arsenal? Would it have declared a state of siege effectively neutralizing the opposition? And, most importantly, would it have continued incessantly to pour arms into El Salvador, even increasing the flow of arms, bullets, and now propaganda just when the people of El Salvador have been given an unprecedented opportunity to express their views?

Given this history we are understandably skeptical when the government of Nicaragua declares it want peace, or that it wishes better relations with the United States. How, we ask, is this professed interest in peace reconciled with Comandante Humberto Ortega, when he states that the opposition will be "hanged from the lampposts?" Or with Comandante Bavardo Arce when he tells us that the Nicaraguan government will continue to pour arms into El Salvador, no matter what we do or say?

In spite of this harsh response on the part of the government of Nicaragua, our offer to engage in a dialogue was repeated by Secretary of State Haig at the OAS General Assembly meeting in December, 1981. Secretary Haig said, "the United States has made proposals to Nicaragua to normalize relations. If Nicaragua addresses our concerns about intervention and militarization, we are prepared to address their concerns. We do not close the door to the search for proper relations." Again, the Nicaraguan government has not responded to our offer.

On February 24, 1982, President Reagan said "we seek to exclude no one [from the benefits of our Caribbean Basin Initiative]. Some, however, have turned from their American neighbors and their heritage. Let them return to the traditions and common values of this hemisphere and we would welcome them. The choice is theirs."

Finally, just a few weeks ago, the President of Mexico offered his good offices in the effort to reduce tensions between Nicaragua and the United States. We welcomed that initiative. In a press conference in New York on March 15, Secretary Haig reiterated the five points which we believe can serve as the basis for an improvement of relations between the governments of the United States and Nicaragua and which were conveyed earlier to the Nicaraguans.

A commitment to mutual non-aggression through mutual high-level reassertion of our Rio Treaty engagements.

A United States political commitment on the activities of Nicaraguan exiles in this country.

A regional undertaking by Nicaragua not to import heavy offensive weapons and to reduce the number of foreign military and security advisers to a reasonable, low level.

A proposal to the United States Congress for renewed United States aid to Nicaragua.

Action by the Nicaraguans to get out of El Salvador—to wind up the command and control, the logistics operations, including delivery of weapons and ammunition, and operation of training camps.

And now, even as representatives of the Mexican and United States governments are consulting on this initiative, the government of Nicaragua, fully aware of what is going on, has once again made a move that can only increase tensions, not reduce them.

Although we find its actions puzzling, we have not interposed any objections to the request of Nicaragua that an opportunity be

granted for their head of state to present an exposition to the Council, even though the government of Nicaragua, for whatever reasons, chose to ignore procedures well-established in both the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of American States. As members of this Council know, Article 52 of the United Nations Charter encourages efforts to achieve the peaceful settlement of disputes through regional arrangements and gives priority to them. Article 23 of the OAS Charter specifically singles out the role of the OAS in settling regional disputes before such disputes are referred to the Security Council.

The government of Nicaragua should be among the first to recall the existence under the OAS of the 17th meeting of Foreign Ministers which dealt in 1978 and 1979 with events in Central America threatening to the peace of the region. Indeed, in 1979, the Nicaraguan Government of National Reconstruction termed the resolution of the 17th meeting of Foreign Ministers as "historic in every respect." That meeting was never terminated. The question of Central America remains before the OAS. Just yesterday, in the Permanent Council of the OAS, the Foreign Minister of Honduras made serious proposals for efforts to bring peace to Central America.

The Organization of American States, thus, not only has jurisdiction of this matter in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations and OAS Charters, it is also formally seized of the matter. It is clear that the OAS is the appropriate and primary forum for consideration of the matters addressed by Nicaragua.

We appeal once again to the government of Nicaragua to join with us and other neighboring governments in resolving differences, ending interventions, living in peace in this hemisphere.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK, MARCH 26, 1982

By way of reply, I should like to begin by thanking the various members of the United Nations who have spoken today in support of the principles of national self-determination, national independence, strict respect for territorial integrity, the principles of non-intervention in the affairs of other states. Those are principles which are very dear to my country and which the United States in its foreign affairs does its very best to honor in a serious and consistent fashion.

I should like also to express the United States' sincere agreement with the principles of International Law which were cited by the distinguished representative of Guyana and various other speakers today, particularly with reference to the use of force and threats of force in the affairs of nations. The United States is very profoundly committed to the principles of non-use of force in international affairs and committed also to following and abiding by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations concerning the use and non-use of force.

I should also like to express the solidarity of the United States with all those people who hope for change, for democracy and developoment in Central America.

I cannot forbear noting that there have been some rather odd disjunctions between some aspects of political reality and political symbolism today. I find it interesting, as an observer of political affairs as well as a representative of my country, to hear the government of Vietnam speaking with such conviction about the principle of respect for national independence. I trust that members of the United Nations would all agree that respect for the principle of national independence should apply in Kampuchea as well as in the rest of our countries. Similarly I found it interesting yesterday to listen to the representative of Angola pay homage to the principle of respect for national independence since Angola is a nation, of course, whose national independence is in some sense subject to the will of thirty thousand, twenty five thousand, twenty thousand, however many thousand foreign troops who occupy that land with the consent of that government which is here invoking the principle of national independence.

I find it, I suppose, particularly interesting to listen to the representative of the government of Cuba commenting on peaceful affairs in this hemisphere and respect for the principles of national independence and non-intervention. Cuba is a very strange nation which today, as members of this Council know, maintains some 40 thousand soldiers in Africa alone where those troops dominate two countries, doing for the Soviet Union there what the Ghurka mercenaries did for 19th Century England. In Central America, Cuba is attempting to export aggression, subvert established governments and intervene in a most persistent and massive fashion in the internal affairs of more than one nation in that region. In Nicaragua alone it maintains no less than 1,800 to two thousand security and military personnel. In other words, as Assistant Secretary Thomas Enders noted yesterday in his testimony before the Congress of the United States, "Cuba is a would-be foreign policy giant superimposed on an economic pigmy whose peoples have had to sacrifice all hope for a rising standard of living in order to gain advantages in foreign affairs." Those advantages are largely purchased for it by some three billion dollars annual economic aid from the Soviet Union and a great deal more military aid of course. My country naturally welcomes any move of the government of Cuba toward greater concern for economic development and well-being of its people.

Finally, commenting on the use of language and the realities of politics, it occurred to me that members of the Council might be interested in a recent article concerning Sandino and Sandinismo in Nicaragua, since we are discussing here the letter of the Coordinator of the Nicaraguan junta. A prestigious writer, Pablo Joaquin Chomorro y Cardinale, was assassinated in the final days of the Somoza regime, as you perhaps know. His death was a precipitating factor in the successful revolt against the Somoza regime leading eventually to the installation of the current junta in Nicaragua. Pablo Joaquin Chomorro was a very highly respected writer whose name is from time to time invoked by the leaders of the revolution but not as often as that of Sandino. And he was, of course, the editor and publisher of La Prensa, the last remaining independent newspaper in Nicaragua—which may or may not have been permitted to publish today. Chomorro wrote:

"Sandino should be exalted precisely as a contrast to the Communists who obey signals from Russia and China. Sandino fought against the United States Marines but he did not bring Russian Cossacks to Nicaragua as Fidel Castro did in Cuba. There is a great difference between the Communist Fidel Castro who in his false battle for the independence of his country has filled it with Russian rockets, soldiers, planes and even canned goods, and a Sandino who defended the sovereignty of his ground with homemade bombs but without accepting the patronage of another power. For this reason, Sandino was great because he was not handed over to Communist treason as Castro but fought within an Indo-Hispanic limit. Naturally the Communists who attacked and slandered Sandino when he was in the mountains now try to use him because they have no moral people to restrain them. Sandino was a pure product of our time, very different from the products exported by Russia or China and as such we must exalt and preserve his memory. The value of his exploits is a Nicaraguan value, not Soviet, and his nationalism is indigenous not Russian. Sandino is a monument to the dignity of our country and we must not permit the Communists with whom he never communed to besmirch his memory in order to use his prestige and to succeed, someday, on the pretext that they are fighting imperialism in delivering over our land to Russia as Castro did with Cuba."

I would finally like simply to mention that there has been a good deal of talk of change in Central America today and there has been a good deal of invocation of hope for change for the people of Central America. The government of the United States hopes very much for change in Central America; we hope it will be as peaceable as possible and bought at as low a price to the people of Central America as possible. An example of peaceable change may be observed this very weekend in El Salvador where free elections with a free press, free assembly, with competition among parties and candidates will take place. The risks of free election are, as every office holder knows, very great. When a government risks a free election it risks being defeated. It takes a very brave government who is more committed to freedom and democracy than to retaining power to run such a risk. My government congratulates the government of El Salvador for being willing to risk its power for the sake of freedom.●

SOVIET ANTI-ZIONIST PROPAGANDA INCREASES

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, when we learned that the Vashchenkos had actually left the Soviet Union, we accepted the good news and perceived their release as a step toward an easing of restrictions on Soviet emigration, as well as a genuine gesture on the part of the Soviet Government. I hope that the Chymkhalovs will also soon be leaving.

Today, however, I was dismayed to read on the front page of the Washington Post about the recent publication of the "Class Essence of Zionism," an anti-Semitic book, which is yet another tactic the Soviets are using in their propaganda campaign against their Jewish citizens.

As the Post reports, the book, reviewed favorably in the official Soviet press, charges, among other things,

that Zionists collaborated with Nazis in World War II to exterminate Jews who were not Zionists. This obvious lie is part of the recent wave of increased official anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union that has resulted in a sharp decrease in the number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Only 421 Jews have been allowed to leave so far this year, a small percentage of the number who emigrated in past years.

The Soviet Government, by encouraging the dissemination of this book, is condoning a distorted and false picture of history. The Soviet Government is acting in a blatantly discriminatory way, against internationally recognized human rights standards.

I want to recommend that my colleagues read the following Washington Post article, which describes the contents of the book:

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1983]

SOVIET BOOK ASSAILS JEWS

(By Dusko Doder)

Moscow, June 29.—The recent publication here of a blatantly anti-Semitic book—charging, for example, that Zionists collaborated with the Nazis in the mass executions of the Holocaust—coincides with a fierce anti-Zionist and anti-Israeli propaganda drive designed to discourage Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union.

The book, which has been warmly reviewed in the official Communist press, comes after a Kremlin decision last fall to practically close off the Jewish exodus to Israel. According to figures compiled by western organizations, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union dropped from a high of more than 51,000 in 1979 to 2,688 last year. In the first four months of this year only 421 Jews are known to have been allowed to emigrate.

In his preface to "The Class Essence of Zionism," Lev Korneev, who has a doctorate in history and is regarded as an expert on Zionism, recalls themes reminiscent of some of the most bitter periods of anti-Semitic sentiment of the Stalinist era, asserting that Jews in ancient times were involved in commerce and that "profit was their ideology."

This phrase provides the key to the understanding of the book, in which Korneev uses Marxist terminology of class struggle for a savage attack on the "Jewish bourgeoisie" in the Soviet Union and elsewhere.

Korneev claims that Jewish bankers and industrialists financed the mad monk Rasputin in an effort to influence the last czar, Nicholas II. He gives examples of Jews in other countries achieving prominence and occupying influential positions.

Jews everywhere, Korneev writes, are citizens of a Jewish nation, and that "automatically puts Jews in the role of a fifth column in any country"—a "double loyalty" that is exploited by imperialists, Jewish elites and Israeli secret service agencies.

Korneev's book and the accompanying anti-Zionist drive have pressed home this common theme of singling out the Jewish community as a people with "dual loyalties." Such a climate is widely viewed as being designed to make it more difficult for Jews to assert their Jewishness and demand the right to emigrate to Israel.

How many of the 2 million Soviet citizens of Jewish background would like to emigrate is not known. For the past eight months, Soviet officials have insisted that most Jews who wanted to leave already have and that Jewish emigration has come to an end.

That argument was advanced recently by officials of an anti-Zionist committee set up in April to wage a propaganda war against Zionists and discourage Jews from applying to emigrate. There is currently a drive, reflected in letters to newspapers, to establish a committee to combat Zionism in Moscow.

The reason for the curtailment of Jewish emigration is believed to be the Kremlin's assessment that it was losing too many trained specialists while gaining nothing in return.

One aspect of the campaign is reflected in numerous articles claiming that Jewish emigres lead a desolate life in Israel and in the West and in accounts about would-be emigrants who changed their minds and decided to stay in the Soviet Union.

Historically, Russian Jewry has been subjected to various forms of repression, including forcible conversion, occupational and geographic restrictions, and persistent attempts to "denationalize" Jewish culture.

While some czars such as Alexander I were relatively tolerant, others were fanatically anti-Semitic, notably Alexander III, under whose regime major pogroms were carried out.

Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state, opposed any form of anti-Semitism. His successor, Josef Stalin, disliked the Jews, and he established an "autonomous region" for them in Birobidzhan in the Soviet Far East. Toward the end of his life, Stalin was on the verge of launching an anti-Semitic campaign with the so-called "doctors' plot," an allegation that Jewish physicians were planning to poison him.

In recent years, anti-Semitism has been more subdued, despite Moscow's major anti-Zionist drive after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. The distinctions between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism, although blurred, were nevertheless observed.

"The Class Essence of Zionism," published here this spring, attempts to eliminate distinctions between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism.

Its publication raises the question of how such a work that violates the Kremlin's stated policy toward nationalities and ethnic groups could have been published. But the fact that the book has received favorable reviews in the official press, including the government newspapers Izvestia and Sovietskaya Kultura, is indicative of the current climate created at least in part by the authorities.

Izvestia said the book would be received with "great interest" by the general reading public. Sovetskaya Kultura, an organ of the Central Committee, said the author's research was "interesting and convincing," and it praised him for writing a "necessary and courageous" volume.

In newspaper articles in recent months, including one in Pionerskaya Pravda, a national newspaper for school children, Korneev has charged that Zionists are trying to turn all Jewish citizens into "traitors."

His articles also assert that all profits from the sales of Levi jeans are channeled directly to "Zionist militarists." He has charged that because the state uses its money for military purposes.

His book is a more ambitious attempt to substantiate this line of thinking. He goes systematically through Jewish history and religion purportedly examining Zionism in its social, economic and political context.

The Jews themselves, Korneev writes, are to be blamed for anti-Semitism. The reason for this allegedly rests on the exploitation of gentile population by wealthy Jews all over the world rather than on racial or religious grounds.

However, the latter play a secondary role in the emergence of anti-Semitism, Korneev writes. He advances the argument that Russian anti-Semitism dates back to the Mongol period, when Genghis Khan and his successors ruled what is now the Soviet Union and allegedly used Jews as tax collectors, a task that the Jews carried out "ruthlessly," he adds.

He charges that pogroms of Jews in czarist Russia and the Ukraine frequently were started by the Jews themselves because "the Zionists wanted to have people emigrate to Palestine."

Korneev argues that "from the very beginning" of the Soviet state, international Zionism sought to undermine socialism, collaborating with anti-Soviet counterrevolutionary leaders.

He then claims that Jewish and Zionist organizations took part in the mass execution of Jews during World War II. The Zionist leadership, he charges, participated in the extermination of hundreds of thousands of non-Zionists and helped Hitler seize power in Germany.

"If it had not been for the Zionist-Nazi alliance, the number of victims, including Jewish victims in World War II, would have been smaller," he writes.

The book, published in an edition of 10,000 copies by Kiev publishing house, has created a controversy among Soviet intellectuals.

At a recent press conference with the newly formed Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee, the question of Korneev's book was raised by western journalists, who asked how the committee regarded the book. The committee's deputy chairman, Samuel Zivs, a law professor, refused to discuss the book and asserted that the Soviet government is against any form of nationalism and anti-Semitism.

