HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, March 26, 1984*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The law of the Lord is perfect, reviving the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes; the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the ordinances of the Lord are true, and righteous altogether.—Psalm 19: 7-9.

Help us, O Lord, to see Your truth in all its manifestations, and encourage us to live that truth in all the avenues of life. 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 with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4072. An act to provide for an improved program for wheat.

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

S. 803. An act to establish the Commission on the Centennial Review of the Civil Service.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of sections 276h-276k of title 22 of the United States Code, as amended, appoints Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. BINGAMAN as members of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group during the second session of the 98th Congress, to be held in Washington, D.C., on May 17-20, 1984.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY, AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit on Tuesday, March 27, 1984, should the House be reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule at the time.

This request has been cleared, and I understand that there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been informed that we have not had a chance to approve this. Could I ask if the gentleman would withhold for a few moments while we check?

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SYNAR) withdraws his request.

THREE YEARS OF REAGANOMICS

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching the third anniversary of Reaganomics and—if last week was any indication—a meaningful, sustained recovery continues to elude our grasp.

On Tuesday the prime rate jumped to 11.5 percent, with predictions that it will climb to 12 percent by summer. The stock market continued its shaky performance, while the Commerce Department acknowledged that our Nation faces the largest trade deficit in history.

REAGANOMICS: AN ECONOMIC COMPARISON

(Or "So You Think We Are Better Off Now Than We Were Before . . .")

Near the close of the 1980 presidential campaign, candidate Ronald Reagan asked the American people a simple question: ". . . are you better off than you were four years ago?" It was a thought-provoking question, and one that merits being asked again today. The truth is that the performance of the economy during the Reagan Administration has fallen far short of the performance of the economy in the four years immediately preceding.

	1981-83	1977-80
Real gross national product [1] (percent)	+1.3	+3.2
Industrial production [2] (percent)	+0.1	+3.0
Rate of capacity utilization [2] (percent)	75.9	83.4
Plant and equipment expenditures [1] (percent)	+0.8	+14.6
Housing starts [3]	1,282,600	1,761,200
Domestic auto sales [1]	6,253,300	8,486,700
Merchandise trade balance, in billions [3]	−$50.6	−$39.6
Business failures [4]	24,491	8,461
Civilian unemployment rate [5] (percent)	9.0	6.5
Number of persons unemployed [5]	9,889,000	6,742,000
Real disposal personal income, per capita [1] (percent)	+1.3	+1.9
Prime rate [6] (percent)	14.84	10.96
Mortgage rate [6]	14.14	10.51
Municipal bond rate [6] (percent)	10.76	6.59
Federal budget deficit, in billions [7]	$153.0	$48.5
Net private investment, in billions [6] (in constant dollars)	$51.3	$84.3
Farm income [6] (average annual rate of growth) (percent)	−5.7	+1.75

[1] Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.
[2] Federal Reserve Board.
[3] Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
[4] Dun & Bradstreet.
[5] Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
[6] Economic Report of the President, 1984.
[7] Office of Management and Budget.

Note.—Each figure is presented as an overall or annual average in order to offset any differences which would arise due to the variance in the number of years of each administration.

Rather than the economic cure-all promised by its creators, Reaganomics is proving to be little more than a political quick fix, financed over the last 3 years with more than a half trillion dollars this Government did not have.

Mr. Reagan says his economic policies have produced a long-term "sparkling recovery." In fact, Mr. Speaker, for most Americans, Reaganomics will be little more than a election year fizzle.

WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 473, NATIONAL EYE HEALTH CARE MONTH

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be stricken from the list of cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 473.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FOSTERING COMPETITION IN SPARE PARTS PROCUREMENT

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the protests about the waste in Federal spending, this Congress has yet to see any real progress on reduc-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ing cost overruns. We have all heard the horror stories of tools and equipment bought for prices hundreds of times their real value. I recently showed the House a small plastic bag containing 31 cents' worth of bolts and washers, the same items for which the Pentagon spent $21,525. The Pentagon's inspector general told Congress last fall that the Pentagon had not made its procurement managers sufficiently price conscious.

That is why I am asking all Members to support a bill now in the Armed Services Subcommittee that would put an end to those horror stories. I am pleased to report that this bill includes the Roth amendment that would help small businesses to compete for Federal contracts. The problem small businesses face today is that they do not have access to the blueprints needed to build and compete for spare parts contracts. The Roth amendment would require the Government to provide that data to all potential competitors. This will put teeth into the legislation by opening the field of competition as wide as possible.

I ask all of you here in Congress to help us pass this legislation so that the American people can be confident that we in Congress will do all in our power to cut waste and fraud.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY, AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit on Tuesday, March 27, 1984, should the House be reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule at that time.

This request has been cleared twice through the minority, and I understand that they twice now have indicated they have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LINE-ITEM VETO, BALANCED BUDGET, AND SCHOOL PRAYER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, during this past weekend I had the opportunity to travel home again to do another town meeting, where I had the opportunity to have some discussion with 350 people who live in my district.

The purpose of the meeting was to talk about what is happening with the economy and what they think should be done. Two of the areas in which we specifically asked them to respond had to do with a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto amendment. Ninety-four percent of the people who attended that meeting said both of those pieces of legislation should not only be passed but should have the opportunity for full discussion here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, for a number of weeks, a number of Republicans have wished to offer unanimous-consent requests calling for consideration of an amendment to require a balanced budget, an amendment to require a line-item veto, and an amendment to allow school prayer.

Mr. Speaker, the Chair has ruled that in order to make these requests, or any of them, we must have the clearance of the majority and minority leaderships. As we have said for a number of weeks, the request has been cleared by the minority leadership, by the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), and I would now yield to a spokesman from the majority leadership for appropriate clearance.

Mr. Speaker, I hear no response, and that should make it very clear to the American people who stands in the way of bringing up a balanced budget amendment, a line-item veto amendment, or a school prayer amendment—and that is the Democratic leadership of this House.

CHANGE IN THE INSANITY DEFENSE RULE AWAITS ACTION BY THE HOUSE

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

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago, another Member cited that this is the third anniversary of Reaganomics. We certainly do not have the time to go into the inconsistencies and inaccuracies of his statement. But I would just like to suggest that this week marks the third anniversary of a tragic event, and that was Mr. Hinckley's attempted assassination of the President.

It is important for any number of reasons, not the least of which is that 3 years after that event still on the floor of the House of Representatives we have not been accorded the opportunity of voting on the question of changing the insanity defense rule. This is something that has been worked on on a bipartisan basis on the Senate side, it has been worked on on a bipartisan basis in the House subcommittee and committee, and yet for 4 or 5 months it has languished without even being given an opportunity for review by the Rules Committee. That is just symbolic of the many different types of crime legislation which have languished in this House for several years.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we might be able to accord it the same courtesy that has been accorded name changes for particular wilderness areas and the planting of more pine trees in a certain part of Oregon. It seems to me that it is the type of legislation that the folks out there expect us to deal with, and I hope we will not have to wait another 3 years until we are given that opportunity.

BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS ON CIA INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, we have forged a bipartisan consensus on legislation to modify the application of the Freedom of Information Act to the Central Intelligence Agency. This consensus is embodied in H.R. 5164, the Central Intelligence Agency Information Act introduced on March 15. I am proud to be a sponsor of this bill with Mr. MAZZOLI, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Intelligence Committee, on which I serve as ranking minority member, with Mr. BOLAND, chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and with Mr. ROBINSON, the ranking minority member of the Intelligence Committee.

The bill is carefully crafted to achieve three purposes.

First, the bill will relieve the CIA from an unproductive FOIA requirement to search and review certain specifically defined CIA operational files consisting of records which, after line-by-line security review, almost invariably prove not to be releasable under the FOIA.

Second, the bill will provide more effective security for the identities and operational activities abroad of individuals who risk their lives and livelihoods to assist the United States by cooperating with the Central Intelligence Agency.

Third, the bill will improve the ability of the CIA to respond to FOIA requests from the public in a timely and efficient manner, while preserving undiminished the amount of information releasable to the public under the FOIA.

I urge my colleagues in the House to give favorable consideration to this legislation in the coming weeks.

□ 1210

CENTRAL STRATEGIC PLANNING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, a recent Harris Business Week poll of 601 executives, many from the 1,200 large corporations in Business Week's corporate scoreboard correlates directly with the finding of the Joint Economic Committee concerning industrial policy. Last year, several hearings conducted by the Joint Economic Committee, demonstrated an absence of any strong support for a so-called national industrial policy.

Most importantly, this was from witnesses whose views spanned the political and economic spectrum. Responses to the recent Harris Business Week poll show there is a strong aversion to central planning in the United States. Nearly two-thirds of those polled believed that central strategic planning is not feasible in our kind of economy.

The next question in the survey indicates, I believe, the disinclination toward central planning. The Harris poll asked those who thought central planning was infeasible if they thought it would be feasible if all central planning was done in the private sector. In other words, if their natural antipathy toward central planning would be overcome by virtue of the fact that those who would make that decision would be in the private sector. One-third of this group thought it would be feasible, while a strong two-thirds said it was not.

In other words, even if they in the business community were given the opportunity to do the strategic overall central planning, an amazing two-thirds of them said it would not work.

Two important points can be drawn in response to these questions, I believe. The first is the continued overwhelming opposition to central planning even if it is done in the private sector, and second, the question was asked on the presumption that all of the central planning would be conducted in the private sector.

This is important, because none of the industrial proposals being considered in Washington, including those going forward in our committees in the House of Representatives, would allow the private sector alone to do the central planning.

The one predominant feature among all the proposals being considered in Washington is the heavy role that the Federal Government would play directing the direction of our economy.

Among my colleagues in the Congress, I have not heard anyone suggest a proposal that would allow the private sector to have exclusive control over planning the economy; so the second question does not seem to have much direct relevance to the debate as it is currently being discussed here in Washington. In fact, I believe it would be naive to think that Congress would turn over to the private sector the authority and responsibility toward central strategic planning.

The question is useful, however, in indicating the lack of support for the central planning schemes currently being debated here in Washington. Perhaps the best indication of the aversion to central planning, even though it might take place in the private sector, came from the testimony of Dr. Robert Noyse, a recipient and cofounder of the National Medal of Science and cofounder of Intel. He oftentimes is referred to as the major spokesman for Silicon Valley, the one who truly understands what drives high tech in this country and he is often requested to testify before panels, both here on the Hill and off the Hill, both within Government and in academic circles.

On June 30 of last year he told our Joint Economic Committee of a situation where he had advised his wife not to invest in a local high tech startup which later turned out to be the most successful in American industrial history. This firm is called Apple Computer.

Stated Dr. Noyse:

> It is precisely because those of us who should have known better didn't see that opportunity, including if I may say so, the big established computer companies that gave Apple such a big opportunity.

He added in his prepared testimony:

> As a footnote, I might add that I am fortunate that my wife, like most, did not take my advice.

In other words, here we have someone who is known as probably the expert in the area of high tech, who based on his own information, his own inclinations, his own feeling for that area, recommended that one should not invest their money in what turned out to be the most successful high tech startup company in the history of the United States.

Now, that should suggest something about our ability to foresee the future, and that should, it seems to me, give us pause before we decide that any group of Americans collectively can make those infallible decisions that would drive this economy.

As a matter of fact, it seems to me it points up the fallacious aspect of this argument and it undercuts the ability of our economy to respond far more quickly and far better than other economies as we face the unknown future. By that I mean this. If you have a rapidly expanding aggressive economy which allows the spirit of entrepreneurialship to prevail, which allows people the opportunity to succeed, knowing that, yes, they may fail, but gives them the ability to put their own initiative to work, to use their own imagination, the possibilities are the successes that are out there will be captured within that system as opposed to a system which shuts everybody down and puts them all into one capsule and says, like toothpaste, we are going to squeeze all of those ideas so that at one end the right idea will prevail.

The next two questions in the survey were asked on the assumption that some central strategic planning mechanism would be implemented. In other words, even though you do not want it, if it is going to come, how would you react to these questions? Because such an overwhelming dislike for central planning was displayed in the earlier part of the survey, these latter questions in some ways are almost moot. Such questions are analagous to asking people, "Which taxes should be increased by the Federal Government?" Despite the fact that 70 percent of those polled in a recent survey opposed the tax increase and perfer that spending be reduced.

It is clear that two-thirds of the executives polled do not think that central planning in our kind of economy is feasible. Nonetheless, results of these latter questions, based on the assumption that we would adopt some sort of central planning, is informative.

The first question in this set, question D, shows that if there were some central strategic planning mechanism, only 7 percent believe it should be used to make key decisions about resource and capital allocation. Yet, and unfortunately, despite such a low level of support, the House Banking Committee on economic stabilization on February 8 of this year reported out a bill which would provide for a bank for industrial competitiveness—to do what? To use taxpayer funds to provide loans, loan guarantees and purchase capital stock to mature our linkage industries. Only 29 percent in this survey felt that business, labor, and government should get together to agree. Remember that this fairly low response was based on the assumption that there were some central strategic planning mechanisms at work in our economy.

□ 1220

Twenty-seven percent of the executives believed that a central planning mechanism should merely collect data and forecast and then an additional separate 27 percent believed that this mechanism should merely collect data.

Therefore, combining these two responses a clear majority, 54 percent, do not believe that any central planning mechanism should play an active role other than that of collecting data and forecasting.

I believe that our colleagues on the House Banking Committee will find

these responses useful when they begin to mark up the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee industrial policy proposals sometime next month.

The answers to the next question are also noteworthy in light of several various industrial policy proposals which have been debated and considered in this last year.

This question was also based on the assumption that central planning was to be done. Eighty-two percent under these assumptions believe that an existing agency of Government such as the Commerce Department should not conduct such central planning. Seventy-eight percent are opposed to central planning being done by "an independent arm of government set up like the Federal Reserve." Seventy-one percent do not believe that central planning should be done by business only.

This corresponds with an earlier level of opposition by those who believe central planning would be infeasible in our economic system to central planning being done in the private sector.

Notably, if the assumption is accepted that some form of central planning were to be conducted, 61 percent believe it should be done by a tripartite board of business, labor, and government. But if you take away the critical assumption as indicated by the earlier strong aversion to central planning this response again is almost moot.