Another committee member, Yuri Kolenshnikov, said, however: "This committee in the future will fight against wild and wrong accusations in books which have been written by a few authors and unfortunately have been permitted to be published."●

NASA's VIP LIST

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, the planned landing site of the Space Shuttle was not the only aspect of this recent and historic mission to be overcast by dark clouds.

I would like to enter in the RECORD and bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the following article from the Arizona Republic regarding VIP's at the shuttle launch.

THE OTHER JANE FONDA

Millions of fawning Americans have lionized actress Jane Fonda by buying her diet and exercise book, thereby adding to her

considerable wealth and making her a best-selling author.

There is another Jane Fonda, however, one that she might want to forget, but one whom others cannot forget.

Fonda was the darling of extreme left wing groups who took her anti-American venom deep into the enemy camp in North Vietnam during the war, and willingly consorted with communists to aid and abet their propaganda, even as American prisoners of war were rotting and being tortured in nearby camps.

Arizona Rep. John McCain is one whom will never forget.

McCain, a third generation naval hero, was a prisoner of the North Vietnamese [his Navy jet having been shot down while on a mission] when Fonda arrived in Hanoi for a visit with her communist hosts.

McCain refused to meet with Fonda when she was in Hanoi with the communist hosts, and thereby contribute to the communist propaganda triumph.

For refusing to share the spotlight with Fonda, McCain's captors broke both of his arms.

McCain has now written the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, protesting NASA's decision to "showcase" Fonda and her husband, radical Tom Hayden, as Very Important Persons at last Saturday's launching of the space shuttle *Challenger*.

McCain does not argue the right of Fonda and Hayden to attend the space launching.

But he correctly questions the judgment of NASA in honoring Fonda and Hayden, given her record as a willing and unapologetic propagandist for a wartime enemy.

McCain will always carry a deformed arm as a result of Fonda's visit to North Vietnam.

As for Fonda, she merely has become more famous and immensely wealthier.●

WATT'S ACTIONS DO NOT MIX WITH HIS WORDS

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, faced with one of the most dismal public opinion ratings ever recorded by a public official, Secretary of the Interior James Watt has been on the stump in an effort to make known the "truths" of the program he has been carrying out at the Department of the Interior. Unfortunately, the "truths" he is attempting to spread in numerous public speeches and media interviews are more fiction than fact.

As a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I have had many opportunities to view and take part in a Secretary Watt performance. Make no mistake, his public statements and testimony are a performance, carefully crafted and delivered to focus on a particular view, regardless of the public record.

Even a polished performance has not been able to protect Secretary Watt from the numerous public statements he has made and positions he has taken that have created a public furor and rejection of his work as Secretary of the Interior. What has evolved from this litany of public statements and positions that have been repulsed by the public is a siege mentality at the Department of the Interior in which the Secretary cried foul and claimed he had not been able to present his care to the public.

The Secretary has since undertaken one of the most ambitious travel itineraries of any cabinet member, making himself available for speeches and interviews all over the United States. Instead of clearing up the record through these numerous public speeches and interviews, the Secretary has only served to muddy the waters further, and is attempting to create a false impression to the public as to just what the Secretary has and has not done during his tenure at the Department of the Interior.

The attached article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer illustrates point for point the misstatements the Secretary has been foisting on the public in an effort to counter his poor public standing. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues so that they may have a better understanding of the real thrust of Secretary Watt's policies at the Department of the Interior.

The article follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 9, 1983]

SECRETARY JIM WATT—HIS TRUTH CRUSADE IS A HEAP OF FALSEHOODS

(By Bill Strall)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Interior James G. Watt has persistently employed false statements and half-truths in his crusade to spread the "truth" about his stewardship of public lands and natural resources.

Watt made at least half a dozen factual errors in just one 30-minute CBS television interview program March 27.

On this show and in other forums, Watt tenaciously has brushed aside attempts to debate his figures and statements.

On CBS, on other broadcasts and in official Interior Department statements:

Watt claimed he had not imposed a moratorium on the purchase of new national parklands.

He did impose a moratorium.

Watt denied he ever supported the idea of exploring for oil and gas in wilderness areas.

He did support it.

Watt took credit for boosting historic preservation in America.

Soon after taking office, Watt canceled a longstanding Interior program of aid for historic preservation.

Watt declared there is no truth to reports he considered selling some national park system lands.

Watt is on the record saying the country has acquired too much parkland and that the ideas of disposing of some of it would be considered.

Watt boasted that Congress has supported him on all issues.

Congress repeatedly has rejected Watt proposals.

Watt's office declined a request for an interview. The Interior Department office of public affairs, however, provided written responses on specific points. In general, they acknowledged Watt's comments as a matter of record and sought to explain the statements within the context Watt intended.

For instance, on wilderness areas, the department said: "The secretary's remarks as quoted in the draft article are a matter of record. They do not however, reflect the whole story."

The issues of Watt's "truth" campaign, however, go beyond details of complex federal programs. The misstatements made on CBS March 27, and elsewhere, involve basic national policy. Those statements go to the heart of Watt's programs to encourage development of the nation's public lands and to halt the parkland and wilderness expansion.

In this campaign, Watt has given Americans an inaccurate picture of the state of the nation's parklands and resources upon taking office in 1981 and of actions he has taken since. At times, he has told Congress, and even the president, one thing and then gone on television to tell the American people something else.

Watt has been at odds with his own words. He now denies statements he made. He disclaims actions he took or tried to take.

Complaining that "I can't get the full truth out," Watt has made the rounds of the interview programs in an effort to shore up the credibility of the Reagan administration's record on the environment.

To Watt's critics, some of his comments are so sweepingly erroneous, they do not seem to be worth challenging. However, using charts, citing his own statistics and by being better prepared than his questioners, Watt may have come across to uninformed viewers as effective and credible.

For instance, Watt declared on CBS' "Face the Nation" that "we have gone forward with the full support of the Congress."

Instances of congressional opposition riddle the pages of the Congressional Record. One case was Watt's major initial proposal to change current law so he could use money from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for national park maintenance, repair and construction. The law now limits most of those funds to purchase of park and recreation lands. Congress has repeatedly refused to change it.

In another key Watt program, Watt boasted that "not one congressman has cast one vote at any time against" his sweeping five-year program for leasing outer continental shelf lands for oil and gas exploration and drilling. He is right, technically—because no vote was ever taken. The law provides that such plans go into effect automatically unless Congress specifically votes to reject them during a 60-day review period. Members of Congress are on record as voting against specific lease sales contained in the plan.

Watt insisted on "Face the Nation" that he had not imposed a moratorium on acquisition of new lands for the national park system. "That's obviously not the truth," Watt told moderator George Herman when Herman said he had read about the moratorium.

"No. I've tried to correct that three times on this program," Watt added later when asked about park acquisitions. "Let me say it once more. That is simply not true. We've asked for money every year to acquire additional parklands. Every year."

This contradicts what Watt has done and what he had told Congress and President Reagan over the past two years:

In a report to Reagan early this year. Watt said: "Beginning in 1981, we instituted a moratoriun on adding new units to the park system until needed work in existing parks can be accomplished."

In a statement to the Senate Energy Committee Feb. 24, 1981, Watt said, "At this time, we are proposing a moratorium on new federal land acquisition. This would save nearly $400 million over the next 19 months. We would limit funding during this period to court awards and a limited number of emergency purchases . . ."

And an Interior Department press release on May 7, 1981, said: "Watt said he had placed a moratorium on newly acquisitioned land by the Interior Department as part of major redirection of the parks program.

(In its response, the Interior's office of public affairs said: "There is no moratorium and has been none since June 1981. Watt opposes establishment of new parks, with special exceptions like the Harry Truman home, during this period of tight budgets, but he does not oppose necessary acquisitions of land for existing parks.")

The Interior Department budget has contained funds for purchase of lands for addition to the national park system.

Most of the $240.4 million appropriated in 1982 and 1983 and proposed for fiscal 1984, however, has been mandated by the courts to pay for land acquired or condemned before Reagan and Watt took office.

Watt's 1984 budget for the National Park Service asks $54.7 million for acquisition of parklands. All but $1.4 million of that total—$53.3 million—is budgeted in expectation that Interior will have to pay the money under court order.

No money is budgeted to buy hundreds of thousands of acres of new national park lands authorized by Congress in recent years.

Watt's comments on land acquisition constitute a turnabout on that subject. On "Meet the Press" in January, he lauded the Carter record of cutting back on land purchases, adding, "We've cut it since we have been there. We think that was a good Carter decision." On CBS in March, he decried the Carter reductions and said, "We have sought to restore that."

Watt's arguments are valid in the sense that he has increased spending on facilities such as water and sewage systems and roads in the parks, but the overall Carter budget for park operations, maintenance and construction did not decline in the precipitous fashion Watt claims.

His figures look impressive in part because the 1983 and 1984 budgets include $175 million in highway and road construction funds that come out of the new 5-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax for roads.

The budget increases for which Watt can take credit have little to do with the impression Watt has fostered that the natural resources of the parks themselves have deteriorated and are being rescued by him.

The Carter budget for park operation and maintenance but not construction, increased from $426.1 million in 1977 to $502.4 million in 1981, the year Reagan took office. In 1983, Reagan asked for $539.7 million and Congress appropriated $564.5 million.

Watt failed to tell the full story of another critical Interior issue: whether oil, gas and mineral development should be allowed in wilderness areas.

On "Face the Nation," Watt insisted he always opposed any such activities.

And on the "Larry King Show," Watt said: "Never have we proposed that we would drill or mine the national parks or the wilderness . . . It's the law and we never would have proposed it in the first place."

But on April 22, 1981, Watt told a meeting with the Los Angeles Times' Washington bureau: "Congress has allowed exploratory drilling and mineral activity in wilderness areas. So I'm not changing anything there. That law Congress put into being in 1964 and I think it's right."

And Watt acknowledged, in a March 9, 1982, address to the Izaak Walton League in Des Moines, that the department had granted oil exploration leases on wilderness areas, as had his predecessors.

(Interior responded that Watt voluntarily pledged in early 1982 not to issue any leases in wilderness areas through the end of Congress' 1982 session so lawmakers could consider changes. In February 1982, he proposed a law that would ban all drilling in wilderness areas until the year 2000 unless the president declared a national emergency. The proposal has not gotten out of committee. "This chronology clearly shows that the secretary had indeed been seeking to amend the law to ban leasing in wilderness when he made the 1982-83 statements," Interior said.)

Other Watt statements and the record:

Sell parks: "There's no truth to that at all. There's never been a proposal that we would sell any parkland." ("Face the Nation.")

In a meeting with reporters Feb. 19, 1981, Watt was asked if he was looking to reduce the amount of national parklands. "We're looking at the options. We're open to a lot of ideas. In my judgment, some of the areas in the National Park Service system are not of the significance that deserve the national protection and the commitment of tax dollars."

Offshore oil: Watt said his new five-year plan reversed the "erratic and unpredictable" leasing schedule of his predecessor, Democrat Cecil Andrus. (Statement to House Interior Committee, Jan. 26, 1983.)

The plan was adopted by Andrus before Watt took office. Watt altered it to accelerate the schedule of sales and increase the acreage available to industry.

"For the first time, seven OCS sales were held in one year." (Watt press release, Jan. 11, 1982.)

Alaskan oil: "We leased onshore resources in Alaska for the first time in 15 years." (Letter to Reagan, Jan. 20, 1983.)

Leasing in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska was banned by Congress until 1981. The ban was lifted by Congress at the request of President Carter.

Coal: "There has not been a prohibition against coal leasing in any state at any time . . . You'll see that we have leased more acres than did the Carter administration for coal." ("Face the Nation.")

Watt may have meant a prohibition during his term, but did not say that. The Nixon administration imposed a coal leasing moratorium on all federal lands in 1971. The moratorium was in force until Dec. 20, 1980, when Andrus called for the first lease sale in nearly a decade.

Mining: "The facts are that under our new program, there are more inspectors to enforce reclamation of mined lands than ever in the history of the program." ("Face the Nation.")

Watt did not say so, but he was talking about a total of state and federal inspectors. Watt's own chart showed that the number of federal inspectors was cut from 180 to 69 under him.

Mining rules: Asked if he had proposed changes in the rules governing strip mining, Watt said, "Absolutely not." ("Face the Nation.")

In January, he told Congress that "by the end of February, we will have rewritten 91% of all of the Office of Surface Mining's regulations."

Hunters, fishermen: Watt said, "We're for hunters and fishermen . . . I'm a hunter. Boy, and I champion hunting causes. So the people that hunt and fish, they think Jim Watt's the greatest." ("Larry King Show.")

The 4.5-million National Wildlife Federation composed primarily of hunters and fishermen, called for Watt's resignation. NWF Executive Vice President Jay D. Hair told Reagan that "the overwhelming majority are opposed to policies Mr. Watt has adopted or advocated."

Environment: ". . . We have accomplished these initiatives with more stringent environmental protection stipulations at all phases of the leasing process than any previous administration imposed." (Letter to Reagan, Jan. 20, 1983.)

On March 28, 1983, U.S. District Judge A. David Mazonne of Boston halted a Watt-proposed offshore lease sale in the Georges Bank off the Massachusetts coast. The judge said the sale might have violated four different federal environmental protection laws.

(Interior responded that the ruling would be appealed. Such rulings have been made in the past only to be overturned and the lease sales permitted.)

Clean air, water: "I could not conceive, Bob (Robert Novak, the show's co-host), that this administration would have to contend with a cantankerous Congress that would allow the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Toxic Waste Dump Act—I think that's what it's called—and the Safe Drinking Water Act to expire during the last Congress. What did the Congress do? They voted themselves a raise, but did not address those pieces of legislation." (Evans-Novak program.)

Congress addressed all those programs during 1982. None of the laws expired. They continue in force until Congress passes new legislation.

(Interior responded: "Certainly these problems were addressed by the Congress to the extent that legislation was introduced. However, they were not 'addressed' to the extent that legislation was enacted to provide long-term solutions to the problems. The Congress was evidently unwilling to devote the attention and energy needed to resolve these issues.")●

REPORT ON EL SALVADOR TRIP

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1983

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, TOM HARTNETT, for taking this special order to give Members who visited El Salvador 2 weeks ago the opportunity to discuss their observations. Nothing is more important to the American people and Members of this body than a realistic discussion of conditions in El Salvador and the options which are

available to the U.S. Government in dealing with this situation.

In the past, I have been highly critical of what I have seen in El Salvador, and I remain deeply concerned about the bloodshed—bloodshed which has been caused by both the leftist guerrillas, government military and paramilitary forces. Further, I remain concerned that the Salvadoran system of justice has been so slow to act with respect to the murders of the four American churchwomen slain in El Salvador nearly 3 years ago.

My 4 days in El Salvador have by no means made me an expert on that country and its deep problems. But I came back with a better understanding of what the Magana government is up against and a better appreciation for why continued U.S. assistance is needed.

The problems facing El Salvador today have roots several hundred years old. Solving those problems and ending a pattern of violence which has existed for scores of years is not an easy process. Difficult as the process would be under the best of circumstances, it is made more difficult by an armed insurrection, financed heavily by outside interests, which is aimed primarily at the destruction of the economic and public infrastructure of El Salvador.

But progress is being made. It is slow by our standards, but it is real and significant. On the human rights front, senseless violence continues on both sides. But two items are significant. First, a human rights commission has been established and is chaired by Monsignor Fredy Delagado and composed of seven members representing all sectors of Salvadoran society. Second, the human rights record of Salvadoran combat regiments trained in the United States has been exemplary, and stands in marked contrast to some of the reports of atrocities by other government troops.

In the area of land reform, progress is clear. At the end of May, some 51,000 farmers had filed for land under phase III of the land reform program, which allows former renters and sharecroppers to claim land they have previously worked. A total of 198,000 acres, or 5.5 percent of the country's farmland has been claimed. Including family members, approximately 300,000 rural people now benefit from secure tenure to the land they till. Under all aspects of the land reform program, 21 percent of the arable land in El Salvador has been redistributed.

Unfortunately, in the realm of judiciary reform, less progress is being made. By no means can the Salvadoran judiciary be considered honest and independent. Bribery of judges is still very much in evidence, and threats to judges and their families is in many ways a national pastime. I do sense that national leaders in El Salvador want very much to improve their judicial process, but even under the best of circumstances the Salvadoran judicial code is different from our own, and as slow as our court system is, the Salvadoran system is even slower. Nonetheless I sincerely hope that the accused murderers of the American churchwomen will be brought to justice before the summer is out. I hope, as a member of the Human Rights Commission told me, that the Salvadoran Government "means business" in this case.

A few words must be said about the electoral process. As everyone knows, the Salvadoran elections of 1982 were highly successful and remarkably free of irregularities. El Salvador has scheduled new elections for December of this year. A quasi-independent "Peace Commission" established earlier this year has announced an amnesty program for guerrilla members who are willing to pursue their goals through the electoral process. Many Salvadorans have already taken advantage of the amnesty offer, and shortly before we arrived in El Salvador, 500 of the 700 political prisoners held in Salvadoran jails were released. It seems to me that political reconciliation must be advanced through democratic processes, and those parties who are truly interested in the long-term welfare of the people whose interests they claim to represent should be willing to "put up or shut up." A million and a half Salvadorans voted with ballots not bullets in March 1982. They deserve the right to make that choice again.

Very few individuals oppose the economic assistance we have been giving to El Salvador. But I am firmly convinced that the economic aid we give to El Salvador would be wasted if we did not give the Salvadoran Government the bare minimum it needs to maintain its stability—and we are talking about a bare minimum of assistance. U.S. military assistance to El Salvador is supported not only by Government leaders in that country but by leaders of the Catholic Church in that country as well. The church officials I spoke with told me that an aid cut off would be disastrous. They echoed in large measure an editorial comment in the official Catholic Church newspaper, Orientation, which stated in part:

> Although we admit that El Salvador has not advanced as far as necessary with respect to human rights, we believe that it would be unjust to abandon us to our own fate only to fall unavoidably into the hands of those who give no sign of respecting such rights.

Human rights, democracy, and reform in El Salvador should be the goals of the United States. But we do not enhance the opportunity for these ideas to flourish unless we are willing to give the Salvadoran Government the reasonable opportunity to survive. The democratic processes which we take as second nature are not firmly rooted in Salvadoran society. They will never take root if we are going to abandon the Salvadoran people who believe in them.

There must be no mistaking the fact that the United States has direct national and security interests in El Salvador, and indeed in all of Central America. I will just cite three.

If some people are pained at the plight of boat people fleeing Vietnam and Cambodia, they will be terrified at the thought of 10 million or more people surging northward out of Central America. There are upward of 10 million illegal aliens in this country already, and 500,000 Salvadorans now living here. How will 10 million more be absorbed into our society without causing a substantial drain on the resources of our States and cities and a loss of jobs in an already tight job market?

Second, we must remember that El Salvador is not like Vietnam in that it is on our doorstep. A series of Communist takeovers in Central America would be a threat to the Panama Canal; a threat to Mexico; and a threat to the sealanes through which 50 percent of our trade passes.

Third, what does it do to our long-term credibility if we simply wash our hands and walk away from this vital area? Recent history is replete with examples of failed U.S. commitments to our allies. Those people who have traditionally looked to the United States for leadership will have yet another reason to rely on someone else.

But in the final analysis, we do not even have to look at this issue in terms of our own national interest. We need look no further than the perspective of the Salvadoran people. Whatever the negative effects a cut off of military aid would have on our own interests, the impact on the people of El Salvador would be infinitely worse.●

DEFER EFFECTIVE DATE OF RULE CHANGES

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to defer the effective date of proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. These rules govern cases in Federal courts.

The proposed amendments were submitted by the Supreme Court to Congress on April 28, 1983, pursuant to provisions of law known as the Rules Enabling Acts. The acts authorize the

Court to propose amendments to existing rules of "practice and procedure" by transmitting them to Congress after the start of a regular session, but no later than May 1. The amendments take effect 90 days after transmittal, unless Congress acts to the contrary. The purpose of the 90-day delay is to provide Congress with an opportunity to review the proposals.

The proposals transmitted last April 28 have stimulated a significant amount of controversy. The Committee on the Judiciary, which I chair, has received requests from members of the bench and bar, and from the academic community, to delay or disapprove the proposed rule changes. There have been a number of law review articles written that raise significant questions about specific aspects of the changes, as well as about the overall thrust of the changes.

The proposals to alter the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, according to the Advisory Committee notes explaining the proposals, are intended to cure perceived abuses in the discovery process; though there is dispute about the extent of any alleged abuse. Accordingly, the proposals to change rule 11 impose upon attorneys the additional burden of certifying the "reasonableness" of the discovery device employed, "given the needs of the case * * * and the importance of the issues at stake in the litigation." In addition, under proposed changes to rule 16, the trial court would be required, within 120 days of the filing of the complaint, to issue a scheduling order that limits the time for the filing of motions and the completion of discovery and other matters. The judge, prior to trial could eliminate "frivolous" claims and evidence and impose sanctions, including attorneys fees—to be paid by a party, the attorney or both—for failure to abide by the scheduling order. Moreover, the proposed amendment to rule 26 would authorize the judge to limit discovery and require the judge to impose sanctions for failure to comply with the certification requirement.

These proposals would undoubtedly alter the character of the relationship between the litigants and the court in civil actions. Under the present rules, and consistent with our adversarial system of justice, the judge's role is that of impartial arbiter, and it is primarily up to the litigants to control the manner in which the litigation proceeds. The proposals shift the burden to the courts to process the cases expeditiously. Judges, practitioners, and scholars have suggested that the proposals place too much unchecked power in the hands of the judges and do little to enhance the efficiency of the courts. They voice concern that scarce judicial resources will be diverted to managerial tasks and, at the same time, that the new provisions will stimulate new cases and further divert the attention of the judges.

Similarily, the proposals to change the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure will have a significant impact on the disposition of criminal cases in Federal courts. The proposals affect various aspects of the criminal justice process. For example, the proposed change in rule 23(b) would permit a verdict by a jury of 11 when 1 juror is justifiably excused after the jury has begun deliberating on the verdict. Critics of the proposed change argue that relaxing the longstanding 12 member jury rule will foster pressure to remove a recalcitrant juror and thereby interfere with the traditional, unanimous verdict.

The proposals would amend rule 11, which sets forth specific procedures for accepting a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, by adding a harmless error rule that permits a court to disregard any deviations from the specified procedures unless the deviation affects substantial rights. In 1975, Congress redrafted the rule to insure that a defendant pleading guilty or nolo contendere is fully aware of the consequences of his or her decision. The record of the proceeding enables an appellate court to assess the voluntariness of plea and thereby protects against groundless attacks on the plea proceeding by disgruntled defendants. Critics argue that the new section will thwart the purpose of rule 11 by allowing courts to accept pleas even though, as disclosed by the record, the defendant has not been fully informed about the consequences of the plea as specified in the rule.

Another proposal would permit a court to extend the life of a grand jury—now 18 months—by 6 months upon a finding that the "extension is in the public interest." Congress addressed the issue of the proper length of the term of a grand jury in 1970. Congress determined then that a court could extend the life of the grand jury but only under well-defined circumstances. The proposed amendment permits the extension arguably for any reason. Critics suggest that, aside from encouraging sloppy work by prosecutors, this provision enables the Government to wield even more than the considerable power it already has by enlarging the time within which one may be incarcerated for contempt. They suggest such a change is unnecessary in light of the few cases in which an extension may be appropriate and the court's current power to convene a special grand jury.

I have mentioned only some of the changes. The package of materials contains others, many of which have produced letters of concern and requests for delay.

The purpose of my bill is to defer the effective date of the amendments so that we can take a close look at them. The critics of the proposed changes include: Federal judges, bar associations, law professors, lawyers in private practice, and public defender associations. Some of the critics have questioned the wisdom of the specific amendments; some have questioned the power of the court under the Rules Enabling Acts to promulgate rules that affect the substance of litigation; and some have even questioned the constitutionality of various proposals. It may be that the opponents of the specific changes are sounding unnecessary alarms, but it would be an abdication of our responsibility under the Rules Enabling Acts to ignore these alarms.

I do not have the answers to the questions raised by the critics. The questions, however, are important ones which the Congress should have an opportunity to debate. The Enabling Acts provide 90 days within which Congress must act if it is to partake in the rulemaking process. This time period does not permit a detailed examination and resolution of the questions. My legislation will give Congress the time it needs to do that job. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this bill to defer the effective date of the rules changes.●

CHILD HIGHWAY SAFETY

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce a bill to improve child highway safety. Over the last three decades we have seen the death rate for preschool children decline by 53 percent. Virtually all of this decline resulted from a 62-percent reduction in death rates for medical illness. In contrast, the combined rate of child pedestrian and child passenger deaths remained unchanged. Highway death is the only major cause of death for these children that has not declined. In fact today it is the single leading cause of death in children. For this reason I believe we must immediately recognize that highway deaths and injuries are the No. 1 public health threat that all our children face.

The bill I am introducing today provides a program to meet this challenge. It encourages each State to combine their wisdom and experience in administering programs within their State, with the knowledge accumulated through implementation by many States of model child highway safety programs, to put forth a child highway safety program that will work best in that individual State.

The Federal Government's interest in protecting the Nation's children has a long, successful history. Federal dol-

lars have been well spent for State programs in maternal and child health, nutrition, primary care, and immunizations. The combined Federal/State programs in these areas have resulted in the significant decline of deaths due to medical illness I cited earlier. We must now also turn our attention to motor vehicle safety and put an end to the senseless and easily preventable tragedy of so many of our children needlessly dying on our highways.

I am especially proud to introduce this bill as it builds upon the hard work of many of my fellow Tennesseans. I particularly would like to note the efforts of Dr. Robert Sanders, Dr. Sam Carney, Dr. Ed Caldwell, and Mr. Edward Casey. Mr. Casey of Nashville, Tenn., first had the idea for a child passenger safety law back in 1975. Dr. Robert Sanders of Murfreesboro, Tenn., with the help of his wife Pat and Drs. Carney and Caldwell, worked tirelessly to see that dream realized. Through an act that has truly demonstrated unique dedication, they have taken Mr. Casey's idea and today can share a large part of the credit in the great strides that have been made.

In 1977 Tennessee became the first State to enact child highway safety legislation. I am happy to report that this law and the carefully crafted programs that emerged to complement this law have met with dramatic success. Since the law took effect in 1978, there unfortunately have still been 71 deaths among children age 0 to 4 years, but only two of these deaths involved children using safety restraints; and of those two, one was registered in an accident classified as nonsurvivable and in the other, officials suspect the device may have been improperly installed. Even more important, State estimates show that at least 80 young lives have been saved in the 5½ years since Tennessee's law was implemented. As a result, Tennessee's program now serves as a model many States choose to follow. As of today 40 States plus the District of Columbia have joined Tennessee in passing similar legislation mandating the use of child restraints by preschool children.

This has been a fine beginning. However, experience has shown that the enactment of a law is just that, only a beginning. For a successful program leading to a reduction in deaths and injuries the law must be part of a larger comprehensive strategy.

There are several important steps that the bill I am introducing today takes to provide just that strategy.

First, it provides incentives to encourage all States to pass laws requiring the proper use of child passenger restraints. Second, it helps States with the initial resources and expertise necessary to build their law into an effective program tailored to their local needs. Third, it stresses the importance of education as a means of achieving the desired behavior changes. Fourth, it provides for child safety seat longer programs, a provision particularly important for low-income families. Fifth, it encourages States to recognize the equally important problem of child pedestrian safety.

Accidental deaths of child pedestrians is a problem that is not often discussed, so I would like to share some figures with my colleagues that illustrate the importance of including a child pedestrian program as an integral part of this legislation. In 1981, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) data show in the 0- to 4-year age group there were 329 pedestrian deaths as compared to 633 passenger deaths. However, in the 5- to 9-year age group there were 549 pedestrian deaths as compared to 390 passenger deaths. Recent studies completed by the Department of Transportation have resulted in the availability of a comprehensive program for child pedestrian safety. This program, which is available to States, has been demonstrated extremely effective in reducing deaths and injuries caused in motor vehicle accidents involving child pedestrians.

Clearly the time is right for us to act. We have the means and the technology to prevent many of these tragic deaths. We need only recognize the problem and provide the States with the means to implement effective comprehensive programs to complement their laws. This bill does that. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this legislation. I look forward to working with all concerned parties to insure that American children are adequately protected.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. 3483

A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide incentive grants in order to encourage States to adopt and enforce laws requiring the proper use of child restraint systems by children in motor vehicles, to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the issuance of a Federal motor vehicle safety standard, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Child Highway Safety Act".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) motor vehicle accidents are the leading cause of death for children;

(2) motor vehicle accidents are a leading cause of serious injury to and disability of children;

(3) child pedestrian deaths account for one-half of the total highway deaths of children and primarily occur in heavily populated areas;

(4) child restraint systems when used properly are 90 percent effective in preventing deaths of children and 67 percent effective in preventing disabling injuries to children;

(5) State laws requiring the use of child restraint system have resulted in dramatic reductions in both deaths of and injuries to children;

(6) State laws requiring the use of child restraint systems when implemented together with child safety seat loaner programs and education programs result in comprehensive State programs that significantly enhance the effectiveness of such laws;

(7) education programs concerning child pedestrian safety which target countermeasures to specific types of highway accidents have been demonstrated to be an effective means of substantially reducing the number of child pedestrian deaths; and

(8) current State initiatives, although extremely encouraging, lack the resources necessary for successful implementation of comprehensive and effective child highway safety programs.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide States with incentive grants to assure the timely and widespread enactment of child highway safety laws and implementation of comprehensive and effective child highway safety programs.

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 409. Child highway safety programs

"(a)(1) Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall make grants to those States which establish and implement child passenger safety programs. Such grants may only be used by recipient States to implement such programs.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (4), a State shall be eligible for a grant under this subsection for a fiscal year if (A) it has in effect a law that requires the proper use of child restraint systems by children in motor vehicles and that includes an enforcement program, and (B) it enters into such agreements as the Secretary may require under paragraph (3).

"(3) No grant may be made to a State under this subsection in any fiscal year unless the State enters into such agreements with the Secretary as the Secretary may require—

"(A) to ensure that the State will maintain in such fiscal year its aggregate expenditures from non-Federal sources for child passenger safety programs (excluding expenditures for acquisition of child restraint systems) at or above the average level of such expenditures in its three fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this section;

"(B) to ensure that the State will establish and implement in such fiscal year a program to lend or rent, at reasonable rates, child restraint systems to parents and guardians of children who are required to use such systems in motor vehicles under the laws of such State;

"(C) to ensure that the State will expend in such fiscal year an amount, which is not less than 60 percent of the amount of the grant, for establishment and implementation of a program to educate the public and law enforcement personnel concerning (i) the need for using child restraint systems, (ii) the proper installation and use of such systems, and (iii) the manner in which the law requiring proper use of such systems will be enforced; and

"(D) to ensure that the State collects, and submits to the Secretary, annually such data as the Secretary shall require on (i) the number of deaths of children as a result of

motor vehicle accidents, (ii) the number of injuries to children as a result of motor vehicle accidents, (iii) the types of motor vehicle accidents, (iii) the types of motor vehicle accidents that result in deaths of or injuries to children, and (iv) the usage of child restraint systems by children in motor vehicles involved in such accidents.