And believe it or not, if academic experts were to be added to this tripartite board, then nearly 60 percent, 59 percent, would be opposed to such a panel. I believe that all in the industrial policy debate recognize that it has been a debate on what the proper role for Government should be in economic decisionmaking.

And for this reason the most indicative response on the role of Government is the economy came on the last question. Two-thirds see only a minor role for Government or hardly any at all in the decision to help industries. Only 31 percent see a major role for the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that any attempt to centralize the decisionmaking process would go against the dynamics and diversity of our economy and people. The conclusion, I believe, was not only borne out by the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee, but also by the recent Harris Business Week survey.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD at this point the questions and results of the 1984 survey.

THE BUSINESS WEEK HARRIS POLL

Interviews conducted by telephone between January 24 and 30, 1984, among 601 executives.

A. As you know, a number of so-called smokestack industries in the U.S.—such as the steel, auto, machine tool, textile, shoe, petrochemical, paper, and rubber industries—appear to have long-term structural problems. They have had trouble competing with foreign products here at home, have not had a major infusion of capital and new technology, and were a major source of unemployment in the recent recession. Do you think these industries will continue to be in trouble, even in this period of recovery, or do you think they can be turned around?

	January 1984	March 1983
Will continue to be in trouble	57–1	44
Can be turned around	39–2	51
Not sure	4–3	5

B. In deciding what kind of help might be given to specific industries or companies, some form of central strategic planning could be pivotal. Now, in our kind of economy and system, do you think such central strategic planning is feasible or not?

Feasible, 33–1; Not feasible, 64–2; Not sure, 3–3.

C. If it were possible for all such central strategic planning to be done just by the private sector, would you then find it feasible or not?

Feasible, 31–1; Not feasible, 66–2; Not sure, 3–3.

D. Now, if there were some central strategic planning mechanism, do you think it should made key decisions about resource and capital allocation, or get business, labor, and government to agree on what ought to be done, or just collect data and forecast industry-by-industry efficiency and performance, or just collect data?

Make key decisions about resource and capital allocation, 7–1; Get business, labor, government to agree, 29–2; Collect data and forecast, 27–3; Just collect data, 27–4; Not sure, 10–5.

E. If central strategic planning were to be done, do you think it should be done by (reach each item) or not?

	Should be	Should not	Not sure
An existing agency of government, such as the Commerce Department	15–1	82–2	3–3
A tripartite board of business, labor, and government	16–1	36–2	3–3
A board of business, labor, government, and academic experts	39–1	59–2	2–3
An independent arm of government, set up like the Federal Reserve	18–1	78–2	4–3
Business only	27–1	71–2	2–3

F. In determining which industries or companies receive help, the role of government is important to define. In such areas as tax policy, expert financing, imports protection, and other areas, of course, government now does give help to many industries. Overall, do you see a major role for government in the decision to help industries, a minor role, or hardly any role at all?

Major role, 31–1; Minor role, 49–2; Hardly any, 18–3; Not sure, 2–4.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to also ask ourselves whether industrial policy helps small business or in fact would it actually hurt it.

That is a question that a lot of people have been asking themselves lately and it is a question that was raised recently in a February 6 Business Week article. One of the major concerns that I and others have about the primary industrial policy proposals currently being considered in Congress is that it would only benefit big government, big labor, and big business.

In other words, it would be elitist by its very nature. Indeed, on February 9 I inserted into the Extension of Remarks section, page 2610, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a Washington Post editorial which stressed the point that it is the big businesses which "can respond most quickly to the daily requirements of the Government bureaucracies."

It is, no doubt, the large companies which have greater resources to devote to regulatory demands and requirements imposed by Washington. For this very reason, small companies, which are responsible for creating most of the jobs in this country, would be put at a disadvantage to big businesses.

In this same Extension of Remarks I inserted a chart which showed that if industrial policy is to be enacted for its job growth potential, experience with the proposal in other countries shows that it has failed miserably in this important area.

The record shows that the United States without a so-called national industrial policy created more jobs during the last decade, some 20 million jobs, that is a 25-percent increase during that time period, than any other Western industrial nation that has an industrial policy.

That is an extremely important point for us to think about because the impetus for a national industrial policy in large measure comes from a perceived need to do different things with the economy to create more jobs. And while that is a worthy goal, it seems to me we ought not to be ignorant of the facts. We should not just legislate on emotion, we should legislate on fact. Emotion is important but oftentimes emotion can overcome the very goals that we are seeking. And the fact of the matter is and it has to be repeated again and again because it is rarely mentioned these days, the United States over the last 10 years did a better job of creating jobs in our economy than any other major industrial country on the face of the Earth. We outstripped these countries tremendously. In some of those countries that have a national industrial policy, as a matter of fact, they had a net loss of jobs in the last decade, while we were increasing our jobs by almost 25 percent.

Now while we might agree, and I think we would readily agree that we need to do more to create an environment such that more jobs are created than even we have had in the past, we should be very, very cautious to adopt policies which have failed in the pursuit of job growth in other countries and abandon those types of things that have created jobs in such large numbers in this country.

The February 6, 1984, article appearing in Business Week, which I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, highlights the concern that industrial policy would impose greater burdens on small businesses. The attitude behind industrial policy proposals is perhaps best summarized by Felix Rohatyn, a leading proponent of an industrial development bank.

The article points out that Rohatyn says that smaller companies, suppliers to the large companies, would be "carried along by the industrial revitalization that would take place."

However, representatives of small- and medium-sized businesses, which are relegated to subordinate status in the central decisionmaking process, do not share this outlook. William Dolle, president of a medium-sized machine toolmaking company, feels that under an industrial policy the "little guys like us will get nothing."

Likewise, John M. Albertine, head of the American Business Conference, which is a group of businesses that have grown rapidly in the last number of years, not large businesses, but small to medium businesses, thinks that "many companies would just get the 'crumbs' from funds that go to big industries."

Perhaps the best indication of the priorities for industrial policy is the proposed makeup of the various economic cooperation councils, which relegate small business to a level equal to that of public interest groups. By paying lip service to small business, the creators of industrial policy had hoped to make a case with the small businessman or woman, but have obviously come up far short. As the Business Week article points out:

And indeed the Democrats, who have seized on industrial policy as a campaign issue, have so far failed to come up with a national strategy to aid small and medium sized companies.

In fact, after studying the industrial policy proposal for almost a year and having had the opportunity to have chaired several hearings on industrial policy for the Joint Economic Committee, I think the Economic Cooperation Council is misnamed. I think a more descriptive and appropriate name would be the Council on Political Clout and the Bank for Industrial Competitiveness could be called the Bank on Political Clout. John Albertine makes the point in the article that "Those who don't have a lot of political clout will be largely ignored by the process."

□ 1230

Evidently, Mr. Speaker, no one is going to fool the small businessmen and women of this country, and that in itself is a very positive sign.

Another thing that we ought to keep in mind as we address ourselves to the siren song of national industrial policy is the fact that with this tremendous amount of job growth which has taken place in the Nation in the past decade, most of it has come from small- and medium-sized companies. Some studies have shown that if you take the Fortune 500 or the Fortune 5,000, literally no new net jobs have been created in those companies. The tremendous amount of growth that we have seen has come in the small business to medium size business, with, really, the greatest emphasis in the small business community. That suggests that anything we do which takes the possibility of capital, which takes the possibility of investment, which takes the possibility of ever increasing small business, will really be taking away the greatest potential that we have for job creation in this country.

Those who suggest that this will not happen, that Government that comes together in Washington with some sort of council will do better than all of those small entrepreneurs, all of those men and women around this country, evidently have not learned the lesson of the Vietnam war. I thought the lesson of the Vietnam war was that the best and the brightest are not all in Washington; and if they are, they do not always make the best and the brightest decisions.

Yet here we are, in an economic sense, saying "Look, the only thing we need to do to take care of the problems we have is create a little bit more central planning, we will bring the best and the brightest here in Washington, D.C., and they can do a far better job of determining what is good for the people back home than the people back home."

It sorts of turns on its head the very concept of a representative democracy. We are here in the House Chamber, the Chamber of the U.S. House of Representatives, and "representative" means that we represent the people, their hopes, their aspirations, their dreams, their concerns. We are sent here to take care of the difficulties that they find in dealing with Government, in assisting them with those things that they cannot do individually or they cannot do so well at the local government level or they cannot do so well in private institutions and churches and families, and so forth.

But here we are being told that all we have to do is allow a council to be created, will collect all of this meaningful data, will come together and somehow out of that we will arrive at the proper decisions so that here in Washington, D.C., we can decide what is best for Littleton, Colo., or Long Beach, Calif., or Dallas-Fort Worth, or many, many other communities around this country. In some ways I think Members of Congress, instead of taking some needed trips around the world at times to find out some of the concerns around the world that we have to vote on, ought to be required once every 2 years to drive across this country and stop in small communities around the United States and find out how diverse, how vast this country is and how no group of people here in Washington, D.C., could possibly anticipate the concerns, the needs, the desires, the aspirations of all of the American people, and would then again remember how difficult it is for us to foresee what the difficulties are or what the problems are in every town and hamlet in America.

It is tough enough to decide what the problems are. It is even more difficult to apply the proper solutions to those problems, and I think it is the height of arrogance for us to suggest that, once we are vested with the cloak of being a Member of the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate, or once we come to Washington, D.C., and somehow sit on the banks of the Potomac and smell the fumes that emanate from this area, that we are somehow better and brighter than those people who sent us here. I think we ought to reject that, and I think we ought to recognize the fact that the small businessmen and women of this country are not being fooled is something we ought to apply to ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include in the RECORD the article from Business Week of February 6, 1984:

WOULD INDUSTRIAL POLICY HELP SMALL BUSINESS?

So far, proposals for an industrial policy to restructure American industry have focused on big companies and big industries. Some experts, however, believe that the real payoff to an industrial policy must come through revitalizing the thousands of smaller companies that serve the surviving giants of smokestack America. But figuring out how to do this—and convincing the owners of these smaller companies that they can benefit—is proving a difficult challenge.

William L. Dolle Jr., for example, president of Lodge & Shipley Co., a Cincinnati machine toolmaker, has seen his sales decline from $52 million in 1981 to less than $20 million last year. The Japanese are taking over the market for his chief product, computer-controlled lathes. Yet when asked about an industrial policy to help his company, he says: "Little guys like us will get nothing."

FROZEN OUT

And indeed, the Democrats, who have seized on industrial policy as a campaign issue, have so far failed to come up with a national strategy to aid small and medium-size companies. Yet these companies are being frozen out of the private capital market, some experts say, because they are competing against glamorous high-tech concerns that promise high returns. If they do not survive, unemployment could rise sharply, causing political and social turmoil. So even though these companies may be earning low rates of return right now, some economists say they should be helped on social grounds.

A key element of most industrial policies is an investment bank patterned after the old Reconstruction Finance Corp. (RFC)

started by Herbert Hoover in 1932. But that bank would focus only on big industries and big companies. The leading proposal for such a bank comes from a group headed by investment banker Felix G. Rohatyn, former Du Pont Co. Chairman Irving S. Shapiro, and AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland. Rohatyn sees smaller companies benefiting primarily from "trickle-down." He says that smaller companies—suppliers to the large industries—would be "carried along by the general industrial revitalization that would take place."

The Rohatyn-Shapiro-Kirkland proposal would create an Industrial Development Board whose members, appointed by the President, would represent business, labor, and government. The board would work with a few industries to develop competitive strategies, and the bank—the Industrial Finance Administration—would supply funds to carry them out. The IFA would have $5 billion in government funds to lend or invest, with its assistance contingent on an equal amount coming from the private sector. Small companies could jointly ask the board to act on a shared problem, such as tax treatment, but there would be no direct assistance.

Gar Alperovitz of the National Center for Economic Alternatives disagrees with this approach. He thinks that any new RFC-type bank should be required to earmark some of its government funds for small industrial companies. "Small businesses could provide jobs in depressed areas, lead in innovation, and strengthen decentralization of our elephant-dominated economy."

Those who want to help small businesses point to the success of the original RFC in the 1930s. That bank channeled funds to smaller companies directly. Jesse H. Jones, its autocratic and highly respected chairman, operated in relative freedom and could place his loans pretty much where he wished. For example, the RFC lent several million dollars to Botany Worsted Mills, in Passaic, N.J., and saved a plant that employed 5,000 people. In that instance, Jones insisted that Botany tighten up its management as a condition of the loan. Not all the RFC loans were of that size, however: Jones once boasted that he had made a loan for $500.

But the 1980s are not the 1930s. During the Depression, the RFC was the only game in town for small business, says Clark Nardinelli, an economist at Clemson University. Private banks were reducing loans and building cash assets. Now private banking and venture capital are vibrant, and a host of federal assistance programs already exists.

DRAWING THE LINE

Money set aside for small business could create enormous administrative difficulties. Frank S. Swain, chief counsel for the Small Business Administration, says that the SBA has different size criteria for different industries and spends inordinate amounts of time just "hassling out tough questions such as where you draw the line on size."

Furthermore, many companies need changes that go far beyond the expertise of investment bankers, says Robert A. Pritzker, president of Marmon Group Inc. He doubts that an RFC-like bank could identify potentially profitable small businesses. Pritzker has made a career of buying up "nuts-and-bolts" companies and turning them around. "But I'm not an investment banker—I'm an engineer," he notes.

And many people think that such a bank—however designed and staffed—would end up dispensing funds to only politically powerful companies. John M. Albertine, head of the American Business Conference, a lobbying group of medium-size businesses, thinks that many companies would just get the "crumbs" from funds that go to big industries. "Those who don't have political clout will be largely ignored," he says. Evidence exists to support this view. In 1983, 10 exporters received 80% of the Export-Import Bank's direct loans.

Whether real or imagined, these objections are pushing some politicians and economists to suggest other, more modest, ways that an industrial policy could help keep smaller, old-line businesses alive. The most popular idea is state funded investment banks—mini-RFCs. Already 13 states have started such institutions, says Larry Ledeber, an economist with the Urban Institute. Some of them invest in a variety of industries while others concentrate on high tech.

"It's easier in the smaller microcosm of a state to bring the private sector into a coherent partnership with state and local government," says Belden H. Daniels, a Cambridge (Mass.)-based consultant in economic development. He cites a Massachusetts partnership between the state and the insurance industry. In return for favorable tax treatment, a pool funded by the insurance companies makes higher-risk loans. A 1978 loan of $5 million, says Daniels, helped keep Wang Laboratories Inc. on its feet when it was a struggling company with less than $150 million in sales.

A FACTORY SERVICE

Another approach for channeling capital to smaller businesses is to create a secondary market for industrial loans, proposal supported by Representative John J. LaFalce (D-N.Y.) and Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.). The plan would create a government-backed institution that would insure, package, and resell industrial loans, playing a role similar to that of the Government National Mortgage Assn. in housing finance. This would enable companies to obtain financing at lower interest rates than they can get on their own.

Capital is not the sole problem for small companies. Often companies need to modernize, which takes knowledge of new technology. LaFalce and Kennedy propose a "factory extension service" that would link universities and businesses. It would be modeled after the Agriculture Dept's Extension Service, which informs farmers about new products and techniques.

These proposals may help smaller business. But if the current economic expansion falters, the push for supplying capital to smaller companies through a national RFC may get wider support.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, there are currently pending in Congress several proposals that intend to create a so-called Economic Cooperation Council or Council on Industrial Competitiveness as a part of a grand industrial policy package. The purpose of this centralized planning council is, of course, to reach a consensus and then direct the course of the United States industrial and economic policy.

It seems to me that we ought to ask the very important question: Who will make up such a council? Because that is a very interesting question that raises some important and, I believe, well-founded concern.

As could be expected, the "foxes" in charge of this "henhouse" will be representatives of big labor, big business and big government. For those of us who have dared to inquire as to how the interests of the individual American are to be represented in this scheme, industrial policy proponents have acquiesced in a familiar manner. In a deft political move to stifle any objections and mollify the public, the braintrusts backing this council of omniscient economic market bureaucrats have, in the name of egalitarianism, made provisions to include, of course, the ever faithful "public interest" in this council.

Apparently their hope is that public at large is never informed as to how the "public interest" is represented here in Washington.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a recent survey indicates the monstrous dimensions of this "public interest" misnomer. Of all of the amorphous terms and clouded lexicon that pervade and terminally muddle industrial policy proposals, one buzzword that has been clearly defined is the selective bureaucratic definition of "public interest."

I think it is interesting to note that the survey of public interest groups by S. Robert Lichter and Stanley Rothman, published in the April/May 1983 edition of Public Opinion magazine, will give us an idea of who is out there purporting to represent that so-called "public interest."

Lichter and Rothman explained that their "goal was to better understand an influential leadership group and the dymanics of the new liberalism it represents."

As the Lichter-Rothman article and the Wall Street Journal editorial of June 13, 1983, that I will shortly insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, point out, it would be exceedingly difficult to find a legitimized group more cohesively dissonant with mainstream American political thought than public interest groups.

Lichter and Rothman conclude that "in their quest to represent the public interest, they"—that is the public interest groups—"often deviate from the outlook and perspectives of the general public."

Again we see the idea of the best and the brightest rearing its ugly head.

The logic of placing representatives of a group that appears to advocate the complete upheaval of American economic institutions and ideals—51 percent propose a move toward socialism—on a council created to catalyze the resurgence of our free market economy absolutely eludes me.

The scenario of this select intelligentia walking hand in hand with chosen elites from big business, big labor, and big government to rearrange the priorities and, in the process, destroy the

impetus for a healthy free market economy is very alarming indeed.

One of the most revealing features of industrial policy is the way it has been deliberately designed. What is important is not as much who are included to serve on these councils, but who are also excluded.

There is no doubt in my mind that only leaving room at the bargaining table for big business, big labor, big government, and representatives of the so-called public interest, is overlooking and preventing the participation of many important elements of our economy.

Those who carry the political clout in Washington do not have to worry about proposals like this. For the rest, however, industrial policy means that more control over the policies that affect you will slip away.

Industrial policy represents a misguided and undemocratic attempt to interfere with the free market process and substitute the selected interests of powerful special interest groups for the greatest resource of economic guidance presently available, that is, the American people.

Mr. Speaker, when I talk about the public interest, I, of course, recognize that there are those who sincerely believe in the public interest and that as a term overall it is probably ambiguous enough. As a matter of fact, there is a particular appeal to it.

The fact of the matter, however, is that the public interest has taken a life of its own in terms of its own interpretation.

Basically, it has to be defined by those who participate in it. And the interesting thing is that the public interest groups primarily are of one philosophical bent.

Now, that is their ability, that is their right. If they want to be involved on one side of the political spectrum or the other, they have the right, as every other American citizen does. But the fact of the matter is that many people, hearing the notion "public interest," immediately assume that they do not have a philosophical bent, that they are objective or bipartisan, as the case may be, and that, therefore, it might make some sense to have those who are within the public interest represented on particular boards.

The reason this is extremely important is that the current proposal before the House of Representatives, which will be marked up by the House Banking Committee, includes not only representatives of business, labor and the Government, but, as a result of my testimony before the committee, they allow one person to be on there—and I believe it is a 16-member panel—one person to represent small business.

□ 1240

But they also require people from academia and those who have been active in special interest groups. That is the term that is used in the legislation itself. That is why it is extremely important that we might look at what that means. That is why the public opinion survey is so extremely important.

Let me just give you a taste of what the predominant philosophy is in these public interest groups. They were asked, they were given a group of public figures and groups and asked with whom they identify. This is the approval rating given of these various individuals and groups. No. 1 was Ralph Nader, with 93 percent; No. 2 was EDWARD KENNEDY with 93 percent; No. 3 was John Kenneth Galbraith with 90 percent; No. 4 was Gloria Steinem with 89 percent; No. 5 was Andrew Young with 86 percent; No. 6 was the Sandinistas with a 50-percent approval rating; No. 7 was Fidel Castro with a 34-percent approval rating; No. 8 was Milton Friedman with a 15-percent approval rating; in other words, he is approved by less than half of those who approve of Fidel Castro. No. 9 was Margaret Thatcher with a 14-percent approval rating; No. 10 was Jeane Kirkpatrick with a 14-percent approval rating; No. 11 was Ronald Reagan with a 5-percent approval rating.

In other words, the predominant philosophy of those who make up the "special interest" to which we are to seed our ability to make industrial policy, believe that Fidel Castro is seven times better than Ronald Reagan in terms of approval. The Sandinistas are 10 times better, and the Moral Majority out of this group of 12, in last place with a 2-percent approval rating.

Now, as I said, these people have every right to decide who it is they think are the proper people to lead these countries and of whom they approve and whom they disapprove. I would challenge anyone to suggest that if you gave that same list of people and groups to an average group of Americans, a cross-section of Americans, you would find that 5 percent of them approve of Ronald Reagan, while 34 percent of them approve of Fidel Castro, or 50 percent of the Sandinistas.

The fact that one of these people on this group, Mr. KENNEDY, was unable to get the nomination of his own party would suggest that 93 percent of the American people do not approve of him in terms of his basic philosophy or his ability to make decisions for the rest of America.

That, I think, we must look at very, very closely. Are we in fact going to have a situation in which the best and brightest, so-called, are going to make decisions that heretofore have been made by American citizens in small hamlets, small towns, medium-sized towns, large towns, in all 50 of the States and in the territories across this entire globe, or are we going to believe that those decisions can best be made at the local level?

Now, I am not a Pollyanna, Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that somehow we have a 19th-century laissez-faire economy operating in the United States at the present time, nor do I wish us to go to that sort of situation. In fact, I rather doubt historically whether we ever had that type of situation in the world. But that is not the point; the point is, Where do we go from here? Is the future to be charted by those who wish to have those decisions made more and more by a smaller and smaller circle of individuals who somehow curry political favor, who come to Washington, D.C., and make the decisions for the rest of us?

It might be instructive for us to look at what happened in the past. We had the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that came into existence during the New Deal. There is some question as to how successful it was during that period of time, and whether in fact it was helping to get us out of the doldrums of the Depression, or whether in fact the unfortunate truth is that World War II provided the economic impetus for us to get out of it.

I think you can say without contradiction that the U.S. Congress ridded itself of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation because of what it came to represent. That was an elitist-type body, making decisions more and more on a political basis rather than an economic basis.

Many have suggested that if someone believes we can set up some sort of committee or commission or council in Washington, D.C., and that committee, commission, or council is going to be somehow isolated and insulated from political considerations, they have not been in Washington, D.C., very long.

As a matter of fact, when you look at the history of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, you find that in the early fifties it was making loans to people who wanted to start roadside snake farms for sale to other people. They even extended a loan to a couple of enterprising people who wanted to start a roulette wheel in the back of a hotel room in Las Vegas. Now, those may be worthy goals for some people, but I doubt that the American people should be required to have their money go there.

The last point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is this: The economy is a very complex mechanism. No one has all the answers, that is true. In fact, I dare say no one has all the questions. But the one overwhelming, recurrent factor in all considerations of national industrial policy, is that it does not create any new wealth; it does not make the pie any larger; it does not

say to others come and partake in the pie that will become ever larger and larger so that all Americans can have part of the American dream.

What it says is basically the pie is already as big as it is ever going to get; you cannot make it any bigger, so we are going to have to redistribute parts of the pie, and for those of you who may have parts of the pie now, you are going to get a smaller slice, and for those of you who are now just coming to the table to eat, you are going to have to deal with a smaller pie than anybody has had before, or a piece of the pie that anybody has ever had before. As Jack Albertine has suggested, "If you happen to be small business, you don't get to eat at the table, you will be able to pick the crumbs up off the floor as they are pushed away from those already at the table."

That is a defeatist attitude. What we ought to do is pursue policies that increase the size of that pie, that expand that pie so that the American dream can be part and parcel of every man, woman, and child in America. So that they can go so high and so far as they wish and their talents will take them. That means us embarking on a policy of creating an atmosphere where initiative is not stifled, but encouraged; where inventiveness, where risk-taking, where the ability to succeed drives many, many different people around this country. People that I probably would suggest in some circumstances I do not think could make it, but I am not the one to judge, nor is any other Member in the House of Representatives or the Senate to judge or in the White House, for that matter. These people should be given an opportunity to do as others have that have gone before them, to rise and fall on their own merits.

I do not say that we do not take care of those who cannot help themselves, that is not the debate. We will always have a social policy which says that we have an obligation to help our neighbors, both privately and through governmental policy. But we are talking about what is the cutting edge of the dynamics of the economy. How is that economy going to move as we continue on into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Lichter-Rothman article from Public Opinion, April-May, 1983, edition and the Wall Street Journal editorial be placed in the RECORD.

Lastly and finally, Mr. Speaker, I would hope my colleagues will seriously look at the question of national industrial policy, as I have suggested in testimony before. I think it has been over the last year and a half the fad of the year, the economic fad of the year, the bloom is off the rose, so to speak on part of it, such that some people who still pursue it, are calling it all sorts of other things. So it shall not be recognized, but I would hope that we would seriously look at it. I hope we would not make the mistake of trying to duplicate the Japanese experience that never existed; that some think, gives us reason for a national industrial policy. That we would not duplicate the actions that have taken place in West Germany and France and other countries who followed a definite national industrial policy which has failed in comparison to ours to create the jobs that are necessary for the men and women of this country now and in the future.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 13, 1983]

VERY INTERESTING

If you had to guess, which group in American life would you suppose cast its votes in the last four presidential elections in the following manner: 90% for Humphrey in 1968; 96% for McGovern in '72; 93% for Carter in '76; and 92% for Carter or Anderson in 1980? Democrats? The candidate's staff? His relatives? Sixth-graders?

It turns out that there is one significant group in America displaying such remarkable intellectual cohesion. These are the members of what call themselves "public interest groups." Their taste in presidents and other political affinities are revealed in a fairly amazing survey conducted by S. Robert Lichter and Stanley Rothman, published in the April/May issue of Public Opinion magazine. They surveyed the leaders or senior staffers of 74 "public interest" groups, including Common Cause, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Environmental Defense Fund, Public Citizen, the Children's Defense Fund, Congress Watch and the Center for Law and Social Policy.

"The public interest," Messrs. Lichter and Rothman remind us, was defined by Walter Lippmann in 1955. "The public interest," he wrote, "may be presumed to be what men would choose if they saw clearly, thought rationally, acted disinterestedly and benevolently." This, we would guess, comports exactly with the self-definition of the people who profess to the fashionable name. But the Lichter-Rothman survey makes it evident that the left-wing values and goals of many of these groups are about as representative of the mainstream public and its interests as the most far-right group one can find in polling data.

Some 90% of this group's members define themselves as "left of center." About 94% believe that government ought to redistribute income, and 51% believe the U.S. should move toward socialism. They rank the most influential groups in America as: business, media, military, government agencies, unions, religion, intellectuals, blacks, consumer groups and feminists. Their preferred ranking would be: consumer groups, blacks, intellectuals, feminists, unions, media, government agencies, business, religion and the military.

Finally, America's professional—and in many instances, government-funded—defenders and definers of what is in the public's interests were asked to register their approval of the following: Ralph Nader, Edward Kennedy, John Kenneth Galbraith, Gloria Steinem, Andrew Young, the Sandinistas, Fidel Castro, Milton Friedman, Margaret Thatcher, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Ronald Reagan and the Moral Majority. Actually, the preceding list is the exact ordering of the survey's approval rankings. The Sandinistas got 50%, the president of Cuba received an approval rating of 34% and the president of the U.S. got 5%.

[From the Public Opinion, April/May 1983]

WHAT INTERESTS THE PUBLIC AND WHAT INTERESTS THE PUBLIC INTERESTS

(By S. Robert Lichter and Stanley Rothman)*

Ralph Nader was probably the first soldier in the modern public interest army. He was bright, ascetic, and dedicated, a prototype for the hordes of college volunteers who eagerly marched behind him. With missionary zeal, they took on all that they thought was evil in society. It wasn't very long before the campuses and the capital were filled with Nader-like groups, each having a Nader-like mission. Thus was born the public interest movement.