The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum standards for the programs referred to in clauses (B), (C), and (D). The minimum standards for the program referred to in clause (B) shall include, but not be limited to, a standard which requires that child restraint systems be lent or rented to parents and guardians who are economically disadvantaged at rates which such parents and guardians are able to afford. The minimum standards for the program referred to in clause (C) shall include, but not be limited to, a standard which requires that at least one-third of the amount expended by the State pursuant to such clause in any fiscal year shall be expended for establishment and implementation of nonmedia promotion and education programs. Funds expended by a State under clauses (B), (C), and (D) may include Federal funds provided by a grant made to the State under this subsection.

"(4) No grant may be made to a State under this subsection in fiscal year 1987, 1988, or 1989, unless such State—

"(A) received a grant under this subsection in fiscal year 1984, 1985, or 1986; and

"(B) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary—

"(i) a reduction in the mortality rates, injury rates, or both, for children required in such State to use child restraint systems in motor vehicles; or

"(ii) an increase in the usage of child restraint systems by such children in motor vehicles involved in accidents;

from calendar year 1983 (or calendar year 1979, 1980, 1981, or 1982 if the Secretary determines such calendar year is more appropriate for comparative purposes) to the last calendar year of calendar years 1984, 1985, and 1986 in which such State received a grant under this subsection.

"(5)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall determine the amount of a grant made under this subsection for a fiscal year to a State.

"(B) The maximum amount of a grant made under this subsection for a fiscal year to a State shall be determined by the Secretary so as to reflect the extent to which the child passenger safety program such State is implementing in such fiscal year exceeds the requirements established under paragraph (2); except that such maximum amount shall not exceed 9 percent, and shall not be less than 4.5 percent, of the amount apportioned to such State for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983, under section 402 of this title.

"(C) A grant for the maximum amount authorized under subparagraph (B) for a fiscal year may only be made under this subsection to a State which is implementing in such fiscal year a law which, at a minimum, requires the proper use of a child restraint system in a motor vehicle by all children—

"(i) who weigh less than 40 pounds,

"(ii) who have a height of less than 40 inches, or

"(iii) who are less than 4 years of age.

"(b)(1) Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall make grants to those States which establish and implement child pedestrian safety programs. Such grants may only be used by recipient States to implement such programs.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (4), a State shall be eligible for a grant under this subsection for a fiscal year if (A) it enters into such agreement as the Secretary may require to implement an effective child pedestrian safety program, and (B) it enters into such agreements as the Secretary may require under paragraph (3).

"(3) No grant may be made to a State under this subsection in any fiscal year unless the State enters into such agreements with the Secretary as the Secretary may require—

"(A) to ensure that the State will maintain in such fiscal year its aggregate expenditures from non-Federal sources for child pedestrian safety programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in its three fiscal years preceding the date of enactment of this section;

"(B) to ensure that the State will expend in such fiscal year an amount, which is not less that 60 percent of the amount of the grant, for establishment and implementation of a program to educate the public and law enforcement personnel concerning the need for child pedestrian safety, the types of child pedestrian accidents most often occuring within the area, and the countermeasures which will prevent those accident types;

"(C) to ensure that the State collects, and submits to the Secretary, annually such data as the Secretary shall require on (i) the number of deaths of children as a result of motor vehicle accidents, (ii) the number of injuries to children as a result of motor vehicle accidents, and (iii) the types of motor vehicle accidents that result in deaths of or injuries to children, and

"(D) to ensure that the State will expend in such fiscal year an amount, which is not less than 40 percent of the amount of the grant, for child pedestrian safety programs in urban areas.

The Secretary shall, by regulation, establish minimum standards for the programs referred to in clauses (B) and (C). The minimum standards for the program referred to in clause (B) shall include, but not be limited to, a standard which requires that at least one-third of the amount expended by the State pursuant to such clause in any fiscal year shall be expended for establishment and implementation of nonmedia promotion and education programs. Funds expended by a State under clauses (B), (C), and (D) may include Federal funds provided by a grant made to the State under this subsection.

"(4) No grant may be made to a State under this subsection in fiscal year 1987, 1988, or 1989, unless such State—

"(A) received a grant under this subsection in fiscal year 1984, 1985, or 1986; and

"(B) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary a reduction in the number of child pedestrian deaths or injuries or both from calendar year 1983 (or calendar year 1979, 1980, 1981, or 1982 if the Secretary determines such calendar year is more appropriate for comparative purposes) to the last calendar year of calendar years 1984, 1985, and 1986 in which such State received a grant under this subsection.

"(5)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall determine the amount of a grant made under this subsection for a fiscal year to a State.

"(B) The maximum amount of a grant made under this subsection for a fiscal year to a State shall be determined by the Secretary so as to reflect the extent to which the child pedestrian safety program such State is implementing in such fiscal year exceeds the requirements established under paragraph (2); except that such maximum amount shall not exceed 3 percent of the amount apportioned to such State for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983, under section 402 of this title.

"(C) A grant for the maximum amount authorized under subparagraph (B) for a fiscal year may only be made under this subsection to a State which enters into an agreement with the Secretary to implement a child pedestrian safety education program which, at a minimum, includes the following:

"(i) designation of a single agency to carry out such program;

"(ii) identification of circumstances and factors which result in child pedestrian accidents, including an assessment of types of child pedestrian accidents; and

"(iii) use of targeted countermeasures for each type of child pedestrian accident.

"(c) After consultation with the Surgeon General, the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this section, including but not limited to, regulations to establish mandatory safety standards for child restraint systems and minimum standards regarding enforcement of child restraint system laws. Final regulations to carry out this section shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section.

"(d) Of the amount appropriated to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall set aside $500,000 to carry out in such fiscal year evaluation, research, and demonstration projects concerning child pedestrian safety and child passenger safety. Such projects shall be designed to reduce mortality and injury rates for children resulting from usage of motor vehicles. The Secretary, acting through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, shall enter into contracts with persons who have experience in evaluating or implementing child highway safety programs to carry out such projects.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, out of the Highway Trust Fund, $64,000,000 for the six-fiscal-year period ending September 30, 1989. All provisions of chapter 1 of this title that are applicable to Federal-aid primary highway funds, other than provisions relating to the apportionment formula and provisions limiting the expenditure of such funds to Federal-aid systems, shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, except as determined by the Secretary to be inconsistent with this section. Sums authorized by this subsection shall not be subject to any obligation limitation for State and community highway safety programs.

"(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'motor vehicle' means any vehicle driven or drawn by mechanical power manufactured primarily for use on public highways, except (1) any vehicle operated exclusively on a rail or rails, (2) any vehicle providing taxicab service, and (3) any vehicle having a capacity of 15 or more passengers.".

(b) The analysis for chapter 4 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end there of the following:

"409. Child highway safety programs.".

Sec. 4. Section 103 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1392) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) Not later than 4 months after the date of the enactment of the Child Highway Safety Act, the Secretary shall promulgate a Federal motor vehicle safety standard under which manufacturers of passenger motor vehicles would be required to install in such vehicles anchorages, or provide predrilled holes in such vehicles to attach tether anchorages, for child restraint systems.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'passenger motor vehicle' means any motor vehicle which is a passenger car or multipurpose passenger vehicle (as defined in section 571.3 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect October 1, 1982); and

"(B) the term 'child restraint system' has the meaning given such term by section 571.213 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect October 1, 1982.".●

WHAT HAPPENS WITHOUT THE LEGISLATIVE VETO

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing our Government after last week's Supreme Court decision on the legislative veto have long been anticipated by James Sundquist, of the Brookings Institution. In an article written by Sundquist which appeared in the Los Angeles Times, on February 26, 1982, and which I placed in the RECORD on March 4, 1982, he predicted that a logjam would occur in Government without the legislative veto.

Following the Court's decision, Mr. Sundquist wrote, in the Washington Post on June 26, 1983, of the effectiveness of the legislative veto and of the purpose it served. Mr. Sundquist observes that "Insofar as this device of accommodation is now rendered unavailable, the two branches are condemned that much more often to the confrontation, stalemate and deadlock that so frequently leave the government of the United States impotent to cope with complex problems."

While it does us no good to bemoan the decision of the Supreme Court, I think that it would behoove us to review Sundquist's arguments. As we look for alternatives to the legislative veto, Mr. Sundquist's discussion reminds us of the severity of the problem we face. At this point I would like to place in the RECORD the articles by James Sundquist.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 26, 1982]

LEGISLATIVE-VETO ISSUE: WILL IT END IN A LOGJAM?

(By James L. Sundquist)

A constitutional dispute a half-century old appears finally headed for resolution by the U.S. Supreme Court, with profound implication for the practical conduct of government. At issue is a device invented in 1932 to enable Congress to delegate power to the President or to agencies of the executive branch, yet reserve the right to veto actions taken under the executive power.

Critics of the legislative veto contend that it permits Congress to meddle in the administration of laws, exerting improper influence and authority over decisions that should belong exclusively to the executive. They can make a strong case, but it overlooks a practical reality. If Congress is not permitted to veto actions taken under delegated power, it can simply refuse to delegate the powers in the first place. It can retain the decision-making authority, to be exercised through statute, but that will further clog the overloaded congressional calendar and result in delays and deadlocks on matters that urgently require action.

The specific case before the court arises from a ruling by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco a year ago that struck down a legislative-veto provision in the statute regulating the deportation of aliens. Late last month, the Circuit Court for the District of Columbia rendered a much broader decision in a natural-gas-pricing case, appearing to outlaw the legislative veto in all forms and circumstances as a violation of the separation-of-powers doctrine of the Constitution. If the Supreme Court upholds that position, the veto provision in about 200 statutes will be invalid.

The veto came into being as a compromise in 1932, when Congress was unwilling to give President Herbert Hoover a free hand to reorganize government bureaus, yet could not do the job itself. Its solution was to authorize the President to issue reorganization orders provided that the House or the Senate could disapprove any such order within 60 days. Although Hoover signed the bill, his attorney general concluded a few months later that the arrangement was unconstitutional and a bad precedent. The Justice Department has stuck by that position ever since, sometimes (as, notably, in the Carter Administration) while the President was acquiescing in, or even advocating the legislative-veto provisions as the way to break legislative logjams.

How will those logjams be broken in the future if the legislative veto is outlawed? Certainly in many cases the executive branch will not gain power but will be the loser. Reorganization of the government is a case in point. Congress will be no more willing to trust President Reagan or any future President to recast the governmental structure on his own than it was willing to trust Hoover. Every reorganization will have to be achieved through a congressional act, and few that are controversial are likely to become law.

In the War Powers Resolution of 1973, the legislative veto was the key to settling an even older and more urgent constitutional issue, over who has the power to involve the United States in war. Congress was again reluctant, and understandably so, to give the President carte blanche to use military forces anywhere in the world solely at his own discretion. Yet it recognized that sometimes the President has to act in crises, immediately and forcefully. The artfully crafted compromise that was adopted—over President Richard M. Nixon's veto—authorized the President to respond to emergencies with military force, but gave Congress the right to reverse the President's decision.

In the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the President is prohibited from refusing to expend appropriated funds, but is allowed to defer expenditures, subject to a legislative veto. Without such a cimplified procedure, every such action would have to go through the full legislative process. The result would inevitably be fewer deferrals—in other words, more spending.

Similarly with regulatory agencies. For Congress to have review veto power over rules and regulations can be pernicious, but without it the legislators can simply withhold authority—telling the Federal Trade Commission, for example, to draft its regulations as proposed bills, to be enacted into law.

The list of cases could go on. But they all add up to this: If the executive branch finally wins its case against the legislative veto, it will live to regret its victory. Tension and conflict will increase within the government, many deadlocks between the branches will prove unbreakable, and problems that demand urgent attention will go unresolved.

The Supreme Court may hold that in interpreting the constitutional language it is not permitted to take practical considerations into account, although there are many occasions when it has done so. But the constitutional separation of powers surely introduces enough difficulties into the operation of the government already, without the addition of a new rigidity that would prevent statesmen from working out on a case-by-case basis the kind of power relationships that so far—on balance—have served the country well.

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1983]

WITHOUT THE LEGISLATIVE VETO . . . MORE CONFRONTATION, STALEMATE, DEADLOCK

(By James L. Sundquist)

When the Supreme Court on Thursday outlawed the legislative veto, one wire service in its lead paragraph described the action as a "shattering blow to congressional power."

Reporters who must interpret an event within minutes of its happening can be forgiven a hasty judgment. But this particular judgment certainly qualifies as premature. A better guess is that, in the long run, the Supreme Court decision will prove to be a shattering blow to executive power.

Which branch won, however, is not the important consideration. The crucial point is that the court—if its ruling turns out to be as sweeping as it at first appears—has destroyed an ingenious device that has been worked out, usually cooperatively, by practical people in both the legislative and executive branches to overcome the conflict that is inherent in a government of separate and independent branches.

The court in its decision took some pride in defending and preserving the separation of powers written into our governmental structure by the Founding Fathers 200 years ago. One need not second-guess the court in divining what the Fathers had in mind. The court majority is, in all probability, quite right in its interpretation of 18th-century political philosophy. But it is a pity that that philosophy could not in this instance have somehow been made to accord with the practical experience of politicians and administrators in trying to fulfill the responsibilities of government in 20th-century America.

The fundamental problem, in trying to make the government of the United States work effectively, is not to preserve the separation of powers but to overcome it. For anything of consequence to be accomplished, the executive and legislative branches must be brought from confrontation into a reasonable degree of harmony. The legislative veto is a device that has served that purpose, providing even in cases of severe disagreement and distrust a frame-

work wherein decisions can still be made expeditiously and actions taken. Insofar as this device of accommodation is now rendered unavailable, the two branches are condemned that much more often to the confrontation, stalemate and deadlock that so frequently leave the government of the United States impotent to cope with complex problems.

The first and longest use of the legislative veto is as good a case as any to illustrate the utility of the device. Fifty years ago Congress, recognizing that the departments of the government need to be reorganized from time to time to keep abreast of changing responsibilities, reached the obvious conclusion the Congress would not and could not do that job. To make all the necessary organizational changes through the legislative process was just too tedious, difficult and complicated—requiring hearings, committee consideration and floor debate in both houses, and House-Senate conference committees whenever the houses disagreed. Given this procedure, reorganization questions tended not to be considered at all; the structure of the government remained essentially frozen while its responsibilities grew and changed. One answer would have been to let the president, as the head of the executive branch, organize it as he pleased. Yet Congress was unwilling to give any president *carte blanche* to create and dissolve agencies and move them from department to department. So the legislative veto was invented: let the president reorganize the executive branch, but subject to the right of Congress to veto any scheme before it took effect. Under this arrangement, which has been satisfactory to both Congress and presidents alike for half a century, the structure of the government has generally been kept abreast of the times. Now and then Congress rejects a presidential reorganization plan, but most of the plans have been allowed to take effect, and the laborious and—for this purpose—ineffective legislative process has been circumvented.

Since its invention in the 1930s, the legislative veto has been used over and over again, by now more than 200 times. In my judgment, it has been overused, applied more frequently than it should have been. But each case has been a matter of executive-legislative negotiation, in the course of hammering out one or another practical compromise, and most have been mutually acceptable. In fact, in many cases, the legislative veto has been the means of achieving historic compromises that have resolved central constitutional questions over which the two branches have quarreled for decades. One such example is the War Powers Resolution of 1973—passed over President Nixon's veto, to be sure—which, until last Thursday, had settled the question of the extent to which the president may engage in military operations without a declaration of war by Congress. Another is the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, which was welcomed by President Nixon as the resolution of the acrimonious dispute over whether the president could refuse to spend money Congress had appropriated. In both cases, the president is given a limited delegation of authority: he may act, but Congress can reverse him if it disagrees.