"Public interest" is a term that is widely used but rarely explained. It's been around since the nineteenth century, yet only a few brave souls have attempted definitions. Walter Lippmann, writing in 1955 before the label became interlocked with the movement, explained it as follows: "The public interest may be presumed to be what men would choose if they saw clearly, thought rationally, acted disinterestedly and benevolently." [1]

If men frequently fail to see, think, and act according to these lofty standards, there are those who attempt to do it for them—the public interest groups. They have taken on the entire American citizenry as a constituency, and the task they set for themselves is equally catholic. They are there to speak for all the people, whose voices would be otherwise drowned out, to accomplish "the purposes we all share and must pursue together." [2] They have names like "Common Cause," "Public Citizen," and "Consumer Federation of America." They counterpoise their interests to the selfish or the vested interests; they profess to advocate the public interest "with the same persuasiveness that others advocate special interests." [3]

The term "public interest" may not be new, but the movement is. It arose in the 1960s when the social and political atmosphere changed, bringing new alignments, new codes of behavior, and new definitions. Life had been much simpler in the 1950s. Those were the days when political labels were fewer, but clearer. At one end of the spectrum stood liberals, who supported New Deal social programs; at the other end stood conservatives who opposed them. In general, liberals were working class and Democratic; conservatives were middle class and voted Republican. People with college educations on the whole were much less enthusiastic about New Deal social programs than were those with high school or grade school educations. Then things turned topsy-turvy. The political landscape burst into bloom, yielding up such neologistic hybrids as the new right, the new left, the new or "neo" conservatives, and "neo" liberals. The old liberal and conservative labels were still

---

* S. Robert Lichter is assistant professor of political science at George Washington University and Stanley Rothman is Mary Huggins Gamble professor of government at Smith College.

[1] Walter Lippmann, "Essays in the Public Philosophy," (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1955), p. 42.

[2] John Gardner, "In Common Cause" (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.) 1973, p. 16.

[3] Ibid, p. 18.

around, but they bore little resemblance to their 1950s homonyms.

According to Everett Ladd,[4] what was "new" about liberalism and conservatism was that they'd switched classes. In the new order, the lower middle class is the more conservative, and the upper middle class the more liberal. And education tends to be a liberalizing, not a conservatizing, influence. The two groups both adhere to the Democratic party, but to different "wings." The upper status new liberals constitute a burgeoning "intelligentsia." Their concerns include matters of economics privilege and privation, but they center on newer social, cultural, and "life style" issues. It is no accident that the new liberalism and the public interest movement arose at almost the same time. The latter is the purest political expression of the former.

The public interest movement brings together established consumer and civil rights groups with the new Nader groups and other organizations working for governmental and social reform. In little over a decade, it has helped redirect the public agenda to encompass such diverse concerns as voting reform, consumerism, environmentalism, and the right to uphold "deviant" attitudes and life styles.

As part of a larger study on leadership and social change, we surveyed leading members of the public interest movement about their backgrounds, their social, economic, and political outlooks, and their aspirations for American society.[5] Our goal was to better understand an influential leadership group and the dynamics of the new liberalism it represents.

DOING WELL BY DOING GOOD

There are two prongs to the public interest movement—the formal lobbying organizations and an informal network of attorneys based in public interest law firms, universities, foundations, and government. We created separate lists of key individuals in both sectors. For the organizational sample we selected presidents and boards of directors of major public interest groups, relying on such sources as Public Interest Profiles, Washington Five, and the Encyclopedia of Associations. For the legal sample we consulted such works as the Ford Foundation's Public Interest Law: Five Years Later and the Council for Public Interest Law compendium, Balancing the Scales of Justice. We also relied on the invaluable assistance and expertise of Ms. Nan Aron, executive director of the Alliance for Justice, a national association of public interest organizations. We restricted the list to those individuals affiliated with groups based in the Washington, D.C. and New York metropolitan areas.

We randomly selected equal numbers of individuals from each sector to obtain a total sample of 157. These individuals represent a cross section of the public interest elite, including leaders or top staffers of seventy-four organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union, Center for Law and Social Policy, Children's Defense Fund, Common Cause, Congress Watch, Consumer's Union, Critical Mass, Environmental Defense Fund, Public Citizen, and Women's Legal Defense Fund, as well as major public interest law firms.

[4] Everett Carll Ladd, "The New Lines Are Drawn," *Public Opinion*, July/August 1978.

[5] This study is directed by Stanley Rothman and Robert Lichter under the auspices of Smith College, George Washington University, and the Research Institute on International Change at Columbia University.

The social and personal backgrounds of this group, shown in table 1, approximate the "ideal type" of the new liberal. Most are white males, although the group includes a substantial minority of women (31 percent). Most were raised in big cities on the east coast in the comfortable circumstances of the upper middle class. Fifty-six percent recall that their family income was above average while they were growing up, four times the proportion who remember below average economic conditions. Moreover, a majority of their fathers were educated professionals, and 40 percent of those fathers held a postgraduate degree.

TABLE 1.—*Social and personal backgrounds*

Background	*Percent*
White	97
Male	69
From metropolitan area	71
From northeast corridor	60
Father voted Democrat	64
Father's occupation professional	52
Father held a postgraduate degree	40
Attended "highly selective" college	45
Social science major	53
Holds postgraduate degree	89
Family income $50,000+	58
Political liberal	90
Raised in Jewish religion	47
Current religion "none"	41

Their parents were politically aware and tended toward liberal and Democratic sympathies. Forty-nine percent say their fathers were liberal, and 63 percent apply the liberal label to their mothers. (Only about one-quarter of the general population describe themseves as liberal.) Sixty-four percent say their fathers identified with the Democrats and 71 percent link their mothers to that party. Moreover, the parents usually communicated their political beliefs to their children. Fully half recall frequent political dicussions at home, three times the proportion who seldom or never talked about politics.

Public interest leaders are overwhelmingly young, highly educated, well-paid professionals, with secular and liberal outlooks and Democratic voting habits. Their average age is thirty-nine, and a majority are in their thirties, which means that many experienced firsthand the social and political ferment that swept across college campuses during the 1960's. Most were interested in social issues even then; a majority majored in the social sciences, including one in three who studied political science.

Their academic credentials are most impressive. Seventy-two percent went to private colleges or universities, and 45 percent attended highly selective schools. In fact, on a widely used measure of college selectivity that rates colleges from "one" (lowest) to "seven" (highest), the median rating for the entire group is a startling 6.17. Most went on to law school or other postgraduate training, and most continued in high quality programs. Currently 78 percent are lawyers, and only 11 percent lack some postgraduate degree.

In light of their impressive educational credentials, it is not surprising that public interest leaders are very well paid. Indeed most have done well by doing good (although many could undoubtedly do even better in corporate law firms). Despite their relative youthfulness, 35 percent earned over $50,000 in individual income in 1981; 58 percent exceeded $50,000 in family income. Among business leaders, the subjects of one of our earlier studies, 57 percent had family incomes exceeding $50,000. Inflation might help account for the public interest elites' comparatively greater monetary success, but it should not be forgotten that they are much younger than most business leaders.

If many public interest leaders are following family traditions of upper status liberalism, they depart from their parents in one respect—they have moved toward a more secular orientation. Ninety-five percent had a religious upbringing, including 47 percent in the Jewish faith, 29 percent as Protestants, and 17 percent as Catholics. Currently 41 percent profess no religious affiliation, 35 percent still consider themselves Jews, 13 percent Protestants, and 8 percent Catholics. Moreover, these affiliations are usually only nominal. Eighty-four percent say they seldom or never attend religious services.

Like their parents, the vast majority of public interest leaders regularly vote Democratic; nearly all consider themselves liberals. Since 1968, no Republican presidential candidate has received more than 4 percent of their votes, as table 2 shows. Their strongest support went to George McGovern, who garnered 96 percent of their ballots in the face of the 1972 Nixon landslide. In the other three elections, they supported third party candidates more often than Republicans. In their ideological self-evaluations, 90 percent place themselves left of center, 8 percent in the middle of the road, and only 2 percent to the right of center. Among the general public, by contrast, 21 percent describe themselves as left of center, 43 percent in the center, and 36 percent to the right of center (Gallup, September 1982).

TABLE 2.—*Presidential voting record 1968-80*

	Percent
1968:	
Nixon	2
Humphrey	90
1972:	
Nixon	4
McGovern	96
1976:	
Ford	3
Carter	93
1980:	
Reagan	2
Carter	80
Anderson	12

Note.—Up to 8 percent voted for minor party candidates.

PROFILE OF THE NEW LIBERAL

Everett Ladd argues that the new liberal rejects traditional bourgeois values, cultural norms, and older codes of behavior. The new liberal supports "a new morality" and endorses alternate life styles. He seeks government action in the service of social change. He is critical of the United States and its international role, hence he is reluctant to support military spending.

As table 3 shows, every element of this description fits the public interest elite. They agree almost unanimously that the government should substantially reduce the income gap between rich and poor people, and that government bears the responsibility to guarantee jobs for all and to insure a good standard of living. They are equally vehement in rejecting the Reagan administration's position that government should ease its regulation of business. Moreover, substantial minorities dissent from some economic propositions that are practically articles of faith for most Americans. Thirty-seven percent support government takeovers of big corporations, and 29 percent reject the capitalist dictum that people with more ability should earn more.

The liberalism of public interest leaders shades into profound dissatisfaction with the American social and economic order, a feeling not shared by the public. In fact, their alienation was one of our most striking findings. Forty-eight percent agree that our institutions should be completely overhauled, and a majority (51 percent) believe the country would be better off if we moved toward socialism. Three out of four believe the very structure of our society causes alienation, and over 90 percent say our legal system favors the wealthy. Only 30 percent see the private enterprise system as fair to workers. A mere 18 percent accept the basic credo of American capitalism that hard work will lead to financial success. Only about half the public interest leaders believe the system can be salvaged.

TABLE 3.—*Attitudes on social issues*

[Percent agreement]

Economics:	
Government should redistribute income	94
Government should guarantee jobs	80
Government should take over big corporations	37
Government should guarantee a good standard of living	80
Less regulation of business is good for U.S.	18
People with more ability should earn more	71
Political alienation:	
U.S. institutions need complete overhaul	48
Structure of U.S. society causes alienation	75
U.S. legal system favors wealthy	92
In America, hard work leads to financial security	18
Private enterprise is fair to workers	30
U.S. should move toward socialism	51
Foreign policy:	
More forceful with U.S.S.R	9
CIA overthrows sometimes necessary	26
Goal of U.S. foreign policy has been to protect business	74
U.S. military should be the strongest in the world	3
Disavantaged groups:	
Women should get preference in hiring	79
Blacks are denied education to advance	83
Blacks lack motivation to advance	3
Black gains come at white expense	3
Blacks should get preference in hiring	85
Poor people are victims of circumstance	77
Sex and morality:	
Woman has right to decide on abortion	95
Homosexuality is wrong	12
Homosexuals shouldn't teach in schools	8
Adultery is wrong	55
Energy and environment:	
Environmental problems are not serious	5
We should halt nuclear energy development	68
Nuclear plants are safe	7

Their profound dissatisfaction with the system makes them staunch supporters of affirmative action for disadvantaged groups. They overwhelmingly agree that poor people are victims of circumstances beyond their control and that blacks lack not the motivation but the educational opportunity to climb up the economic ladder. To speed their advances, 85 percent support preferential hiring practices for blacks, and nearly as many (79 percent) would extend that assistance to women.

THE LIBERAL BENT

Public interest leaders' rejection of traditional values extends to the realm of sex and morality. Ninety-five percent are prochoice on abortion. Only one out of eight regards homosexuality as wrong, and even fewer would restrict a homosexual's right to teach in public schools. They are more evenly split on the issue of extramarital sex; 55 percent agree that adultery is wrong.

If there is one issue that unites this group, it is environmentalism. Protection of the environment provides the raison d'être for many of the groups we sampled, so it is no surprise that virtually all reject the contention that our environmental problems are not serious. Most also view nuclear energy as a threat to the human and natural environment. Over two-thirds want us to halt nuclear energy development immediately, and over 90 percent regard nuclear power as unsafe.

The public interest elite are also critical of America's world role, and take a decidedly dovish stance. Three out of four believe that the primary purpose of our foreign policy has been to protect private business. By contrast only one in four believes the CIA should ever be empowered to undermine foreign governments. They vehemently reject appeals for a defense buildup. A minuscule 3 percent agree that our military should be the strongest in the world, regardless of cost, and only 9 percent call for more forceful dealings with the Soviet Union if that might increase the risk of war.

We asked public interest leaders to rate ten leadership groups in terms of the influence each wields over American life. Then we asked how much influence they believed each group *should* have. As table 4 shows, they see American society as dominated by the traditional "power elite" of business, the military, and government, along with the news media. At the bottom of the heap are the new contenders for influence—intellectuals, blacks, consumer groups, and feminists. If they could, public interest leaders would alter this pecking order according to the principle that "the last shall be first." They would deplete the influence of traditional elites like business, religion, and the military, and vastly expand the role of today's outsiders. And they would place consumer groups (that is, themselves) at the very top rung. It is worth noting that they see unions as residing in the middle of the pack and are content to leave them there.

TABLE 4.—RANKS OF INFLUENCE AMONG LEADERSHIP GROUPS

Perceived influence	Preferred influence
1. Business	1. Consumer groups.
2. Media	2. Blacks.
3. Military	3. Intellectuals.
4. Government agencies	4. Feminists.
5. Unions	5. Unions.
6. Religion	6. Media.
7. Intellectuals	7. Government agencies.
8. Blacks	8. Business.
9. Consumer groups	9. Religion.
10. Feminists	10. Military.

HEROES AND GOATS

Thus far we have examined the public interest elite's value choices and policy preferences. But since policies are made by people, we asked them to assess some highly visible individuals and groups in the current political environment. Table 5 shows that their idols lean to the left and their bêtes noires to the right. Not surprisingly, the garland goes to Ralph Nader, progenitor of today's public interest movement. But close on his heels are Senator Edward Kennedy, liberal economist John Kenneth Galbraith, feminist Gloria Steinem, and Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young, all with approval ratings of 86 percent or better. (Nader edges out Kennedy on the basis of a 56 to 49 percent "strong approval" rating.) These liberal leaders are followed by Nicaragua's Sandinistas, of whom 50 percent approved and 39 percent disapproved, with the remainder unsure. (No more than 3 percent were unsure about any other person or group.)

TABLE 5.—*Approval of public figures and groups*

	Percent
1. Ralph Nader	93
2. Edward Kennedy	93
3. John Kenneth Galbraith	90
4. Gloria Steinem	89
5. Andrew Young	86
6. Sandinistas	50
7. Fidel Castro	34
8. Milton Friedman	15
9. Margaret Thatcher	14
10. Jeane Kirkpatrick	14
11. Ronald Reagan	5
12. Moral Majority	2

A majority disapproved of all other individuals listed. Cuban Premier Fidel Castro captured a 34 percent approval rating, more than twice that given any conservative figure. Only about one in seven approved of conservative economist Milton Friedman, U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, or British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. (At about the time of our survey, Mrs. Thatcher was voted "most admired foreign leader" in the U.S. News & World Report annual poll of American leaders. This leadership group obviously feels differently.) Pulling up the rear are Ronald Reagan and the Moral Majority, with approval ratings of only 5 and 2 percent, respectively. In fact, 90 percent strongly disapproved of both, a proportion double that attained by any other figure.

It would be hard to imagine more consistent results. Public interest leaders approve of liberals and disapprove of conservatives across the board. They are much more critical of the conservative leaders of their own country and of its closest ally than they are of leftist leaders in Latin America. So their assessments of political personalities are consonant with their views on the issues, and all echo their liberal perspective.

Finally, beyond specific ideas and values, we were interested in the broader intellectual milieu of the public interest elite. Where do they get their ideas, or at least the information to support them? To find out, we asked them to assess the reliability of a dozen information sources, including major media and journals of opinion on both the left and right. The results are shown in table 6. According to this group, America's most reliable source of information is the Public Broadcasting Service. This may reflect a shared cultural and ideological style. In our study of the media elite, PBS personnel were well to the left of other journalists,

and one staffer called public broadcasting "the Peace Corps of the 1980s." The Times placed second, followed by the New York Review of Books, the Nation, and the New Republic. Our subjects consider these last three journals of the left more reliable than such mainstream news magazines as Time and Newsweek. They place leading conservative journals at the bottom of the scale.

TABLE 6.—RELIABILITY OF INFORMATIONAL SOURCES

1. PBS.
2. New York Times.
3. New York Review of Books.
4. The Nation.
5. The New Republic.
6. Newsweek.
7. Time.
8. TV Network News.
9 U.S. News & Wold Report.
10. Public Interest.
11. Commentary.
12. National Review.

What do these findings tell us about the leadership of the public interest movement? At the top, it is primarily a movement of young lawyers who were raised in comfortable circumstances and cosmopolitan environments, studied at elite schools, and gravitated toward the power centers of New York and Washington.

As principal upholders of today's new liberalism, the public interest elite represent an emerging political tradition born of our rapid transition to a post-industrial society. As such, in their quest to represent the public interest, they often deviate from the outlook and perspectives of the general public. This alienated yet influential group represents a paradox. For, despite their rejection of much of America's social and economic order, their very existence attests to the vitality of our pluralist political system.

□ 1250

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE COUGHLIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, of Pennsylvania.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you pursuant to Rule L(50) that I have received a civil subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. In consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk of the House, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena, as modified by consensual agreement, is in conformity with the privileges and precedents of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE COUGHLIN.

AMENDMENTS TO SUBSTANTIVE BANKRUPTCY LAW CONTAINED IN H.R. 5174

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5174 would amend the bankruptcy law relating to personal bankruptcy, grain storage facility bankruptcy, and the rejection of collective bargaining agreements in chapter 11 bankruptcy cases.

PERSONAL BANKRUPTCY AMENDMENTS

No evidence of widespread abuse of the bankruptcy laws by consumer debtors was presented to the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law.

While personal bankruptcy filings increased in 1979 and 1980, filings decreased in the past 2 years according to statistics complied by the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts.

The recent decrease in personal bankruptcy filings highlights the cyclical nature of bankruptcy. Historically, personal bankruptcy filings have increased and decreased along with ups and downs in the general economy.

A 1983 General Accounting Office report found that less than 6 percent of the 2-year increase in personal bankruptcy filings could possibly be attributed to the 1978 changes in the bankruptcy law. The remaining 94 percent was explained by factors that traditionally have forced people into bankruptcy: unemployment, inflation, illness, marital discord. Two of the chief reasons were found to be the overextension of credit and threats against debtors by creditors. In fact, 73 percent of the individuals questioned by the GAO reported that they sought relief from their debts because of creditor actions or threats of such action.

An 8-year study of creditor practices by the Federal Trade Commission reached the same conclusions as to the cause of default. Even creditors who testified before the FTC uniformly agreed that consumers rarely took out loans with no intention of repaying.

A recent survey by the National Credit Union Administration also illustrated debtors' good-faith efforts to pay off loans. That report indicated that 50.4 percent of all credit union loans discharged in bankruptcy had been refinanced at least once. The study also found that debtors think long and hard before petitioning for debt relief: Loans discharged in bankruptcy had been delinquent an average of 9.3 months, while loans voluntarily written off as uncollectible had been delinquent an average of 11.8 months, a difference of only 75 days.

Strong evidence that debtors do not run to bankruptcy courts at the first sign of financial trouble is also found in credit industry-financed studies. In volume II of a creditor-sponsored study conducted by the Purdue Credit Research Center in 1982, economists found that 20 percent of the debtors questioned had sought credit counseling before bankruptcy and that 92 percent had tried at least one alternative to bankruptcy, such as consolidation loans, selling assets, and arranging different payment schedules. A study by Andrew Brimmer & Associates found that 48 percent of the debtors questioned used credit-counseling services before filing for debt relief and that 68 percent attempted compromises and financial counseling with their creditors.

Bankruptcy losses have not increased substantially since passage of the 1978 Bankruptcy Code. Loss figures, like bankruptcy filings, go up and down with the economy. Loss figures since passage of the 1978 code are generally less than loss figures during the 1974 recession.

For example, the annual reports of one major finance company state that its net chargeoffs from all sources were 1.23 percent of average customer receivables in 1966, 1.97 percent in 1974, and 1.17 percent in 1982. Bankruptcy chargeoffs are a mere fraction of these amounts.

A study prepared by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System found that finance companies' loss figures exceeded those of banks and other consumer lending institutions. But it also found that the profits of these institutions were roughly equal. One person testified in hearings before the subcommittee that this is because "finance companies are volume lenders, whose profits depends on the quantity, not quality, of their loans."

The GAO report stated that:

[e]xamination of the available data for 1980 and 1981 showed that as a percentage of total credit outstanding, bankruptcy losses ranged from .1 percent to 1.28 percent.

Subtitle A of title II of H.R. 5174 represents a compromise worked out with the representatives of the consumer credit industry. It represents a melding of provisions from H.R. 1800 and H.R. 1147. The bill also contains some new provisions which are not contained in pending legislation.

The provisions are fair to both creditor and debtor interests, while serving to curb potential abuses of the bankruptcy laws.

The bill would place a ceiling on the total amount of personal and household items that can be exempted by a debtor, and on the unused amount of the Federal real property exemption which debtors may apply to personal property. It would discourage debtors from loading up on luxury goods in anticipation of filing for bankruptcy. It would encourage chapter 13 repayment plans that provide for a meaningful level of payment and insure that chapter 13 payments commence within 30 days of the filing of the plan.

The bill would permit a bankruptcy court, on its own motion in its equitable powers and not at the request or suggestion of any party in interest, to dismiss a chapter 7 bankruptcy case commenced by an individual whose debts are primarily consumer debts if the court finds that the granting of

relief would be a substantial abuse. This provision would not create a future income test.

The Congress historical efforts to encourage fully informed, voluntary proceedings in bankruptcy are continued through this legislation. The bill would require the clerk of the bankruptcy court to give written notice of each form of debt relief available under the Federal bankruptcy laws. A bankruptcy petition filed by a consumer individual would be required to provide that the petitioning individual is aware of each form of relief available under the Bankruptcy Code and that the consumer chooses a chapter 7 liquidation. In cases in which the consumer is represented by an attorney, the petition also would be required to be accompanied by an affidavit signed by the attorney stating that he advised the client regarding each form of debt relief.

In cases in which a debtor is represented by an attorney during the course of negotiating a reaffirmation agreement, the bill would no longer require court review of the reaffirmation agreement. Instead, the agreement would be filed with the court, and accompanied by an affidavit of the attorney that represented the debtor during the course of the negotiations which states that the agreement is fully informed, voluntary, and does not impose an undue hardship. It is contemplated that debtors' attorney generally are in a position as good as or better than the court to protect debtors from burdensome agreements.

The bill would state that an individual injured by any willful violation of a stay provided by section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code shall recover actual damages including costs and attorneys' fees, and, in appropriate circumstances, may recover punitive damages.

This private right of action is an additional right of individual debtors, and is not intended to foreclose recovery under already existing remedies.

Several provisions in the bill would streamline certain procedures that apply to creditors seeking to preserve their rights and interests in a bankruptcy case. It would require an individual to file a statement regarding his intent to retain or surrender property securing a consumer debt within 30 days after the commencement of a bankruptcy case, or before the meeting of creditors, whichever is earlier, and to comply with this statement within 45 days. The bill would terminate the automatic stay provided if chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code is a debtor or codebtor does not respond within 20 days to a creditor's request to proceed against the codebtor under title 11 United States Code section 1302(c)(2). The bill would prohibit the trustee from recouping certain preferential transfers from creditors, and would make other amendments in the personal bankruptcy law.

GRAIN ELEVATOR BANKRUPTCIES

Subtitle B of title II of H. 5174 would make amendments relating to grain storage facility bankruptcies. The depressed farmers of America need relief from the difficulties posed by the financial failure of a grain storage facility. The volatile nature of the market for grain and the vigilance needed to preserve and protect the condition of stored grain present unique problems for producers whose grain is stored or sold to a facility which files for bankruptcy relief.

The delay that inevitably occurs in a grain elevator bankruptcy case while the court resolves the competing claims of ownership, and protects the interests of farmers and other claimants, creates special problems for the family farmer. Grain held by a bankrupt grain elevator may represent a major portion of an individual producer's marketable assets.

The bankruptcy law, of course, does not cause grain elevator insolvencies and cannot restore missing grain to an elevator, where there are shortages. Thus, bankruptcy legislation cannot wholly remedy the problem of grain elevator insolvencies. Grain elevators must also be required to meet financial and operating standards necessary to prevent inadequately capitalized or improperly managed facilities. Various legislative proposals pending before the Committee on Agriculture would assist in preventing elevator failures and in eliminating the severe shortages of grain that often exist in grain warehouse insolvency cases. An Ad Hoc Agriculture Subcommittee report on grain elevator insolvencies makes sound recommendations for preventative legislation in this area. These amendments to the bankruptcy laws represent a remedy to the bankruptcy aspect of the problem of grain elevator failures.

This bill would require a bankruptcy court to prevent unnecessary, harmful delay in the disposition of grain and the proceeds of grain. The bill would add a new section (section 557) to title 11 of the United States Code to provide that, on the request of the trustee or any entity that claims an interest in grain or the proceeds of grain, the court shall expedite the procedures for the determination of interests in and the disposition of grain, by shortening applicable time periods to the greatest extent feasible and by establishing a timetable generally not to exceed 120 days.

The procedures that may be expedited under this new section 557 include the filing of a response to a claim of ownership, a proof of claim, a request for abandonment, a request for relief from the automatic stay provided in section 362(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, as well as a response to a request for a determination of secured status or a determination as to whether grain may be sold.

The new section 557 also would provide that any governmental unit that has regulatory jurisdiction over the operation or liquidation of an insolvent grain elevator (for example, a State agricultural agency or the U.S Department of Agriculture) has a right to appear and be heard in a grain elevator bankruptcy case on any issue relating to grain or the proceeds of grain. In addition, the bill would require the trustee in such cases to consult with a government unit that has regulatory jurisdiction before taking any action relating to the disposition of grain in the possession of the debtor or the bankruptcy estate.

The new section 557 would further provide that the trustee may recover from grain and the proceeds of grain the reasonable and necessary costs and expenses attributable to the preservation or disposition of grain or the proceeds of grain, but may not recover from such grain or grain proceeds any other costs or expenses.

The bill would provide a priority for individual farmers engaged in the production of grain against a grain storage facility to the extent of $2,000 for each individual producer.

The bill would provide that a seller who is a producer of grain sold to a grain storage facility is entitled to reclaim grain from a bankrupt grain storage facility if the producer makes written demand for reclamation within 10 days after the debtor received the grain. A bankruptcy court could deny this common-law right of reclamation provided under the Uniform Commercial Code only where the court secures the producer's claim with a lien.

Finally, the bill would amend the bankruptcy rules to clarify that a warehouse receipt, scale ticket, or similar document constitutes, to the extent not inconsistent with State law, prima facie evidence of the validity and amount of a claim of ownership of grain.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

Subtitle C of title II of this bill clarifies congressional intent with respect to the limited circumstances under which a collective bargaining agreement may be rejected in a bankruptcy case under title 11 of the United States Code.

At the time that the 1978 bankruptcy law was under consideration by the Congress, the law being applied on the question of the conditions required for the rejection of union contracts in bankruptcy was the standard set forth by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks* v. *REA Express, Inc.*, 523 F.2d 164, 167-169 (CA2), cert. denied, 423 U.S. 1017

(1975). The Congress was fully aware of the strict standard for rejection established in REA Express and believed it was simply continuing that standard when it enacted the 1978 law. Indeed, most lower courts have applied the strict standard of REA Express in interpreting the 1978 law.