The supposition that the court decision strikes "a shattering blow" at congressional power rests on the premise that in the absence of the veto the president will receive, instead of restricted grants of authority, unrestricted grants. But there is no reason whatever to believe that Congress will behave that way. In most circumstances where Congress has demanded a veto as the condition for granting power to the executive, it will simply retain the power in itself—which, constitutionally, it has every right to do. It will tell the president to recommend instead of giving him a contingent right to act.

In the case of reorganization, for example, it has never given a president unrestrained authority except during war emergencies—either before or after the legislative veto was invented. We can safely conclude it will not do so in the future. So, as a practical matter, the court has returned the country to the old days; if the government is to be reorganized in any significant respects, it will have to be done by statute—which means it will rarely be reorganized at all.

In the case of impoundment of appropriated funds, where the president and Congress have been routinely deferring expenditures under the simple legislative veto procedure, a blanket authorization to the president is likewise not conceivable. So deferrals will have to be enacted by statute, which can only mean that they will be fewer and more money will be spent. In these and many other matters, presidents and executive agencies will have less, not more, real delegation of authority.

Besides simply refusing to grant discretion in the first place, Congress has many other means of forcing the executive branch to behave as the legislators wish. Executive actions now subject to legislative vetoes can be barred through riders on appropriations and authorization bills. Those procedures are, compared with the legislative veto, clumsy and cumbersome—but they have been, and can be, totally effective. Assuming that Congress will continue to be jealous of its powers and suspicious of presidents and their subordinates—surely a safe assumption—the court's decision can be expected to increase friction between the branches, load an already overloaded Congress with more responsibilities that it is ill-equipped to handle, replace simple with complex processes of congressional control and, on occasion, tie the government in knots, without reducing congressional power in the least.

But there is one saving thought. In the process of amending the Constitution, the executive branch plays no formal part, either in the federal government or in the states. Amendments are proposed by Congress, with no need for approval by the president, and they are ratified by the state legislatures, with no approval by the governors. So, if legislators desire to restore the legality of the device they have invented and fostered—and if executives as a matter of principle resist—the constitutional amendment process is stacked heavily in favor of the legislators. The "shattering blow," if such it be, can be recouped with the executive branch merely a bystander in the process.●

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUATION OF THE GUERNSEY SILT RUN

HON. DICK CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I represent the members of the irrigation districts located in the Wyoming part of the North Platte irrigation project, which itself is located in both Wyoming and Nebraska. For many years, the irrigation districts have employed on a seasonal basis a natural water conservation practice known as the silt run. A silt run allows water released from storage and containing silt to flow into the irrigation project distribution systems, lining those distribution systems and increasing their conveyance efficiency substantially.

In the past few years, the North Platte project and the Secretary of the Interior have disagreed about whether, and on what terms, the silt run should be allowed to continue. The disagreement occurs essentially because the United States some time ago purchased certain hydropower facilities from the project and now claims the right to maximize power output from them even though this would impair or prevent the silt run, a custom which clearly predates the purchase of the facilities.

I have reviewed the correspondence between the Department and the irrigation districts concerning the dispute. I have also reviewed additional materials collected and supplied to me by the irrigators. On the basis of this review, I believe it is likely that representatives of the U.S. Government promised the irrigation districts during the hydropower negotiations that the customary silt run could continue. Recent Department of the Interior analyses of the dispute appear to concede that such promises were made.[1] Nothing in the contracts between the United States and the project is to the contrary.

For these reasons, I remain unconvinced by the Department's position that its contracts, although silent on this issue, do not allow or require the continuation of the silt run, or that they would allow the Department to impose unspecified, and potentially very burdensome, charges on the irrigators if the silt run interrupts power generation.

It seems to me that in this situation, the Government should be required to keep its promises, and this is what the legislation I introduced yesterday would do. The legislation would require the Department to continue the silt run in return for only those charges already explicitly spelled out for water deliveries under existing contractual agreements.●

[1] Guernsey Silt Run—Power Interference charges: An Analysis Report, pp. 25-27 (DOI, April 1983).

FAILURE OF U.S. POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, our policy toward Central America raises some of the most serious and troublesome questions facing our Nation today. This administration has instituted a policy which places increasing emphasis on military aid and on military solutions to problems which are the result of social, economic, and political injustice.

This policy is not in the best interests of the United States, nor is it in the best interests of the people of Central America. Instead of relying on military assistance to prop up governments with little popular support, we should be using our considerable influence to encourage progressive and equitable development in the region.

Two recent articles illustrate the inherent fallacies in the Reagan administration's policy. The June 16 editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press discusses the counterproductive nature of our military aid. It also points to the chilling possibility that this administration may become a victim of its own cold war rhetoric and become so deeply involved that it cannot extricate itself from deeper and deeper military involvement. The second article was published in the New York Times on June 17. It was written by our former Ambassador to El Salvador, Murat Williams. This article poignantly illustrates the futility of this administration's propensity to rely on military solutions. More specifically, he identifies the social and economic inequalities of life in El Salvador, which prevent the Salvadoran military from gaining the support of the people or even the support of Salvadoran troops.

Mr. Speaker, these are both excellent articles which reflect my concerns about our current path in Central America, and I believe they also reflect the concerns of the majority of the American people. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, June 16, 1983]

SINKING KNEE-DEEP IN CENTRAL AMERICA

The United States military involvement in Central America becomes deeper and deeper by the day. Soon it may be at the point of no return.

Tuesday, 100 (possibly more) U.S. Army Special Forces troops—Green Berets—arrived in Honduras. They are there, ostensibly, to train several thousand Salvadoran troops in guerrilla warfare. But they will also train soldiers "from other Central American countries" (read: anti-Sandinista Nicaraguans), and a Honduran army spokesman said their main purpose is the training of Hondurans.

Whatever they are supposed to be doing, they ought not to be doing it.

There is a congressionally-imposed limit of 55 on the number of American military advisers in El Salvador. Sending 100 Green Berets to train Salvadorans in neighboring Honduras obviously is the administration's sneaky way of getting around that limit, in defiance not only of Congress but of the American people, who have expressed through public opinion polls and in other ways, their strong objection to further military involvement in Central America.

Nor should the Berets be in Honduras to train "other" Central Americans. Such a move gives the lie to the protestations of the Reagan administration that the United States is doing nothing to overthrow the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. Few have ever actually believed these protestations; each new step toward direct intervention makes them sillier and more hypocritical.

Well, then, what about just training Hondurans? Shouldn't we help them protect themselves against a revolution that might bring communism to yet another small republic?

Rather than protecting them against a revolution, sending U.S. troops to Honduras will probably only hasten its coming. The move will almost certainly strengthen the hand of the Honduran military—like nearly every other Latin military, eager to grab power—and weaken the young and shaky civilian-run government. A military coup will in turn bring greater repression and fuel more insurgency.

The 100 Green Berets are by no means the only American presence in Honduras. They joined about 90 "advisers" already there. There are another 60 military personnel at a radar station (it's supposed to trace shipments of arms from Nicaragua to El Salvador). The CIA is said to have about 100 operatives in the country. There are reports of plans for as many as six American-built (and American-manned?) airfields.

The consequences of the administration's policies range in unpleasantness from merely promoting the growth of anti-American feeling throughout Latin America to, at worst, another wrong-headed, hopeless war, fought for all the wrong reasons in the wrong places.

[From the New York Times, June 17, 1983]

LIMITS IN AIDING SALVADOR

(By Murat W. Williams)

MADISON MILLS, VA.—"Give me one regiment of my old First Division and I can clean up all Central America." Those were the words of a United States Army adviser in El Salvador 35 years ago—in 1948, after he had spend some months on duty as director of the Salvadoran military academy.

I listened with respect because he had had a spectacular war record with the First Division of the United States Army in Europe. Since then, I have often wondered whether he was among the Pentagon planners who recommended sending troops to Vietnam, first in modest numbers and then in hundreds of thousands.

I have wondered more recently whether one of his like-minded successors is making plans now to reinforce the American advisers in El Salvador and whether he will ultimately feel that perhaps two regiments of the "Big Red 1," the old First Division, or the Marine Corps will suffice to "clean up" Central America.

If so, I hope they will hesitate long enough to review the military record of the uniformed forces in El Salvador whom we have grappled to our bosoms as gallant democratic allies. Those of us who have known these forces have rarely been impressed by the Salvadoran Army's military skills. Even the troops most recently trained seem to find invincible opponents in the outnumbered guerrillas whom they have met in jungles and dusty village streets.

It may prove too much to build an effective army out of the young conscripts, pressed into service to fight for a system that has done them little good, under officers who have been steadily maligned by their countrymen. The Salvadoran chief of staff convicted in New York in 1976 for trying to sell $2.5 million worth of machine guns to gangsters demonstrated the kind of corruption that our advisers may still have to confront.

Our training has many limits. Salvadoran country boys often do not have the minimum literacy to qualify for United States training camps. City boys may have the qualifications, but on their return they find life in the jungles harsh and unfamiliar. Two-thirds of the American-trained conscripts have not re-enlisted for further service. Youths from the upper classes have been conspicuously and completely absent from the army rank-and-file. The boys in uniform come almost entirely from families with no stake in the system and nothing to lose—with nothing to fight for.

These are the troops upon whom President Reagan risks our honor. He should consider the lesson we should have learned long ago—in many countries—that advice, training and military matériel are not enough to make military success.

It will be a disaster if we let our commitment of advice and supply go so far that, when it proves inadequate, we must inevitably follow it up with a regiment, or two, or three, of our own best troops.

It will be unpardonable if under the illusion of "not losing El Salvador," we should send American troops to Central America in an intervention that could "lose" the whole of Latin America.

The Reagan Administration proposes to increase the number of advisers in El Salvador and the volume of military aid. Whom will the Americans advise and who will use the weapons we supply? The same military establishment that has been receiving our advice and advisers for at least 37 years. (We sent our first Air Force mission to El Salvador in 1948 and an American officer was director of the military academy as far back as 1946). Our advisers have been good men. Our missions have been skillful. But during almost the entire time we have advised, trained and supplied the Salvadoran military forces, the main preoccupation of the leaders of those forces has been with their own domestic politics.

One need not labor the point that the military officers generally worked to help the wealthy landowning class maintain an oligarchical system. Despite occasional efforts for reform, especially in the early years of the Alliance for Progress, more often than not the military officers served the landed families—and received ample rewards. In the past decade or so, many officers began to ask why they should serve the landed families and not themselves. Today, most of the old landowners are dispersed abroad and military officers have increasingly become landowners.

Never has the system brought notable benefits to the rank-and-file soldiers. Seldom in this century have the higher aspirations of patriotism motivated the

troops. Teen-aged youths, seized by press gangs and marched off to barracks with their thumbs tied behind their backs, could scarcely know what they would fight for if the time came to use the guns we have provided.●

PRESERVE FOR THE FUTURE

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of preservation of our artistic heritage and of community giving still thrives in Connecticut. I rise to commend and to recognize the numerous individuals who have committed their time to the preservation of the Hill-Stead Museum in Farmington, Conn. This is a proud example of volunteers at work as a team to preserve for the future an outstanding representative of the past.

The Hill-Stead Museum is truly a national treasure. The home of a pioneer American woman architect, Theodate Pope Riddle, this unique house-museum, designed by Stanford White, contains a $25 million art collection which has been open to the public since 1946. Hill-Stead boasts a magnificant collection of impressionist paintings. Major canvasses by Monet, Degas, and Manet grace Hill-Stead's walls. Superb Japanese woodcuts, exceptional furniture, bronzes by Barye, Chinese porcelains of the Ming and Sung periods, an outstanding series of clocks—all add to Hill-Stead's beauty, charm, and legacy. Last year, 12,000 visitors toured Hill-Stead, an increase of more than 30 percent over the previous years.

In 1982, the Friends of Hill-Stead, a volunteer group of 1,200 individuals, accepted the challenge of raising a $1 million fund to preserve this splendid house for the enjoyment and education of present citizens and future generations. Raymond D'Argenio, senior vice president/communications, United Technologies Corp., serves as chairman of the Friends of Hill-Stead. Barbara Mooney, vice chairman of the campaign and a director of the Friends of Hill-Stead, has volunteered 2 years of her time to run the day-to-day operation.

Thanks to the generous and dedicated Friends of Hill-Stead, the many individuals and businesses who are working so untiringly to make this drive a success, this outstanding museum will continue to function as a place where new generations of students and scholars can come to study and savor its treasures. I salute all who have recognized, by contributing to the preservation of Hill-Stead, that the quality of the lives we share is very dependent on our willingness to give to one another.●

MARITIME SAFETY ACT

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the second session of the 97th Congress, I introduced legislation, H.R. 7038, to promote maritime safety on the high seas and navigable waters of the United States. This legislation was the result of extensive hearings and investigations conducted by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the 97th Congress.

After holding two major full committee hearings on two major marine casualties—one on the loss of the vessel the SS *Poet* which disappeared in October 1980, and the other on the sinking of the mobile offshore drilling vessel, the *Ocean Ranger*, in February 1982—and after investigating other significant major marine casualties such as the Sunshine Skyway Bridge accident and the sinking of the *Marine Electric*, I have decided to reintroduce the Maritime Safety Act, with minor revisions.

The first part of the bill raises the lid placed on civil liability penalities for unlawfully operating without a certificate of inspection from $500 per offense to $5,000 per day. When the semisubmersible drilling vessel, the *Ocean Ranger*, sank on February 14, 1982, killing 85 men, it was operating without the legally required certificate of inspection issued by the Coast Guard. A one shot $500 penalty was no deterrent considering that the operation was leasing the drilling vessel for approximately $100,000 per day. The $5,000 per day penalty in the new bill will serve as a deterrent to operating a vessel without a current certificate of inspection.

The original H.R. 7038 penalty of $50,000 per day for knowingly operating without a certificate of inspection has been reduced to a maximum of $10,000 per day of violation. Another feature of the new bill is imposing mandatory penalties when a violation occurs. H.R. 7038 in the 97th Congress made the imposition of penalties discretionary. The Secretary retains discretion, however, to modify, compromise, remit, or mitigate the amount of the penalties.

The second part of H.R. 7038 focuses on communication between the owner of the vessel, the master, and the Coast Guard. The bill requires an owner to report to the Coast Guard when the owner has not heard from the vessel in over 48 hours. At the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee hearing on the disappearance of the cargo vessel, the SS *Poet*, testimony was given that the owner of the missing vessel did not report to the Coast Guard until 10 days had passed since his last communication with the ship. With such delayed notice there was scarce opportunity for the Coast Guard to assist the vessel.

H.R. 7038 also requires the master of the vessel to report to the vessel's owner at least every 48 hours. Thus, this section of the bill stresses the necessity of communication in making the marine environment safe. The importance of communication is seen also in section 3(c) of the bill which authorizes $5 million in both 1985 and 1986 to fund not more than 50 percent of the cost of purchasing and installing marine satellite telecommunications systems on vessels of 1,000 gross tons or more.

The final section of the bill permits the Coast Guard to investigate all acts of marine incompetency or misconduct committed by any person licensed by the Coast Guard. The rationale behind this section is that the agency which issues a marine officer's license, representing that the holder of the license is safe and qualified, should also be able to revoke that license if there is evidence of marine incompetency or misconduct, whether or not the officer is operating under a Coast Guard license or some other marine license. Under H.R. 7038, the negligence of a licensed marine officer will be admissable as evidence in a determination of the status of a Federal license.