This administration's Solicitor General argued before the Supreme Court, in the case of *NLRB* v. *Bildisco & Bildisco*, —— U.S. —— (February 22, 1984), that the standard applied in REA Express properly accommodates the policies of the labor and bankruptcy laws. The Solicitor General stated in his brief to the Supreme Court that:

[I]t is essential that there be a stringent standard for rejection of a collective bargaining agreement in a bankruptcy proceeding in order to give appropriate recognition to the policies of the [National Labor Relations Act]. Those policies include encouragement of collective bargaining and protection of employee interests, both of which may be seriously impaired as a result of rejection. The Second Circuit has achieved an accommodation between the labor laws and the bankruptcy laws that gives appropriate recognition to the former by requiring a threshold showing that a business is likely to fail absent rejection. Congress implicitly approved that accommodation when it approved the Bankruptcy Code in 1978.

Despite the position of the Solicitor General that the Supreme Court should adopt the strict standard for bankruptcy court approval of the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement in Bildisco, the Supreme Court affirmed a less stringent standard for the rejection of labor contracts in bankruptcy. The Court approved the third circuit's decision that a trustee or debtor in possession may terminate a collective bargaining agreement where the agreement is burdensome to the estate and the equities balance in favor of rejecting the labor contract. The balancing of the equities standard adopted by the Supreme Court would give no special weight to collective bargaining interest and the significant concerns underlying the national labor policy.

The bill would codify the same standard as was applied in the REA Express decision. The court in the REA Express opinion used various formulations to express the standard. No single phraseology was used by the court. It alternately referred to "collapse," "loss of jobs," "demise," and "liquidation."

The bill would provide that a bankruptcy court may not approve the rejection of a collective bargaining agreement under the bankruptcy laws by a chapter II debtor in possession unless, absent rejection of such agreement, the jobs covered by such agreement will be lost and any financial reorganization of the debtor will fail. This language would insure that the REA Express standard is codified.

A finding that the jobs will be lost is not an additional finding. Whenever a reorganization effort fails, the jobs are lost.

The REA Express standard was the prevailing standard under the Federal bankruptcy laws even prior to 1978. Most lower courts applied the standard of REA Express in interpreting the 1978 Bankruptcy Code. The second circuit standard has worked well. When the third circuit court of appeals created the new "balancing of the equities" test in the Bildisco case, as the first Court of Appeals to reject the REA Express standard, it ignored the longstanding experience of successful financial reorganization under the second circuit standard.

The standard in REA Express properly balances the competing policies of the labor laws and the bankruptcy laws. The policy of the bankruptcy law is to encourage successful financial reorganization of a financially troubled business and save jobs which otherwise would be lost if the business were to collapse. The policies of the National Labor Relations Act and of the Railway Labor Act include encouragement of collective bargaining and protection of employee interests.

Labor policies are impaired as a result of the rejection of a union contract in a bankruptcy setting, unless bankruptcy court approval of a request for rejection rests upon a showing that rejection is necessary to prevent failure of the business and to preserve the jobs covered by the contract. Requiring a trustee or debtor in possession to show that rejection is necessary for successful reorganization is consistent with Federal bankruptcy policy. Under this standard, a business that truly needs financial relief would be permitted to reject the collective bargaining agreement.

As the Solicitor General of the Department of Justice stated in his brief to the Supreme Court:

[T]he second Circuit [REA Express] standard ensures that collective bargaining agreements are rejected only when necessary to accomplish the bankruptcy goal of avoiding collapse of the business, not simply because an employer prefers to operate without the restrictions of the collective bargaining agreements.

Any lesser standard would subvert these important labor policies.

The balancing of the equities test may sound like it balances competing labor and bankruptcy policies, but in reality it ignores the policies of the Federal labor laws.

As the Solicitor General stated in the Bildisco case:

Under [the Bildisco] standard, it appears likely that most collective bargaining agreements could be rejected. Presumably, most debtors-in-possession could establish that a labor contract imposes some burdens on the estate and deprives it of assets that could be used for other purposes. Under the balancing-of-the-equities prescribed by [the Third Circuit Court of Appeals], no special weight is given to collective bargaining interests; instead, interests of creditors are weighted equally with interests of employees.

Thus, the balancing of the equities test falls far short of a fair balance between the policies of the labor and bankruptcy laws. It inquires only whether the rejection of a union contract would be helpful to a successful financial reorganization, rather than whether rejection is necessary to the reorganization effort.

In reality, the balancing of the equities test amounts to no test at all. In practice, the balancing of the equities test treats collective bargaining like any other agreement, This approach renders the policies contained in the Federal labor laws meaningless whenever a company files a petition for chapter 11 reorganization. The Congress did not intend to sanction this enormous loophole to the labor laws when it enacted the 1978 code.

The bill clarifies the Congress intent to incorporate the second circuit standard for the rejection of a union agreement in a chapter 11 reorganization case and presents a proper balance between bankruptcy and labor policies.●

EMERGENCY HOME MORTGAGE ASSISTANCE LOAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last May the House of Representatives passed, on an emergency basis, because it was an emergency, the Emergency Home Mortgage Assistance Loan Act, and it has been ever since, as I have said before, languishing in the Senate where a determined administration and its supporters in the Senate are determined to kill it.

At that time, our debate here divided the membership principally into those, and it turned out to be the majority because we passed the bill by a majority of at least 115, which is substantial as these issues go, so the House was divided into two main camps, the one, the majority, believing the testimony brought out in the successive hearings that the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, of which I have the honor to be chairman, had brought out over a 1½-year period of time, and the others who offered as the argument, one, a specious and untruthful one, that this plan provided an expenditure program known as entitlement, which it was not, is not, and never has been. As a matter of fact, it was just a bare little lifeline extended to hundreds of thousands of plain American families trying to hold onto the ownership of their homes.

At that time, I said that either they were right and we were wrong, or we were right and they were wrong. We cannot have it both ways. Either there is a need, a continuing need now, or there is not. Either there was an emergency then or there was not.

I think that the overwhelming, preponderant majority of the Members of the House at the time we entered and initiated the debate were not sure, but after hearing the debate, the presentation of the facts, and their ability to stand up, not be rebutted successfully by the opponents, who mostly predicated their opposition on ideological bases more than the ad hoc type of determination that this type of debate ought to bring forth.

Today my contention is that, if anything, the picture has worsened, that many, many Americans and families have lost their homes. We have since then, on the subcommittee level initiated and sustained a course of hearings on the homelessness situation, which again, thanks to our subcommittee, became a matter of temporary priority before the Congress, and also during the harsh winter months of last year and this year became an item of interest, at least passing to some, except the President, who still maintains that the homeless are homeless by choice. That is the only reason they are homeless.

I invited the President about 1½ or 2 months ago, in a letter, to join some of us and visit the one shelter which, after the subcommittee bludgeoned GSA and other administrative agencies to provide the old Federal City College building for this business of sheltering the homeless at least temporarily. Finally, after about 4 or 5 weeks of pushing and mauling and shoving and kicking, we finally got them, late in December, even though by that time some very unfortunate incidents had happened on the streets of Washington, including Americans dying on the streets.

One is a concomitant of the other, because for the first time, as our hearings brought out, those on the streets wandering aimlessly seeking a roof at least temporarily were not the usual bums or hoboes and ne'er-do-wells that we had been accustomed to as sort of scrap heap Americans, but we found young married couples, healthy, at least temporarily, but obviously not able to endure healthily for long under the conditions when they appeared before the committee, young, virile, wanting, willing, and able to work, and not able to get it.

They were not homeless by choice. Some of them had just lost their homes. Others were up to 1½ years ago plain, normal, average working, producing Americans and heads of households who had left their own immediate family with relatives while they sought employment and had drifted somehow or other into this part of the country.

We also visited other States, at least I did. Our funding limitations of the subcommittee, contrary to the general impression that Congress wallows in money, prevented us from having the hearings that I had visualized formally as a subcommittee in every region of the country. We did mange to have three, but I myself visited, as chairman, seven of the various regions of the country and saw for myself, including my own district, the city of San Antonio.

Today the situation is as bad or worse, because as brought out most unfortunately, in a callous way, by the Wall Street Journal last Wednesday, March 21, an article on page 5 headed, "Delinquent Mortgage Payments Rose 8 Percent in the Fourth Period but Analysts Call It a Blip." So human beings now are blips, callously referred to as unhappy statistics that contradict this fictitious aura of recovery, the great myth that we have recovery, with 200,000-plus steelworkers still unemployed in what I call the Rust Belt, with farm homeownership as well as farm tenant occupancy of family farms reduced now to the alltime low of 6 percent just within the last year and a half.

This reference to blips, analysts call it a blip. More homeowners were behind in their mortgage payments in the fourth quarter of 1983 than in the third quarter, but analysts said was just a blip in an otherwise strong economy.

□ 1300

The fact is that I read into the RECORD also last week and the week before last the statistics gathered over the last 2 years, the last available statistics not on delinquency of mortgage payments, but an actual foreclosures, that is, homes actually foreclosed upon and taken away by judicial decree from their rightful owners. That is very sinister in what it reflects, and it is on the rise again. Foreclosures reached an alltime high, an outpeak from the depression period high last year and over the last year and a half.

So what are we talking about when we say that the most representative body closest to the people in our country overwhelmingly recognizes the situation and wants to do something by way of a modicum, just a very small lifesaving line we are trying to extend? And it is not even as generous as the old Homeowners Loan Corporation of the Depression, where at least at that time the leaders in and out of the Congress and the Presidency had faith in the American people, had faith in the average household head. After all, if we do not have that in America, we have nothing.

We can delude ourselves with the aura of strength, with the misperception that because we have sophisticated weaponry we are a strong nation, that because we are still considered to be the wealthiest nation, though that may be hollow at this point, we can afford to forget the basic interests of the hardcore origin of the strength of American life, which is the family unit. A family that has no roots with the soil is a family that has no attachment to the cause of that soil, and, therefore, we should not be surprised if American after American finds it difficult to visualize the conflicts presented by the congressional leadership, and following the majority, as well as its Presidents, who come and say at the same time that the overwhelming, preponderating majority of this House that voted against—and, fortunately, they were a minority in the House vote—but the overwhelming, preponderating majority of those in Government say in that that the American family cannot be trusted to pay back even at 10 percent, which certainly was absent during the Depression HOLC, and then turn right around and a few weeks later vote for lending to the impoverished foreign nations that cannot even pay the interest payments on either their public or private debts, their private debts now being the bulk owed our principal American bankers who in turn have sold out. They are in control.

Our big oligarchic banking corporate community is in control of the destiny of this country. The decisions are not being made in this Congress, they are not being made in the White House, they are being made in the plush offices of the Wall Street lawyers of these firms and in the councils of the mighty, these great behemoths of wealth or, as Franklin Roosevelt called them, because I think they are entitled to that designation now, these "great malefactors of great wealth." They have sold out the American people once again. They did it after World War I, as I brought out last week. It has been done once again.

And here the Congress, the majority, went along with $8.4 billion of taxpayers' money demanded by a President as a priority, saying that it was an absolute must, a President that was willing to come and make deals in order to get the $8.4 billion for what is known as the IMF, the International Monetary Fund.

Some of us in vain tried to point out, what kind of perverted priority is that where we say that we will have more faith in those foreigners that cannot pay even interest than we have in our American families?

After all, if we lend it to an American, the history of the Depression shows that they paid back the Home Owners Loan Corporation, paid back,

and it made money for the U.S. Treasury. But then you had the same voices of opposition by the faithless ones who had no faith in the average American family because their faith is in perserving the wealthy, the powerful. There is where their allegiance is.

What I am saying is that those wealthy powerful do not have allegiance to the American national interests, the greatest interests of the greatest need of those great American people. After all, that is our source of everything. It is the whole thing around which we exist, and it has been so forgotten and the transfer of power has been so subtle that it has been difficult to try to speak out.

I know that some of us have. And I here pay my respects to the late Wright Patman, chairman of the committee I have belonged to since I came here 22½ years ago. I was one of those who joined him, and immediately before his death I was the only one still joining him. We were predicting, but never in our wildest imaginations thinking, that the wholesale robbery of the American people would be so despicable, so cold, so callous, so absolutely all-consuming to the point of confiscation, with the interest rates being part and parcel of this big ball of wax.

It is all interrelated. The contradictory situation is reflected by even the Wall Street report that so callously refers to this great human anguish. Maybe it is because these fellows sit up in their offices and do not go out. They have no exposure to the American people, any more than the President does. The President has not rubbed elbows with an average, ordinary working American in 22 years. His associates have been the multimillionaire class. He wears $22,000 boots, and there is no way that I know that I can persuade any of my colleagues or anybody from that class that does not bother to go out and talk to the people and see what is happening out there and see what the real condition is.

When you go out and do the grocery shopping, when you try to see how you can help your son or daughter purchase a home today, which is literally not possible, not for the average American, when you see that, then I do not think you would write headlines with this word, "blip," referring to anguish in human situations, such as that which is happening right now in Pueblo, Colo.

I have in the record presented as of last year and again this year the petition of over 3,000, which represents better than half of the work force in Pueblo because of the shutting down or a practical shutting down of the steel mill there more than 1½ years ago, and the fact that homeownership was being lost at the rate of 100 a month at the time we were trying to get emergency action on an emergency basis, with this mere glimmer of hope that by giving a little line of credit, this temporarily displaced Americans from employment would be able to keep at least a roof over his head.

□ 1310

I have kept my association with Pueblo, Colo., and I want to advise the House that at this point those who have not irretrievably lost their homes, and that is the overwhelmingly preponderant number, are in court now only because they were able to raise a fund through the unemployed members of the Steelworkers Union to help them at least try to get some legal delay in order to see what could happen to enable them to maintain that roof over their heads. At this point, it is a continuing crisis. At this point, it is a rising crisis, because foreclosures are always preceded by delinquent mortgage payments, of course.

But what is the interrelationship here? Why is it that I feel almost to the point of bitterness? I have tried all through my life never to reach that point. One cannot as a human being, accept the acid of revenge or bitterness without suffering and I have been blessed with mostly tempered feeling, but I am now because I see that the people depend on us and that means the Senate and the House. They are going to find an outlet with their elected President. He is bitterly opposed to this kind of legislation. He says there is no need. He says that this is the kind of thing that has been wrong, anyway, for 30 years; but the people must have an outlet somewhere. They are not going to get it in the Supreme Court, and if they cannot find it in the Congress, we are going to have one of the reenactments of the scenes that have occurred over a threshold in the course of our history in the form of a government that we have lived under now since 1789.

Always our beautiful system has responded. After World War II and the civil rights cause, the Congress did not respond. It could not. It is a pluralist body, any more than it could to the mortgage problem.

The Congress has failed yet to enact a national comprehensive so-called mortgage policy. The reason for that, it is a highly sectionalistic and divisible element and the Congress is a pluralistic body of 535 Members; but neither was the Presidency able to and it did not accept President Eisenhower's dispatch of troops to Little Rock. But force, as always, is no answer.

The Presidency could not within its limitations, the Congress would not and the Supreme Court finally did.

But today the avenues for redress of these very serious issues rising and churning from the midst of our population are not being answered. There is no response from either of the three branches of our Government. Our history shows that when we have that, something is going to happen—in my opinion, undesirable social disorder. There is no question of that in my mind.

I feel that it is always to be lamented that that should happen; yet things can be done to prevent it.

There is such a thing as anticipatory action. There is no question in my mind that the Senate has responsibility to at least confront the issue, debate it. Do not bury it, debate it.

Last December I held out on the deal that was made. I do not like deals. I do not believe in hostage taking one way or the other in real life or in legislative life.

What happened was that the President's IMF bill was held hostage to other bills, such as housing; but even my allies on the majority side would not demand of the Senators that they include our emergency home assistance plan as part of the package; but even then I think it was wrong and is wrong for a body such as the Senate that is considered to be the most deliberative body in the world to refuse to look at a bit of legislation that the House of Representatives passed overwhelmingly.

Then I will abide by the decision. If a majority of the Senators want to go out and tell the American people that they are going to turn their backs on a good, solid American head of the household in this desperate effort to hold on to possession of his home, then let it be. Let it go on record; but at least let us go on record.

I appeal to the Senate leadership and the majority of the Senators to at least discuss it and do something one way or the other.

Accompanying that same Wall Street Journal report on the mortgage delinquency is another one that says, "VA Raises the Ceiling on Mortgages to 13 Percent." That means that your home mortgage, such as we use in order to house America, the greatest miracle known to any nation, was a miracle performed by America when it has faith in its own and that was that in 40 years' time, America was housed like no other country.

In 1940 at the beginning of what Mr. Reagan says was a 30-year period that followed where everything wrong, was being undone, in 1940 over 65 percent of the American homes were substandard, inadequate. By 1980 it was only 6½ percent, with twice as many inhabitants, and that many more households in the Nation.

What made it possible? It was made possible because the leaders then at least had the responsibility to seek to begin at home. In other words, charity does begin at home. And even though the Depression was raging—we talk about a deficit today, I can evoke the smells and the sounds and the fright

and the psychology of fright of the Depression period. I am a child of the Depression. I wish I had the power to describe it in words, but I cannot and nobody can; but we should remember, we should know, we should realize what did work and the FHA—which was based on what? It was based on an allocation of credit resources on the part of our national financial leaders to the question of housing and the faith that on a fixed term 30-year mortgage, it would be paid, and that there was the desire and the passion for homeownership which every American knows is deeply rooted in every average American's heart was going to be there and it was, so that in a 40-year span we housed America.

Today we have reverted to the 1929 situation, the 5-percent balloon. That is what it amounts to. They have all kinds of gimmicks, reverse payments, buildup of mortgage payments; then all of a sudden they sock that homeowner, as they are finding out this year, and he is going to have a crisis, or she.

But why? Because we have greater faith in the debtors to our banks whose interest this administration is irretrievably committed, as has been shown by action after action, not only by the Treasury Department, by the agreements, some semisecret, between the President and the Federal Reserve Board Chairman.

I would like to tie in one and the other, as I have in the last three instances that I have addressed the House.

I would like to offer for the record at this point from the New York Times Sunday issue, section 3, the business page, one of the best compilations of the subject matter, entitled "The New Crisis for Latin Debt. Bankers Resist the Pleas of the Biggest Borrowers To Trim Interest Payments. Huge Repayments Stunt Growth"—referring to the Nation.

It has a very good summation of the amount and the dismal picture of the bubble that is about to burst around our heads.

□ 1320

And also tied in with what I said before.

William Graham Sumner, who was addressing himself in a similar period of stress, said these memorial words:

> Who then is he who provides it all. Go and find him. And you will have once more before you the forgotten man. The forgotten man is delving away in patient industry—unless he is unemployed—supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politican of his admiration. But he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide.

The big scramble and the great divide today is between these dinosaurs, big corporations that are also interlocked with the banks, struggling for more and more growth with no production of one job, not one produce of any kind for the Nation's good or consumption, just merely struggling for the sake of struggling. Possession. One giant trying to knock over the other. Exxon, DuPont. But in the process tying up billions and billions and billions of dollars of banking resources that the primary purpose for which the banks were chartered to provide those resources for the engines of production, the small businesses who need to inventory at reasonable, not injurious, not extortionate rates of interest such as flagellating our business community today, also causing small business to go out in such record numbers that again we are outpeaking the Depression numbers or statistics.

But why? I had one businessman ask me the other day, "I thought it was illegal to charge more than a certain rate of interest." And I had a hard time explaining to him that maybe that was so at one time. As a matter of fact, this was uppermost in Abraham Lincoln's mind, the same eternal struggle we have had in this Nation since the beginning of the Nation. I have brought it out ad infinitum on the House floor for 20 years, when I first spoke out on the subject matter. It is ironic that at that time and especially in 1966 the first so-called credit crunch, we were worried about going over 6-percent interest. Who would have dreamed? I am sure that the Honorable Wright Patman has turned over 60 times in his grave that we would be flagellated, that we would be robbed blind, stolen, at 21 percent prime interest rate. The prime interest rate now for a small businessman. And I mean small, not by Washington standards. Small businessman in Washington are big enough to have lobbyists. And that by my standards in San Antonio is big business, not small business. But small businesses, the little tailor guy, has a little tailor shop. The little mechanic who has a little auto repair shop and is trying to keep up with the modern mechanisms and equipment which is very costly that he must have, computers or some kind of electronic device. And he wants to go to that bank and borrow just $1,500. There is no one I know in this country who can borrow at less than 16½, 17½ percent. That is robbery. That is extortionate. That is thievery. It is wrong. And the Congress has a responsibility that it has abdicated for years. As a matter of fact, it has been the silent partner of these pickpockets and thieves, because that is what they are. And we have become the money changers in the temple of American democracy. Should we be surprised that we have Americans going homeless in greater numbers and good solid American folk for whom we must work and for whom we must dedicate our representation to preserve and help them keep their dream and their identification with the soil and the country, their home.

I ask and I plead and I plead and I beg the Senate, please act upon the Home Mortgage Assistance Emergency Act.

Mr. Speaker, the articles I referred to follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 21, 1984]

DELINQUENT MORTGAGE PAYMENTS ROSE 8 PERCENT IN FOURTH PERIOD BUT ANALYSTS CALL IT A "BLIP"

(By Cathy Trost)

WASHINGTON.—More homeowners were behind in their mortgage payments in the fourth quarter of 1983 than in the third quarter, but analysts said it was just a "blip" in an otherwise strong economy.

The Mortgage Bankers Association of America termed the 8% rise in delinquent loan payments "worrisome" but said 80% of those were just 30 days or fewer overdue. The slight 0.08 percentage point increase in the more serious category of tardy loans—those 60 days or more overdue— wasn't big enough to "warrant heightened fears of a future increase" in loan foreclosures, the association said.

Optimism was bolstered by a fourth-quarter decline in new foreclosure proceedings. But that 0.01 percentage point drop to 0.21% occurred even as home loans in the process of foreclosure edged up by the same slight amount to 0.67%. The association linked the rise in loans in the process of foreclosure to continuing high unemployment in some parts of the country.

According to the association, 5.66% of nine million home loans surveyed were at least 30 days past due in the fourth quarter of 1983, up from 5.26% in the third quarter. It was the first increase since the first quarter of the year, when delinquencies were a record 5.84%. In the year-earlier fourth quarter, the rate was 5.7%.

Payments that were overdue 60 days or more increased to 0.92% in the fourth quarter from 0.87% in the third. For 90 days or longer, the rise was to 0.86% from 0.83%.

"I think we have to look at the numbers in the context of where the trend has been going—which is down—and where the increases came from," said Mark J. Riedy, the association's executive vice president.

Delinquency rates increased in all regions, with the Northeast and North Central states taking the lead. But there was regional disparity. New York and Michigan both had declining rates in the fourth quarter, but such Northern industrial states as Illinois, Ohio and Pennsylvania showed steeply rising rates.

Mr. Riedy said the outlook for the housing market was good through 1984 because of the continuing strength of the economic recovery, but he warned that the rise in overdue loans shows "the fragility" of the recovery "in such a high-interest-rate environment."

[From the Wall Street Journal Mar. 21, 1984]

VA RAISES CEILING ON MORTGAGES TO 13 PERCENT

WASHINGTON.—The government raised the maximum interest rate on federally backed Veterans Administration mortgages to 13%

from 12½%, the first change in the rate since November.

The increase follows boosts in other interest rates. The prime, or base, bank lending rate was raised ½ point to 11½%. And the average rate on 30-year conventional mortgage loans, which aren't backed by the government, has climbed an average ½ point to just under 14%. Analysts said the higher VA rate "recognizes the realities of the marketplace."

The rate applies to single-family homes guaranteed by the VA. The rate on graduated-payment loans increased to 13¼% from 12¾%.

Last Nov. 1, the VA interest was reduced to 12½% from 13%. This latest increase marks the first time the VA rate has been changed since congressional action late last year freed the Federal Housing Administration's interest rate from government control. The rate on homes insured by the FHA is negotiated by buyers and lenders in the market, but the VA rate continues to be set by the government.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1984]

THE NEW CRISIS FOR LATIN DEBT—BANKERS RESIST THE PLEAS OF THE BIGGEST BORROWERS TO TRIM INTEREST PAYMENTS

(By Alan Riding)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—When Mexico's new Government slashed public spending and reduced real wages last year, it won accolades from Western bankers eager to believe that austerity was the answer to Latin America's debt crisis.

Today, that confidence has been shaken. The austerity measures demanded by the International Monetary Fund and the big American and European banks have helped to thrust both Mexico and Brazil into recessions that are eroding their capacity to meet future debt obligations. And the newly elected Governments of Argentina and Venezuela seem determined not to pay a similar price to appease their creditors.

So a new Latin debt crisis is brewing, probably more perilous and certainly more political than in the recent past. This time the issue is whether Latin America's four biggest debtor nations can achieve economic recovery and political stability while continuing to make huge interest payments on their foreign debt.

Last year Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, and Venezuela persuaded Western banks to postpone the repayment of principal coming due on their $260 billion in debts. Now they are arguing ever more insistently that by continuing to honor their interest payments—which totaled more than $20 billion last year—they are being forced to destroy their economies and assume the risks of major political upheavals, which, in turn, would eventually force them to default.

"We're living a bizarre and dangerous charade," one American banker in the region remarked. "We're trying to pretend that everything is O.K. with debt repayment, that we're coming out of the woods, and we're losing precious time."

No one knows when the new crisis might erupt, destroying the complacency that has built up concerning the debt issue—or what precise shape it will take. But the lines are being drawn. The debtor nations insist that they must be granted additional loans and easier repayment terms, with interest payments either suspended or sharply reduced.

In contrast, the creditors—both the banks and the governments of the major industrial nations—believe they did enough for their Latin debtors last year by agreeing to postpone the payments of principal coming due on the foreign debt and by providing some new loans. They insist that they cannot possibly alter interest terms on the foreign debt without sustaining huge losses. That argument meets with little publicly expressed sympathy in Brazil, the world's biggest debtor, with $93 billion outstanding. Says Nogueira Batista Jr. of the Getulio Vargas Foundation, an economics studies institution: "The international banking market, which in the past benefited so much from loans to Brazil, will now have to prepare itself to accept emergency solutions and take losses."

Some bankers are betting that Argentina, with $44 billion in foreign debt, will provide the first test of the new Latin determination to reduce interest payments. The test might come this month. Argentina will be 90 days past due on some $3 billion in interest payments when the quarter ends on March 31. If it doesn't reach an agreement to pay these arrears, at least in part, by that date, then United States banking regulations would force some major American banks to list the debts involved as "nonperforming loans." That would reduce the banks' first-quarter earnings by millions of dollars and undoubtedly raise a new uproar over default.

Some American market analysts are even girding for the worst by lowering the first-quarter earnings estimates for Manufacturers Hanover, Citicorp and other big banks. Manufacturers and Citicorp are the two biggest American bank lenders to Argentina, with nearly $3 billion in loans outstanding, and they have fallen behind in collecting millions in interest on the loans. Indeed, no interest has been paid by Argentina since last October and that nation's recently-installed president, Raúl Alfonsín, says he'll continue the moratorium until June 30 while he works out economic policy.

That doesn't perturb Walter Wriston, chairman of Citicorp, who holds that the big four Latin debtors are on the road to recovery and have the wealth to keep up debt payment. Argentina "is so naturally rich, but it has not enjoyed superb management over the years, starting with Peron and Evita uno and dos," he said in a speech last week. "But they are people of good will."

But in Latin America, fear of default and of the wrath of the banks is losing ground to other preoccupations. The change was described in a recent report from the Latin American Debt Commission of the Americas Society, a New York-based organization of United States corporations with operations in the region. "In virtually every Latin American and Caribbean country," the report said, "there are major pressures to turn inward, to reject cooperation with the I.M.F., to turn their backs on existing obligations and to look to solutions which stress a higher degree of protectionism and state control."

The Latin nations together owe Western banks about $310 billion, but Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and Venezuela account for the bulk of this amount, and much of their $260 billion in debt is short-term loans made in recent years. In their effort to repay, the big four debtors are, for the first time in years, sending more money back to the banks and other creditors than they are receiving in new financing from abroad. Last year, in fact, debt repayment forced them to export a total of $10.8 billion in capital, and that contributed to the economic contraction in each of the countries. The big four say this contraction is intolerable.