The intent of H.R. 7038 is to improve the marine safety environment without imposing onerous burdens upon those involved in maritime work. It is a bill which requires all groups—industry, operators, and Federal agencies—to improve their own operations in order to better insure the safety of life and property at sea.

I look forward to working with the maritime community on this bill dedicated to improving safety at sea.●

TIME FOR NHTSA ACTION ON AUTOMATIC CRASH PROTECTIONS

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Supreme Court ordered the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to reconsider its rescission of the standard requiring automatic crash protections—seatbelts or airbags—as standard equipment on American automobiles. The Court called NHTSA's action in repealing this lifesaving rule "arbitrary and capricious." I agree.

The standard was supposed to be effective for 1982 model year cars, but has been delayed over and over. In the meantime, Americans have continued

to die or be injured because they do not have access to this lifesaving technology. Automatic crash protections work, and the time is long past due to get them into every automobile this country produces.

In this morning's Washington Post, George Will presents a lucid and comprehensive report of the sorry tale of delay and inaction in implementing the standard. I take exception only with Mr. Will's assertion that a new statute is needed to enforce the will of Congress. Congress has already spoken—and spoken clearly. It is time for NHTSA to act, and act expeditiously. I have written to Secretary Dole, insisting that she move forward quickly to establish a timetable for implementing the standard, and that such a timetable be in place no later than September 1, so that 1985 model year cars can be equipped with these necessary protections.

I commend Mr. Will's article to you.

AIRBAGS: THERE OUGHTA BE A LAW

(By George F. Will)

Government in Washington often is war carried on by other means. It is an interminable war of indecisive battles between factions of the government. Government needs more battles like those at Thermopylae, Tours, Hasting, Waterloo—battles where issues were settled.

Consider the war over automobile airbags, a war now in its second decade. If you think the Supreme Court ruling last week settled things, think again.

The ruling came a few days after the court's decision striking down the legislative veto. That decision focused attention on how much of the legislating process is delegated by the legislature to the executive branch: Congress expresses sentiments and asks an executive department or independent agency to turn the sentiment into law—into rules regulating behavior.

In 1966 Congress directed the secretary of transportation to issue safety standards that "shall be practicable, shall meet the need for motor-vehicle safety and shall be stated in objective terms." Congress authorized judicial review of all regulations. Such semi-legislation is an invitation to protracted conflict, and many parties—insurance organizations, auto manufacturers, consumerists, medical groups—accepted the invitation.

There have been approximately 60 separate rule-making actions in the history of Standard 208, issued in 1967. In 1967 seatbelts were required. When it became clear that few persons used belts, DOT began considering "passive restraints." Those are devices the effectiveness of which does not depend on any action by occupants of a vehicle. Automatic seatbelts fasten to doors and secure occupants when the doors close. Airbags are inflatable devices carried in dashboards and steering columns. They inflate when deceleration forces become severe; then they quickly deflate.

In 1969 the Nixon administration proposed passive restraints. In 1972 it said such restraints would be required in vehicles manufactured after Aug. 15, 1975. Challenged in court, that decision was upheld. Manufacturers opted for the "ignition interlock"—cars would not start until belts were buckled. An enraged public began performing appendectomies on their cars, dismantling the interlocks. The loud complaints awoke Congress, which, acting with a speed not seen since Pearl Harbor, forbade the interlock and, for good measure, gave itself a legislative veto (decreased) over subsequent standards.

The bureaucratic machinery clanked on, producing (to touch only high points) President Carter's requirement of passive restraints and President Reagan's rescinding thereof. The Reagan administration argued that the life-saving potential of airbags, which is not disputed, would not be realized. This because in 99 percent of all cases manufacturers would satisfy the "passive restraint" requirement with automatic seatbelts designed to be easy to detach, and most of these would be detached by the cars' owners.

The court concluded (all nine justices concurring, at least in part) that this decision was capricious. So? So "further consideration of the issue is required." World without end, amen. Victoria Will, age 2, may become a lawyer—don't almost all American children?—and earn her living litigating the airbag war.

And yet . . .

The court said that a minimal requirement of Congress' directive is consideration by DOT of the possibility that the logical response to the faults of detachable seatbelts is to require nondetachable belts, or airbags. At the risk of seeming radical, or perhaps reactionary, I suggest it is time for the lawmakers to make law.

Sen. John Danforth (R-Mo.) is prepared to play the part of Charles Martel, who at Tours in 732 A.D. sent the Moors packing. Danforth's bill says, among other things: "Each manufacturer of passenger automobiles shall install airbags in each passenger automobile manufactured on or after Sept. 1, 1985." That is what a law looks like.

And after 14 years the evidence is in and vindicates passive restraints. Spending on medicine—often on attempts to recover health lost unnecessarily—is becoming a threat to the nation's economic health. The only substantial and immediately achievable improvements of public health would cost the public treasury nothing. They would come from less smoking, less drinking, less overeating, more exercise. And more use of seatbelts. Use of seatbelts would cut fatalities in half and injuries by two-thirds.

For 54 years motor vehicles have been the nation's leading cause of accidental deaths and injuries. Last year an average of 126 Americans a day died on highways. A conservative estimate is that if airbags had been required during the last decade, the lives saved would number many more than the lives lost in Vietnam. The savings to the private economy and the public treasury would have been scores of billions of dollars.

Honorable persons can disagree about what the law ought to be. But surely it is time for Congress to say what the law shall be.●

PEDRO L. G. MAFNAS HONORED

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will be interested to know that one of my constituents, Mr. Pedro L. G. Mafnas of Guam has been honored to be nominated for inclusion in the next edition of "Who's Who in American Law Enforcement."

A man with numerous honors, Mr. Mafnas has been a security guard at the Guam Department of Public Works for many years. He has an outstanding reputation and this latest honor is one he richly deserves.

At a time when our prisons are overcrowded and pressures grow each day on security guards, men such as Pedro L. G. Mafnas serve as reminders of the high degree of professionalism which exists in their community and as a reminder to others what can be accomplished through integrity and hard work.

At this time I insert a brief article about Mr. Mafnas which appeared in the June 16, 1983, Pacific Daily News:

[From the Pacific Daily News, June 16, 1983]

(By Linda Cefre)

WHO'S WHO NOMINEE

Pedro L. G. Mafnas, a security guard at the Department of Public Works, has been nominated to be included in this year's edition of Who's Who in American Law Enforcement.

Mafnas received a citation award in preventing the destruction of the 1981 Public Works Week exhibits and displays. He also completed a professional security training course at the Guam Community College and first aid training. He received a certificate for firearms qualification from Miles Security Agency and a certificate of recognition from Public Works.

The edition is published and distributed nationwide only once evey three years. This year's edition will be published this fall. Who's Who in American Law Enforcement is a non-profit project of the American Police Academy J. Edgar Hoover Memorial.●

THE LEGISLATIVE VETO—NOW THAT IT IS GONE

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, here we are a week after the Supreme Court decision ruling that legislative vetoes are unconstitutional, and the Congress and the executive branch are trying to sort out what this decision means for the realities of government. In an article which appeared in the New York Times today, Bernard Schwartz, a noted professor at New York University Law School, discusses why the legislative veto was so important to the oversight work of the Congress.

As Schwartz points out:

There is not much point in merely criticizing the legislative veto decision.

But we must look to alternative means of control. For as Schwartz says:

The legislative veto enabled the legislature to assume an effective role as supervisor of the executive. There is no more important role for the contemporary legislature.

At this point, I place Mr. Schwartz's article in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, June 30, 1983]

THE "LEGISLATIVE VETO"—NOW THAT IT'S GONE

(By Bernard Schwartz)

The United States Supreme Court's crucial role rarely has been more dramatically illustrated than by its decision last week striking down the so-called legislative veto, under which Congress could annul executive action by simple resolution. At one stroke, the Court cast more than 200 laws containing legislative veto provisions into legal limbo. According to the Court, the Constitution requires that all legislation be presented to the President for his signature or veto and does not permit Congress to enact what amounts to veto-proof "legislation" that infringes upon the President's authority and thus violates the separation of powers.

Yet, as Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo wisely observed, "the separation of powers between the Executive and Congress is not a doctrinaire concept to be made use of with pedantic rigor." Indeed, despite the Supreme Court's decision, the Constitution never has been construed as setting up a rigid separation of powers. The key principle is a system of checks and balances—not a watertight separation among the branches. The only absolute separation that has ever been possible is in the theoretical writings of a Montesquieu, who looked across at foggy England from his sunny Gascon vineyards and saw a complete separation of powers that did not in fact exist in the English Government at that time.

As the dissent by Justice Byron R. White points out, the Court's decision that all "lawmaking" must be shared by Congress and the President "ignores that legislative authority is routinely delegated to the executive branch, to the independent regulatory agencies." If Congressional action under the legislative veto technique is "legislative" action that must be shared, why is the same not true of executive of administrative promulgation of orders, rules and regulations, which the legislative veto attempts to control?

The key issue is, indeed, one of control. The great need in an era of expanding administrative authority is to establish effective safeguards outside the executive branch.

Congress is the one organ of Government both responsive to the electorate and independent of the White House. The legislative veto enabled the legislature to assume an effective role as supervisor of the executive. There is no more important role for the contemporary legislature.

"The political philosopher," wrote Woodrow Wilson, "has something more than a doubt with which to gainsay the usefulness of a sovereign representative body which confines itself to legislation to the exclusion of all other functions." Important though the legislative function itself may be, a legislative body is hardly worthy of the title of Congress if it merely grinds out laws as a sausage-maker grinds out sausages.

However, since the Constitution is what the judges say it is, there is not much point in merely criticizing the legislative veto decision. The Supreme Court's condemnation is in such sweeping terms that it signals the death knell of direct Congressional attempts to review executive and administrative action. Yet, as John Stuart Mill tells us, "The proper office of a representative assembly is to watch and control the government." What tools are left to Congress by the Court decision to enable it to perform this function?

None that is as effective as the legislative veto. Congress can, to be sure, enact laws limiting executive authority and overruling invalid administrative exercises of power. These will, however, be subject to Presidential veto and the President will rarely agree to restrictions upon his own Administration's authority.

It is also unreal to assume that Congress will now impose detailed restrictions in laws delegating power to the executive. The modern trend has been all the other way. Congress has neither the time nor the expertise needed to draft detailed standards limiting delegated authority.

In addition, Congress is too often unwilling to make the hard choices needed to set defined policies for the executive. It has always been easier to pass a statute with vague language about the "public interest"—high-sounding and meaningless in terms of restricting executive power.

With the legislative veto now gone, it will be all but impossible for Congress to exercise its vital role of what Wilson called "vigilant oversight of administration." The Court decision will insure that we realize more than ever that oversight is the noun of the verb overlook as well as oversee.●

RHODE ISLAND RESPONDS

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wall Street Journal printed an article on the State of Rhode Island which, in the opinion of the congressional delegation, seriously misrepresented the resilient character and wonderful environment of our State.

Today, Senators PELL and CHAFEE and our colleague, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and I responded. I would like to share our reply with our colleagues.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1983.

Mr. ROBERT L. BARTLEY,
Editor, the Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BARTLEY: The harsh and unfair portrait of Rhode Island in a recent article painted a grossly inaccurate picture that brings the Wall Street Journal's reputation for objectivity into serious question.

That unbalanced article did less than paint Rhode Island "warts and all." It painted the warts alone. It dismissed, almost as asides, many of Rhode Island's unique charms and strengths. Beauty is, of course, in the eye of the beholder . . . but we do not think that you looked closely enough.

Our state has economic problems which we freely acknowledge and are working to solve. Rhode Island has forged a strong, creative partnership of labor, business and government—the Rhode Island Strategic Development Commission—to find new solutions. The firestorm of protest ignited in our State by your article is convincing proof of both the depth and strength of this coalition.

While we understand our problems, we also understand that the solutions to these problems can be found in our strengths. Rhode Island offers a total environment and a quality of life that many have found to be among the very best in the United States.

Employers, for generations, have valued the character and reliability of Rhode Island's workforce. Much of this unique character flows from the ethnic and cultural richness of our people, who have combined from many backgrounds to make Rhode Island one of the most diverse and interesting States in America.

The compact size of our state, while perhaps a source of continuing good humor for residents and non-residents alike, also means that our residents can live in city, rural or suburban settings and still be only minutes from work or from the beaches that ring the Rhode Island coastline.

Rhode Island is a beautiful State that has something to offer everyone—breathtaking beaches, old world and new world neighborhoods, industries to provide jobs, entertainment and opportunities for growth and new businesses.

Cross pens, Gorham silver, Bostitch staplers, Brown & Sharpe machine tools, Trifari jewelry, American Tourister luggage, General Dynamics submarines, all these and many more are products of Rhode Island.

We invite you to visit Rhode Island and hope you will bring along any editors or reporters who have grown weary of commuting or tired of the high prices of "big city" living and would like to improve the quality of their lives.

You may discover what we have known all along. Rhode Island is a great way of life. We are proud to represent the fine people of this State.

Warm regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
U.S. Senator.
CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senator.
CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER,
Member of Congress.
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
Member of Congress.●

ARTIFICIAL REEFS

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation which will promote responsible and effective efforts to establish artificial reefs in U.S. waters. When properly designed, constructed, located, and maintained, artificial reef structures serve to enhance the habitat, diversity, and production of fishery resources; enhance U.S. recreational and commercial fishing opportunities; and increase the overall production of U.S. fishery products in the United States. In fact, the local and national environmental and economic benefits of a re-

sponsible artificial reef program are substantial.

This legislation, therefore, would provide the Corps of Engineers with specific authority to approve proposals to construct artificial reefs as well as standards for the evaluation of such proposals. In order to insure proper coordination between the oceanographic and other physical characteristics of a proposed artificial reef site, and the design and materials to be utilized in the construction of an artificial reef, the legislation further authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, through the National Marine Fisheries Service, to develop a long range plan for establishing artificial reefs in U.S. waters. The plan will be utilized by the Corps of Engineers as a benchmark by which to evaluate the quality of future artificial reef construction proposals. The result, I believe, will be a responsible and well coordinated program to maximize the benefits and minimize the potential detriments of artificial reef construction.

Although some nations such as Japan have spent in excess of $1 billion in government funds on highly successful artificial reef programs, there has been little, if any, interest expressed by the U.S. Government in such a program. Instead the legislation would provide encouragement to the private sector to donate appropriate materials to interested artificial reef construction permit holders. Provided that certain standards are met, the legislation specifies that artificial reef material donors would be eligible to claim a tax credit for those expenses incurred in providing such materials. Such expenses include only those that are above and beyond those expenses that would be incurred in the normal manner of disposition of such materials. Such artificial reef expenses eligible for the tax credit would include, but are not necessarily limited to, excess transportation costs, additional costs for preparing the materials in a suitable manner necessary to comply with the applicable permit for such artificial reef, and any expenditure for research on, or associated with, the utilization of such materials on a specific artificial reef site. It is intended that the inclusion of such research costs will encourage private sector research and development efforts on artificial reefs in lieu of analogous yet absent Federal activities. In fact, the intent of this entire legislation is to encourage and facilitate private sector, and State and local government initiatives to carry out virtually all artificial reef construction activities in compliance with minimal, yet necessary Federal requirements.●

THE TRUTH-IN-BUDGETING ACT

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a revision of the Truth-in-Budgeting Act of 1983 (H.R. 2868). This revised bill contains several changes to H.R. 2868, reflecting suggestions made by various parties since the Ways and Means Committee hearings on H.R. 2868 on May 22, 1983.

The basic intent is the same—to require agencies to show all of their transactions with the Federal Financing Bank (FFB) onbudget and in their budget accounts. Current law enables some agencies to transfer their spending to the offbudget FFB. My legislation would put the FFB onbudget by scoring all FFB transactions in onbudget accounts of the agencies actually conducting the programs (the FFB itself conducts no programs). My bill would not reduce the FFB's efficiency in marketing agency debt, and would only change the way in which agency transactions are recorded to reflect program activity more accurately.

Contrary to the intent of the Congress when it passed the Federal Financing Bank Act of 1973, the FFB created a crack in the budget process which quickly ruptured into a flood of offbudget spending—over $100 billion since 1975, and all for credit programs.[1] Until the strategic petroleum reserve was placed offbudget (effective in 1982) the FFB was used to record over 95 percent of offbudget spending each year.

The establishment of the FFB provided an accounting vehicle that has permitted agencies to transfer records of their actual activity (i.e., net spending) from their own books to the books of the offbudget FFB. Some of this spending also bypasses the normal appropriations process.

Agencies transfer their activities to the FFB in two general ways. The first involves direct loans. Agencies combine direct loans into a bundle (called participation certificates or certificates of beneficial ownership, CBO's) which they "sell" to the FFB. These transactions are recorded on the agency's books as sales even though the Government still owns the loan assets. In effect, the agencies have hidden their program levels in the nebulous offbudget accounts of the Federal Financing Bank. This is no small exercise; since 1975, some $60 billion of direct loans have been "sold" to the FFB.

The second way involves loan guarantees. In the case of a true loan guarantee, an agency issues the guarantee to a private party, who secures a loan from a private financial institution. However, agencies routinely arrange to sell the loan guarantees to the FFB, thus transforming the loan guarantees into direct Government loans from the FFB. Thus, not only is the original loan guarantee erased from the agency's budget, but the direct loan also is scored as an FFB loan, not an agency loan. This, too, was clearly not the intent of the legislation that created the FFB.

My bill would end these accounting wizardries by making the accounting honest and straightforward. The "sale" of loan assets to the FFB would be recorded as the agency borrowing it really is, and the sale of loan guarantees to the FFB would be recorded as direct loans from the originating agency which they are.

In a hearing on H.R. 2868, the Treasury Department, Office of Management and Budget, Congressional Budget Office and General Accounting Office all supported the legislation, with technical amendments. They testified that spending hidden in the FFB should appear in the agencies' budgets and the unified budget. In addition, the recently adopted budget resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that "Federal agencies selling loan assets to or guaranteeing loans originated by the Federal Financing Bank should have the budget authority and outlays resulting from those transactions reflected in their agency budgets."

The revised bill differs from H.R. 2868 in its determination of what loans would be required to be financed through the FFB. As originally drafted, H.R. 2868 would have required all agencies to offer their loans to the FFB, which would have had to buy all "suitable investments" that would not disrupt existing private secondary markets (such as for Ginnie Mae securities). The Secretary of the Treasury would have determined what is a suitable investment and what is undue disruption of private markets. Thus, the Secretary would have had to determine what agencies would have to use the FFB for financing.

The revised bill defines statutorily which loan programs would be required to use the FFB. Only programs which were at least 20 percent financed through the FFB during fiscal year 1982 would be required to continue to be FFB financed. No other current nor any future programs would required to use the FFB. For example, Ginnie Mae would not be required to use the FFB, though it would retain the option, exactly as in current law.

[1] During the decade of the 1970's, budget outlays increased 151 percent yet direct loans and guaranteed loans outstanding increased 250 percent and 171 percent, respectively. During the same period, net direct loans and net guaranteed loans increased 436 percent and 459 percent, respectively.

As another example, because less than 20 percent of low-income public housing loans were financed through the FFB in fiscal year 1982, future loans would not have to be made through the FFB.

H.R. 2868 also would require new loan programs to offer their loans to the FFB. The revised bill gives agencies running new programs the option of using the FFB. The revised bill does not affect existing loan guarantees which are privately financed—that is, "true" guarantees. It would, however, correct the current practice in which agency loan guarantees are converted into FFB direct loans, an accounting legerdemain difficult to match with congressional intent. In other words, the bill would have no effect on any existing loan guarantee programs which insure private obligations.

The revised bill would fully accommodate any future programs that provided for true loan guarantees. Agencies would have the option of FFB financing which, if exercised, would be recorded as agency direct loans—in contrast to the current practice of showing the transaction both as an agency loan guarantee and an FFB direct loan.

The current practice of FFB financing loan guarantees flies in the face of the widely held principle that Government funds only be expended based on an explicit appropriation of budget authority. Currently, FFB-financed loans are made on the basis of the permanent, indefinite budget authority of the FFB. By requiring future direct loans to be recorded as such on the originating agency's books, this bill permits Congress to decide explicitly on the type of spending authority most appropriate to the affected programs. As a result, Congress will have the same direct spending control over these programs as it presently has with nearly every other Government program.

At the same time, the bill leaves intact the current exclusion of loan guarantee authority from the definition of budget authority as defined in the 1974 Budget Act. The relationship between budget authority and loan guarantee authority is appropriately a budget process issue and not a Federal Financing Bank issue.

Opposition to H.R. 2868 has centered on the basic intent of the bill. Some agencies and interest groups are concerned about having their programs funded more openly and on budget. Yet the bill is in no way prejudicial to the affected programs, unless one believes that these programs are incapable of competing face-to-face, up front, and onbudget with other Federal programs. The affect of this bill is to create a level playing field.

It is hard to make a case for misrepresenting the activity levels of several Federal agencies, yet this is precisely what is happening, and why we need remedial legislation. Whether deliberate or by happenstance, these exceptions to accepted budget accounting principles undermine the confidence people have a right to expect in the way the Federal budget displays the activities and programs of their Government.●

CONSTITUENTS RESPOND

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to share with you and my colleagues the results of my annual questionnaire for 1983.

In February of this year I distributed the questionnaire through the First Congressional District of Kentucky. A total of 34,812 western Kentuckians responded to the questionnaire and on June 6 the tabulation of responses was concluded and announced to the Kentucky media.

The questionnaires were tabulated by my staff and by 100 college students at Murray State University and the community colleges at Henderson, Madisonville, Hopkinsville, and Paducah, Ky.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the following faculty and students for their hours of effort in scoring the many questionnaires.

Murray State University—Dr. Winfield Rose, chairman of the political science department, and students Kim Thurman, Tamie Marret, Patricia Holland, Gerald Watkins, Monica Sturdivant, Bridget Bufkin, and Tanya Smith.

Henderson Community College—John Sistarenik, professor of history and political science, and students Ricky Abel, Belinda Abell, Beverly Drake, Susan Dixon, Jerry K. Hurt, Brent Hood, Kim Hahn, John Guthrie, Jeffrey D. Kelley, Anthony W. Neal, Patricia Ann Walker, Kane Morgan, Ashly McCormic, John R. Wroten, Patricia Johnson, and Bonnie Harmon.

Madisonville Community College—Tim Cantrell, chairman of social sciences, and students Cynthia Frederick, James K. Ramsey, Marie Ramsey, Jon Todd Tolbert, Lou Ann Russell, Denise L. Martin, Richard L. Curtis, Trixie Y. Lamb, Rebecca Ricks, Tandy Perkins, Rob Towery, Marty D. Cook, Sammy Scott, Robert Lee Curtis, Derrick Helton, Crawford Jent, Kathleen Angel, Virginia Fugate, Helen Langston and Helen Wilcox.

Hopkinsville Community College—Don Hoover, associate professor of social science, and students Norman Petrie, Petra Wesley, Andy Adams, Donna Gupton, Ronald Ramage, Malcolm Perry, Bruce Marklin, Leroy C. Davis II, Daryl Russell, Janet L. Adams, Beth Meighen, Ron Stewart, Wanda Colley, Carla Shelton, Ron Seybold, and Leslie Herndon.

Paducah Community College—Dr. Chun Ro, chairman, division of social science, business and related technologies, and students Judy Albritten, Greg Barnes, Joy Beckman, Janet Bernelle, Danny D. Beyer, Michelle Boaz, Carol Brandon, Scott Brian, Hosea Chatman, Jr., Rebecca J. DiSilvestro, Barry Dublin, Deborah L. Figert, Kelly Giles, Kathy Grant, Claudette Guhy, Phillip Harned, Darlene Heflin, Jessie Ingram, Jeff Kunsman, Lou Ann Geveden Latta, George F. Mahin, Jr., Bruce McGary, LaDonna Melton, Joan C. Mendenhall, Pat Morphew, Courtney Neel, Charles Owens, Greg Ray, Paula Jill Reeves, Harold Riley, Wendy Roof, Gina Smith, Keith Steele, Dianna Sumner, Joe Swatzell, Barry Theobald, E. T. Tidewell, Robert L. Tracy, Kim Williams, Carl Winstead, and Jean Wurth.

The following are the results of my 1983 questionnaire.

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Which single development during the next 12 months would make you most confident about the nation's economic recovery?			
(a) Lower interest rates	22		
(b) Less inflation	13		
(c) Lower taxes	6		
(d) Less unemployment	44		
(e) Balanced budget	15		
2. Supporters of coal slurry pipeline legislation emphasize it would create new incentives for Kentucky's coal reserves and decrease America's dependence upon OPEC oil. Railroad and trucking companies now hauling coal are among the opponents of this legislation. Do you favor coal slurry pipeline efforts?	58	30	12
3. Are you in favor of the Paducah home (known as "Angles") of the late former Vice President Alben W. Barkley being purchased and maintained by the federal government as a national historic site?	28	67	5
4. As a means of helping those persons who are unemployed, would you favor:			
(a) Establishing federally funded vocational programs	54		
(b) Reducing the minimum wage for teenagers	40		
(c) No opinion	6		
5. As a means of reducing the size of the federal budget deficit, would you favor:			
(a) Freezing military pay	11		
(b) Repealing the 10-percent tax cut scheduled for July	31		
(c) Cutting domestic spending	31		
(d) Freezing federal civilian pay	27		
6. Do you think Congress should slow down the growth of military spending to help balance the budget?	51	44	5
7. If an acceptable basing mode for the MX missile can be found, would you favor its production and deployment?	56	35	9
8. Do you believe the United States should cut back on military and economic aid to Israel?	64	32	4
9. Do you support the recently enacted Payment-in-Kind (PIK) program that allows farmers to idle land in exchange for grain being held by the federal government?	56	38	6
10. Should the U.S. subsidize grain sales abroad in order to compete with highly subsidized European farmers?	42	47	11
11. In light of some recent farm foreclosures by the Farmers Home Administration, should Congress allow FmHA to defer payment of interest and principal for one year if the borrower can show he or she could stay in farming and pay off the debt in the future?	83	13	4

12. Do you think Congress should allow clean air laws to be weakened?	32	61	7
13. Do you think the U.S. Constitution should be amended to:			
(a) Require a balanced budget	55	26	19
(b) Permit prayer in public schools	72	17	11
(c) Include the Equal rights Amendment (ERA)	24	58	18
14. Should families who sent their children to private elementary or secondary schools receive a break on their taxes?	32	63	5
15. Do you approve of the job Ronald Reagan is doing as President?	42	51	7
16. Should the United States send more weapons and military advisers to El Salvador?	29	63	8
17. Should the U.S. government require cars sold in the U.S. to be made mostly with U.S. parts and labor?	68	27	5
18. Beginning in July, banks and other financial institutions will withhold 10% of interest and dividends earned by savers and investors. This money, paid directly to the IRS, will apply toward income taxes that are due or can be refunded. Do you want Congress to repeal this 1982 law?	68	28	4
19. Should Congress appropriate more money to help low and moderate income families pay their heating bills?	49	45	6
20. Do you feel the United States should begin reducing nuclear weapons on its own?	30	65	5

OBSERVATIONS ON NICARAGUA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Lawrence E. Harrison entitled "We Tried to Accept Nicaragua's Revolution, the Sandanistas Couldn't Live With a Positive Image of the United States."

Mr. Harrison's observations should be carefully studied by my colleagues and the American people.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1983]

WE TRIED TO ACCEPT NICARAGUA'S REVOLUTION—THE SANDINISTAS COULDN'T LIVE WITH A POSITIVE IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Lawerence E. Harrison)

The Sandinista Government of National Reconstruction was installed four years ago, on July 19, 1979. Three days later, I arrived in Nicaragua in a Flying Tigers DC-8 stretch jet loaded with food—the first of many such flights—to take charge of U.S. assistance programs, the most tangible evidence of our commitment to build a new relationship with Nicaragua.

I left Nicaragua two years later on July 1, 1981. During those two years, the U.S. government was the most important source of food aid and one of the most important sources of financial aid to revolutionary Nicaragua. We provided assistance valued at $120 million, including 100,000 tons of food. We had tried very hard to build that new relationship. But the effort failed, principally, I believe, because the Sandinistas could not live with a positive image of the U.S. government. They did not try at all. And many in the United States cheered them on.

Within a few months of the installation of the Government of National Reconstruction, an article appeared in the Sandinista newspaper Barricada announcing the imminent arrival of 600 Cuban teachers. I called on the minister of education, with whom I had been working to reactivate an old school construction loan, to express concern that so large a number of Cuban teachers would be interpreted in the United States as a Cuban takeover of the Nicaraguan education system. The minister replied that the government would welcome qualified teachers from any country.

I told him that the United States would certainly be interested in sending teachers, possibly through the Peace Corps. He responded, somewhat apologetically. "You know, we Latin Americans have a view of the Peace Corps which would make it an inappropriate vehicle." (He meant, " We Latin Americans of the Left." What he had in mind was symbolized by the move "Blood of the Condor," which depicts Aryan-looking Peace Corps volunteers engaging in genocidal sterilization programs in Bolivia.)

At the end of 1979, as a result of the intervention of then junta member Alfonso Robelo (who is now allied with ex-Sandinista Eden Pastora's guerrilla movement), we received Sandinista approval in principle to start a Peace Corps program. After a lengthy study, the Peace Corps sent in a husband-wife team as co-directors. Both were experienced in Latin America, altruistic, and totally committed to building a new relationship with Nicaragua. After six months of being fobbed off by the Sandinistas, they left. Not one Peace Corps volunteer was accepted.

We often expressed our concern to Sandinista officials about the line in the Sandinista anthem, "We shall fight against the Yankee, enemy of humanity." In November 1979, Jaime Wheelock, one of the most influential *comandantes* and a person with whom I sustained a very frank dialogue throughout my two years in Managua, told me that the word "poverty" was going to be substituted for "the Yankee." Soon thereafter, I was told the same thing by then economic czar (and Stanford MBA) Alfredo Cesar, who has since defected. The change was never made.

At about the same time, a U.S. congressional delegation, led by Rep. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), visited Managua at Ambassador Larry Pezzullo's initiative. Fascell was extremely effective, as were his colleagues, Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.), Matthew McHugh (D-N.Y.) and David Obey (D-Wis.). They pressed hard on the issues of political pluralism and nonalignment in very intense meetings with both the junta, which was increasingly becoming a figurehead, and the Sandinista National Directorate, which is where the real power resides. The congressional group was particularly forceful on the question of elections. In each session they were told that national reconstruction had to be the first priority but that the Sandinistas were committed to elections.

When Alfonso Robelo resigned from the junta in April 1980 and went into opposition, he was promptly labeled a traitor by the Sandinistas. In a conversation with Jaime Wheelock, I tried to explain our concept of dissent. I got nowhere—there is no Spanish word that accurately captures the nuances of "dissent." A day or two later I experienced similar frustration in a conversation about dissent with a young U.S.-trained cabinet minister who had on his desk a bottle of Cuban rum and a copy of "Das Kapital." At one point, he suddenly beamed and said, in English, "Now I know what you're talking about—civil disobedience!"

He has since defected.

A few months later, Larry Pezzullo and I were in Washington to lobby in Congress for the much-delayed $75 million special appropriation for Nicaragua. The Sandinista minister of health, with whom I was working on several programs, was also in Washington, and we had dinner together. During the conversation I complained about inaccuracies and distortions in Barricada, the official Sandinista newspaper, and El Nuevo Diario, which closely followed the Sandinista line. Both sounded very much like Cuba's official newspaper, Granma, particularly in their treatment of the United States. The minister's response: "You don't understand revolutionary truth. What is true is what serves the ends of the revolution."

The August 1980 ceremony to celebrate completion of the literacy campaign was a chilling experience. I had been invited to sit with the *comandantes* and the cabinet because AID had contributed food and some vehicles to the campaign. The ambassador sat in nearby stands with the diplomatic corps.

The Plaza of the Revolution was mobbed with kids in uniform shouting slogans in response to the urgings of leaders on the platform. I was reminded of films I had seen of Nuremberg in the 1930s.

Comandante Humberto Ortega gave the principal address. In the midst of a series of attacks on the United States, he announced that elections would not be held until 1985, thereby reneging on a commitment to opposition groups for early elections. Moreover, he assured his audience, the elections of 1985 would be nothing like the corrupted elections held in the United States. Larry Pezzullo and I both walked out.

My youngest daughter, Amy, then 16 years old, worked during the summer of 1980 as a volunteer with a Nicaraguan organization, Genesis II, which promoted breastfeeding and provided help to orphanages. The head of the organization was Geraldine Macias, a former American Maryknoll nun married to Edgard Macias, vice minister of labor. At the end of the summer (shortly after the completion of the literacy campaign), we had a get-together at our house for Amy and her co-workers. The evening was a little strained because some of the Genesis II people were totally committed to the Sandinista cause and doubtless felt uncomfortable being in the USAID director's house. The Maciases may have felt that way.

Two years later, after the Sandinista security police threatened his life, Edgard sought asylum in the Venezuelan embassy. The Maciases and their children arrived in Washington soon thereafter. They were treated as lepers by many left-leaning church people in the Washington area who had formerly been their friends. The Maciases have found it very difficult to get work and have been living on a shoestring ever since.

In a recent letter to friends, they said:

"Since leaving Nicaragua we have had access to documentation of [the Sandinistas] and some of [their] former members that proves beyond a doubt that their plans from 1979 on were to deny political and religious freedom. Documents that also show how their methods resemble Somoza to the point they appear as a mirror image: rapes, torture, disappearances, murders, threats, and control of unions and community groups through the formation of their 'elite' political party."

During the last part of 1980, the Partners of the Americas program between the state of Wisconsin and Nicaragua, which had endured for some 15 years, ran into trouble. Most of the activities were focused on the

Atlantic Coast. Among other problems, the Sandinistas attempted to take over the Partners' educational radio station (they subsequently did take it over); two Wisconsin plastic surgeons were harassed during a visit to Puerto Cabezas, where they did some highly complicated surgery free; and the Sandinistas circulated the word that Partners personnel were CIA agents.

The ambassador sent a letter to the junta expressing his concern, and I called on the *comandante* responsible for the Atlantic Coast. After I ran down the litany of problems, the *comandante* said, "You have to understand, Mr. Harrison, that Americans are not very popular in this country." I replied that I had lived in Nicaragua for 18 months, traveled extensively, and had the impression that, notwithstanding Sandinista efforts to paint us as devils, most Nicaraguans liked Americans. I added that this seemed to be particularly true on the Atlantic Coast.

He paused for a few moments, then broke into a broad grin and said, "You're right."

Norma Pineda, an accountant, was the senior Nicaraguan employee of the USAID mission, an admirable professional and human being. Her husband, Byron, had been a lieutenant colonel in a noncombatant unit of the National Guard. Just prior to their triumphal entry into Managua, the Sandinistas announced that National Guard members who had committed no crimes had nothing to fear. Despite the pleadings of family and friends to seek asylum in a nearby embassy, Byron Pineda chose to stay in his house because, as he told his wife, "I have done nothing wrong."

About two weeks after the installation of the Sandinista government, Pineda was arrested and much of his property was confiscated. He was tried some six months later and sentenced to 11 years in jail. As in thousands of other cases, all that was proven by the prosecution was that he had been a member of the National Guard.

A few months later, the Sandinistas told Pineda that he would be freed if his wife would provide information on USAID activities to the government. She refused. He was, however, released to house arrest toward the end of 1980, perhaps because of representations the ambassador and I made at high levels of government. Shortly after, he was told that he would be returned to prison if he failed to persuade his wife to become a spy and if he refused to engage in spying activities himself.

A few weeks after that Norma Pineda left Nicaragua. Byron Pineda sought asylum in the Peruvian embassy in Managua, where he has lived for more than two years.

Late in 1980, the Latin American Studies Association, an organization of U.S. intellectuals interested in Latin America, held its annual meeting in Bloomington, Ind. Junta member Sergio Ramirez and Foreign Minister Miguel d'Escoto attended and were given a hero's ovation. James Cheek, then deputy assistant secretary of state for Latin America, was jeered and heckled. (Cheek, one of the Foreign Service's most distinguished and enlightened specialists on Latin America, had played a crucial role in U.S. disengagement from Somoza as far back as 1974.)

In a subsequent Latin American Studies Association newslettter, Harvard Professor and Association President Jorge Dominguez described the Bloomington meeting as "one of the darkest moments of my professional life . . . appalling . . . scandalous . . . damnable."

I returned to the United States on July 1, 1981, and retired from AID early in 1982. I have been at Harvard working on a book on the relationship between culture and development. In December 1982, I was asked to appear on a panel at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. The principal speaker was Francisco Fiallos, then Nicaraguan ambassador to the United States. Despite a subdued speech on Nicaragua's economic problems, Fiallos was given a hero's ovation by the 300 people in attendance. My comments focused on Sandinista human rights abuses and, in particular, Sandinist reneging on commitments to pluralism and nonalignment. I was booed and jeered repeatedly.

One week later, Fiallos defected.●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years I have taken part in the congressional Call to Conscience Vigil in an attempt to draw attention to the plight of Soviet Jews and other prisoners of conscience who are denied basic human rights and privileges—such as the right to practice their religion freely and to emigrate.

In particular, I am concerned about the plight of Miss Galina Vilchinskaya. Miss Vilchinskaya, at 24, has already served 3 years in a Siberian concentration camp for teaching children's Bible classes during summer vacation.

She was released last August, only to be taken into custody again in November. The last word from her was that she was being held in a jail in Vladivostok for interrogation. Her family was denied permission to see her.

Mr. Speaker, as one of many concerned Members participating in this year's vigil, I hope the Soviet Union will exhibit respect for basic human rights and privileges and allow its citizens like Miss Vilchinskaya to follow their consciences and practice their religion without fear of punishment from the state.●

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION'S VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, those who say that this administration has not kept in close contact with the vocational education community are wrong. When the administration submitted its original vocational education proposal it was obvious to many of us that changes were necessary. When the President and the Secretary of Education resubmitted their bill (H.R. 2940) the changes were included. They were asked to include a set-aside for the handicapped in order to assure that handicapped individuals receive equal opportunity for participation in vocational education. They agreed to this change. They were asked to include an authorization of appropriations for such sums as may be necessary rather than the level prescribed in their budget. They agreed to that change. They were asked to include more emphasis on sex equity activities, including programs for displaced homemakers. They agreed to that change as well. They also agreed to permit funding for day care and for the operation of State and local advisory councils. The administration has clearly shown that it is willing to listen to outside advice, and I believe that H.R. 2940 has improved as a result. Many groups have testified to this point. It is time that the truth comes out.●

JARRETT GOODMAN

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a remarkable man who has been of unvaluable service and inspiration to his community.

Mr. Jarrett Goodman of Milton, Wis., a Vietnam veteran, earned a discharge from the service in a most tragic way. He lost part of his right leg when he stepped on a landmine. Mr. Goodman is now employed by the Postal Service and delivers mail daily on a route that spans 60 miles.

Recently, he was honored in Washington as the U.S. Postal Service's handicapped employee of the year. This award was shared with four other postal employees. I bring this to your attention now because Mr. Goodman is representative of a group of people who have not let their handicaps hinder their active lifestyle. With the help of an artificial leg, Mr. Goodman still participates in his favorite sports—softball, basketball, hunting, and fishing.

It is gratifying to know medicine and technology today are capable of giving the support needed to assist the handicapped in carrying on as close to a normal lifestyle as possible.

I would like you to join me in honoring Mr. Goodman not only for his ability to overcome his handicap, but for the inspiration he serves to his community and the inspiration he should be to us all.●

JUSTICE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has brought a case into a court of law knows how inconvenient the sometimes lengthy legal proceedings can be. Moreover, the length of time one must wait before a case is brought to trial can be excessive. Our overworked judicial system, unfortunately, can not provide for all citizens what the Constitution is supposed to guarantee us—a speedy and public trial. This failing in our Nation's legal system hurts one group of people most of all, the elderly, who simply do not have the time to wait month after month, year after year, for their case to be processed and adjudicated. Today I have introduced a bill that would remedy this particular failing in the legal system by compelling the courts to expedite and decide upon all cases brought by citizens 65 years or older within 1 year from the date which the particular action was brought.

This particular problem was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine, Henry Herriford, who is president of the 50/50 club in Compton. He wrote an impassioned personal letter to me, stating that "due to the long delay in court trials * * * the chance of a citizen 70 years or more living to have his chance in court * * * is not guaranteed. He felt that Congress should * * * make a rule that no one over 65 has to wait more than 1 year before coming to court on a hearing."

I agree with Mr. Herriford. The Nation's elderly deserve to gain justice from our legal system. Those citizens who have neither the time nor the strength for such a long wait for their case to be heard must be allowed to have a quick and speedy trial. Let us make the judicial system more fair to the elderly.●

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. JAMES R. "JIM" OLIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, in today's economy, vocational education is a smart investment. It gives us the skilled workers that will make us more productive. It helps put people in the work force and keep them off welfare.

Small businesses, which create most of our new jobs, frequently cannot afford their own job training programs and rely on vocational education to supply them with skilled employees. At a time when our rapidly changing workplace is demanding a greater number of skilled workers, how can the President justify cutting vocational education by nearly 40 percent?

Easing unemployment and fueling the recovery requires the shared efforts of business, labor, community leaders, and all levels of government. Vocational education is an essential element of this effort.

We are all very much aware of education and its role in achieving our economic, social, and defense goals. Maybe the President's visit to Kentucky will make him more aware of the contribution that vocational education makes. On behalf of nearly 300,000 vocational education students in Virginia, I hope so.●

HONORING ANTHONY QUINN

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I am sure each of my fellow colleagues would agree Anthony Quinn is one of the few truly international stars of the theatrical industry. He is also an individual who over the years I have come to know, work with, and above all respect.

Born in Chihuahua, Mexico, of a Mexican mother and an Irish father, Tony was brought to the United States during the turmoil of the Mexican Revolution. Settling in East Los Angeles he grew up in the barrio and like so many other young people Tony worked hard shining shoes. He attended local schools and became an accomplished musician and eventually graduated with aspirations of one day becoming an actor.

In the late 1940's Tony made his Broadway debut in the critically acclaimed "The Gentleman From Athens." Following his crowd-pleasing performance, he starred in the national tour of "A Streetcar Named Desire," and in its Broadway production in 1950. He again toured the country starring in "Born Yesterday." While performing in New York during this time, Tony was also participating in the developing movie industry.

Tony's accomplished list of notable films includes: "Viva Zapata" and "Lust for Life." For his performance in these two films he won the coveted Oscar from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. His other pictures include: "Zorba the Greek," "La Strada," "The Guns of Navarone," "Lawrence of Arabia," "Wild Is the Wind," "The Visit," "The Shoes of the Fisherman," "Requiem for a Heavyweight," "A High in Jamaica," "Jesus of Nazareth," and "The Greek Tycoon."

In addition to his superior theatrical abilities, Mr. Speaker, Tony is an artist in more ways than one. He is an author, painter, and a sculpturer. In 1972, Tony authored "The Original Sin" and is currently working on three more books. Late last year his sculptures and paintings were unveiled at the Center Art Galleries in Honolulu, Hawaii. Among these artifacts 40 received high critical acclaim.

During the 1960's and 1970's Tony supported the Congress of Mexican-American Unity. He headed dozens of stars of the stage and screen in promoting fundraising events for the benefit of the congress. He has also identified with the social movements of years past and the quest for justice among the farmworkers of the Southwest. Recently he was honored by having a library in East Los Angeles dedicated in his name.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this outstanding individual and thanking him for his years of entertaining work and contribution to our country.●

IN DEFENSE OF CHILDREN

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a few Sundays ago we celebrated Father's Day 1983. Across the Nation families celebrated the special relationship which exists between father and child.

While Father's Day was—and should have been—a joyous occasion, Father's Day 1983 also stood as a somber reminder to fathers—and mothers as well—of the duty to protect the children who came into their lives and enrich them so greatly.

On this Father's Day, I renewed my commitment to protect the lives of and the rights of all children. And the challenge is daunting.

Recent statistics have indicated that nearly 1 million cases of suspected child abuse and neglect are reported annually. Approximately 12 million children remain in poverty. Nine million children have no known source of regular health care. Eighteen million children have never seen a dentist.

Fathers, mothers, and, really, all citizens of this country have the responsibility to provide our Nation's youth the opportunity to lead full and productive lives. And in a special way we must protect the rights of the unborn who—although unable to defend their own rights—represent the very future of our society.

So, Mr. Speaker, on Father's Day 1983, I hope all my colleagues—not only we who are fathers—pledged themselves to improving the lot of all America's children.●

FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPPORTERS

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, recently the Education and Labor Committee reported to the House H.R. 2708, the Foreign Language Assistance For National Security Act of 1983.

Unfortunately, the report was filed before I had the opportunity to submit a list of 31 Members who wished to cosponsor H.R. 2708.

I would like to publicly acknowledge these 31 individuals, thank them for their support for language education, and apologize to them for this error.

The Members who were mistakenly excluded from cosponsoring my foreign language bill are: Mr. HARRISON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PRICE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RATCHFORD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WISE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HERTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. BADHAM, and Mr. FISH.●

INSULT TO INJURY

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, as I was listening to the news on the radio today, I learned that the Japanese Government has announced its intention to end its voluntary restriction on the export of cars to our country, beginning next year. To my disbelieving ears, this news came as a shock indeed.

The administration, in its attempt to head off the progress of the Fair Practices in Automotive Products Act (H.R. 1234), the domestic content bill, has been referring to these export restrictions as all but cast in stone.

Well, the Japanese Government has just displayed, once again, its feelings toward the American worker—the American auto and heavy industry worker in particular. This news hits this country when more than 360,000 auto workers and an additional 600,000 workers in auto-related industries are wondering where their next house payment and meal are going to come from. This news stabs like a sharpened knife into the belly of the auto industry in our country—and could not have come at a more inopportune time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this news shows clearly—terribly clearly—why we should enact H.R. 1234 with all due haste. Clearly, we must take steps to protect ourselves. It appears as though if we do not, no one will.●

RULE ON THE HEALTH CARE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED ACT

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1983

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday favorably ordered reported H.R. 3021, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This legislation would provide for a program of grants to States to provide health care benefits for the unemployed.

I wish to serve notice, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic Caucus, that I have been instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to seek a closed rule on title II of our committee amendment.●