Not only in Latin America, but also in the United States, politicians, economists, bankers and academics gather frequently at seminars to discuss new approaches to the Latin debt problem. But in practice, no new idea has been tested; both creditors and debtors continue to deal with the debt through traditional methods that have prevailed since the creation of the I.M.F. after World War II to help Western nations remain solvent. Those traditional measures are essentially a combination of emergency credits and austerity measures that makes money available through slashes in public spending, wage freezes, import restrictions and currency devaluations.

Yet, what began 18 months ago with Mexico's currently collapse as a cashflow problem that seemed addressable in the traditional way has now evolved into a far more complicated repayment issue that not only distorts economic policy and aggravates social tensions, but also threatens political stability.

"No responsible government can idenfinitely impose measures that reduce growth, employment and social programs," the Americans Society Commission said. "Extremist movements of the right and left are likely to attempt to take advantage of unrest resulting from prolonged austerity measures."

Consequently, in Latin America, the financial crisis and ways of alleviating it are being viewed increasingly through a political prism. The region's central bankers are still more interested in good credit rating in New York, but their influence is waning in many capitals. That is particularly the case with Argentina, where the elected civilian Government inherited a shattered economy from an unpopular military regime and is now determined to consolidate the country's new democracy by reviving economic growth, even if this meets with the disapproval of foreign bankers.

Mr. Alfonsin has resisted austerity measures required by the I.M.F. and that has meant he hasn't been able to draw on an I.M.F. standby credit that would help to meet the interest payments. They would be about $6 billion in arrears by the end of the year, if the payment moratorium were to continue.

In Mexico, a severe slump has so far brought no serious social unrest, despite an austerity program that has cut subsidies for food and power, contributed to unemployment and held down real wages, and devalued the peso to limit imports. The cutbacks, plus oil earnings, have allowed the country to keep up with interest payments on its $89 billion debt, payments that totaled nearly $11 billion last year. But President Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado is under strong political pressure to stimulate the economy prior to midterm congressional elections next year.

Brazil's debt crisis has become very political. Last year, food riots and sackings of supermarkets and grain silos reflected growing popular irritation with Government austerity measures, including a new law limiting wage increases in a country with more than 200 percent annual inflation. But, unlike Mexico, Argentina and Venezuela, each governed by civilians elected with strong mandates, Brazil's lame-duck military Government, to be replaced by a civilian regime next year, seems too weak to confront the country's creditors with strong demands for easier terms for repaying its $93 billion debt.

Until recently, the pressure on the creditor nations was defused because the debt shocks had come in stages. Further, in each case—first Mexico, then Brazil and, most recently, Argentina and Venezuela—it was possible to identify specific, correctible reasons for their problems.

Mexico, for example, had borrowed heavily to sustain an overvalued currency and a high growth rate. Brazil's fate was attributed to its commitment to huge mining, hydroelectric and industrial projects that required billions in construction loans, but took too long to produce revenue to pay the debt. The cost of the Falklands war became the explanation for Argentina's crisis, while Venezuela's refusal to devalue the bolivar during last year's Presidential election campaign aggravated its problems by encouraging imports that used up available foreign currency.

As a result, the countries' creditors, supported by the I.M.F. and, less visibly, by the Reagan Administration, were able to focus on tough domestic solutions that would make debt repayment possible—solutions, in short, that fell entirely on the shoulders of the debtors. Now they are protesting that the burden should be shared more equitably by the creditors—the banks and governments in the industrial world. The argument is that the debt crisis stems from their activities, too, specifically from sharply higher interest rates, the weakening of commodity prices, the growing protectionism of the industrial world that keeps out Latin products and the vagaries of the world oil market.

"No matter how much we contort ourselves or the population goes hungry, we will not be able to produce many dollars to help the banks," wrote Celso Furtado, a leading Brazilian authority on development issues.

For the moment, Mexico has accepted the solution of continual postponements of principal payments while maintaining interest payment. Principal payments for Mexican debts maturing between August 1982 and December 1984 were postponed last year and, within a few months, Mexican Finance Ministry officials will begin negotiating postponement of debt obligations due in 1985. The debts rescheduled last year are to be repaid after 1987, but bankers predict a further rescheduling then.

Brazil, on the other hand, is accused by the I.M.F. and the creditor banks of shying away from austerity measures that it agreed to as as a means of keeping up with interet payments, which totaled $9.7 billion last year and are expected to be nearly $11 billion in 1984. Yet, with the country entering its fourth year of recession and having recorded an unprecedented 211 percent inflation rate and a 4 percent drop in its gross domestic product in 1983, economists of all political hues argue that bigger doses of the austerity medicine will not work.

Brazil's outgoing economic team has avoided addressing the interest question in public, promising to meet its obligations this year through a $9 billion trade surplus. But in practice, it appears to be adopting the tactics of passive resistance, signing quarterly letters of intent with the I.M.F. that include an array of austerity commitments that the Government routinely fails to honor. These commitments made possible a large reschedule of principal payments in January, through the signing of a $28 billion package that includes new bank money, renewal of trade credit and postponement of debt payments. Yet this deal disguised the fact that Brazil will once again export capital this year. That is, it will pay out about $6 billion more in interest than it will receive in new loans. Last year, the outflow was $3 billion.

Venezuela's new President, Jaime Lusinchi, last month ordered a sharp devaluation of the bolivar, increased domestic oil prices and promised to encourage foreign investment in an attempt to revive the economy. But, bolstered by Venezuela's relatively high foriegn exchange reserves, largely from oil exports, he also pledged that his program of austerity with growth would not be dictated by the I.M.F. Venezuela refused to work out an austerity program with the I.M.F. last year and could not reach agreement on rescheduling its debt.

Almost all principal payments have been suspended since February 1983 and the country owed about $800 million in interest at the end of last year. Venezuela's main problem is the structure of its debt: $22 billion of the $34 billion total is due to be repaid this year. But its interest burden is lower than that of the rest of the region and it has more than $6.5 billion in reserves. In contrast to others, Venezuela should have no trouble keeping up interest payments, if maturing debt principal can be rescheduled.

Latin American economists invariably stress, as a solution for their problems, the need for open markets for the region's exports and for higher and steadier commodity prices. But the spotlight soon returns to the interest question: The outflow of capital, they say, must be reversed through capitalization of interest payments now in arrears—treating it as if it were principal—and through lower interest rates, which currently range one to two percentage points above the London Interbank Offered Rate, now about 10.4 percent for 90-day loans.

To date, the region's creditors have refused to discuss a change in the rules, with American banks arguing the United States banking regulations prohibit them from making such arrangements and European banks not wishing to go it alone. The initiative to reduce interest payments would have to come from governments, bankers explain, adding that, during an election year, the Reagan Administration is reluctant to become involved.

LABOR'S AMBASSADOR IN WAR AND PEACE: JOSEPH D. KEENAN

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in times of deepest peril, the Nation depends for its survival on its most patriotic citizens.

Many patriots have come from the ranks of the American labor movement and workers.

For the past 40 years, one individual within the U.S. labor movement stood out for his dedication to the national interest—Joseph D. Keenan.

When Hitler's armies invaded the lowlands and Denmark in the spring of 1940, the United States moved slowly but firmly under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt from a period of total military unpreparedness into a period of broad defense and military mobilization.

In 1938, only 188,000 soldiers were authorized for the Regular Army. By 1945, over 13 million Americans were in arms and the United States and its allies had emerged victorious from the greatest World War in history.

Starting in June 1940, to assure this outcome, thousands of factories, camps, cantonments, and cities had to be built from scratch. Many books have described the Herculean efforts involved. But few authors have depicted the role of the building and construction unions in this transformation of the Nation's preparedness for war.

A new book, a portrait of the life and career of Joseph D. Keenan, "Labor's Stand-Up Guy," provides special insights into the role that labor played both in mobilizing the Nation's defenses and in transforming post-war America. It focuses on the critical responsibilities of Keenan in such episodes as the wage stabilization agreement that prevented strikes in World War II, the building of the atomic bomb, and later, the Korean war. While this book is far from definitive, it opens new ground for defense and military scholars and researchers to pursue concerning labor's role in assuring U.S. military strength.

As the United States of America was transformed from the interwar era of the Great Depression and rampant isolationism into the contemporary period of advanced technology and global interests, its labor movement, doubling in size and assuming major influence during wartime, came to play a strategic role in shaping national public policy.

For the most part, though, labor's role, especially that of the AFL in this national transformation both in wartime and beyond, has been untold either by historians, social scientists, or seen by key union figures themselves.

By all accounts, one figure whose career in the labor movement reflects labor's impress on this national transformation was Keenan. International secretary emeritus of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers his achievements still far surpass his fame. Born in Chicago 4 years before the 20th century began, for almost 60 years, extraordinary circumstances in his life thrust him into leadership and advisory roles in some of the century's more important events.

In the process, Joe Keenan was far more than a bystander to history. He became a main actor in such efforts as the creation of the modern labor movement; the war production drive of the Second World War; the making of the atomic bomb and the opening of the nuclear era; U.S. efforts to revive democracy in Germany after the fall of Hitler; formation of labor's League for Political Education—now the AFL-

CIO's Committee on Political Education (COPE), of which he was the founding director; the campaigns of Presidents Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson for the White House, and the civil rights revolution. In the process, Keenan became and remains an authentic folk hero.

As he stepped into these varied activities, Joe did not consider himself a planner or a theoretician charting the way; he was merely a man who could get things done. Close observers believe that his efforts, though unsung, were crucial in achieving vital national goals, for example, in forging the no strike pledge of labor which reduced the Nation's work stoppages in World War II; restoring German unions to democracy after 1945; and, inspiring the AFL as it successfully plunged into the whirlpool of post-war U.S. politics.

Keenan's name now produces little response either in Chicago or Washington beyond the halls of labor which he did so much to construct; but, to those who are knowledgeable about the modern labor movement, he remains one of the half-dozen major figures within its ranks.

In his preface to the book on Joe Keenan, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman says that Keenan received the two highest awards that a President can bestow on a civilian—the Medal of Merit and the Medal of Freedom, because in his life and in his service to the Nation, he represented the hopes and aspirations of the average American writ large.

On comment on Keenan's career illustrates the impression he left on his comtemporaries. According the Gen. Lucius D. Clay, head of U.S. command in post-war Germany, "The re-establishment of trade unions along democratic lines had to come within. That this almost impossible reform did occur came about in a large part, if not entirely, from the work of Joe Keenan."

This book does not attempt to fill a scholarly and journalistic vacuum on either labor's role or on Keenan personally. Nor is it even a full-scale biography; rather, the author simply has tried to tell Joe's story primarily as seen by himself and by others directly related to his career. However, since so little written information was available on a prominent labor figure like Keenan the book should fill a gap and serve to remind scholars and journalists that labor's side of the story in important events of the past four decades has scarcely been looked at, let alone told.

The author of this book on Mr. Keenan, Francis X. Gannon, is a consultant to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States and a former adviser to the late Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. A writer on political and international affairs, he has worked in various capacities for the U.S. labor movement. Mr. Gannon holds a Ph. D. in political philosophy from the Catholic University of America and works with nonprofit agencies including CARA, a national Catholic research center, where he is chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board; the Coolfont Foundation, Berkely Springs, W. Va.; and JACS (Joint Action in Community Service), a citizens' coalition assisting the Job Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this book highly to the Members of this body. It conveys the message that our national survival is as dependent on men and women of integrity and valor as it is on our military might. Joseph D. Keenan, whom I have known for years, is now at age 88—still a model of the activist citizen for all Americans. This book tells why this is so, and I congratulate Joe, his family, his associates from Chicago, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and the AFL-CIO for the great honor and distinction he and they have brought to the working American.●

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET MAY AUTHORIZE REQUEST FOR MODIFIED CLOSED RULE ON FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET 1985

(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 Democratic Caucus Rule 35, I would like to take this opportunity to advise my colleagues that the Committee on the Budget may authorize me to request a modified closed rule for the consideration of the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985.●

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, March 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUNGREN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. RINALDO.
Mr. PRITCHARD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRANK.
Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.
Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
Mr. LEATH of Texas.
Mr. FOGLIETTA.
Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.
Mr. D'AMOURS.
Mr. LANTOS in four instances.
Mrs. KENNELLY.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. UDALL.
Mr. ORTIZ.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 803. An act to establish the Commission on the Centennial Review of the Civil Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution declaring the week of May 7 through May 13, 1984, as "National Photo Week."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1984, 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:

2985. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report on the withholding of $30 million in budget authority provided for grants for the education of immigrant children, which the President previously has not reported to the Congress, pursuant to Public Law 93-344, section 1015(a) (H. Doc. No. 98-188); to the

Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the second volume of the Department's "International Narcotics Control Strategy Report," pursuant to FAA, section 481(e)(1) (97 Stat. 1053); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2987. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification that on March 19, 1984 the Department of Defense provided defense articles, services and training to Chad under the authorities of P.D. 83-8 and P.D. 83-9, pursuant to FAA, section 506(b)(2) (93 Stat. 702); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2988. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the third report on the activities of the multinational force and observers to implement the treaty of peace between Egypt and Israel, pursuant to Public Law 97-132, section 6; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2989. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Department's comments on the report and recommendations of the Commission on Fair Market Value For Federal Coal Leasing; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Interior and Insular Affairs.

2990. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the reports on the following trust funds: Airport and airway, black lung disability, hazardous substance response, highway, inland waterways, nuclear waste, and reforestation, pursuant to IRC section 9602(a) (95 Stat. 1638), Public Law 96-510, section 223(b)(1), Public Law 95-502, section 203(c), Public Law 97-425, section 302(e)(1), and Public Law 96-451, section 303(c)(1); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on Mar. 22, 1984, the following report was filed on Mar. 23, 1984]

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7. A bill to make permanent certain of the authorizations of appropriations under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1963; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted Mar. 26, 1984]

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4900. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4706. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1985 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. SOLARZ (for himself, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GREEN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SIMON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 5243. A bill to establish a commission to identify, designate, preserve, and protect cemeteries, monuments, and historic buildings which are located abroad and which are associated with the foreign heritage of U.S. citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENNY SMITH (for himself, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SILJANDER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 468 Resolution calling for an across-the-board freeze on Federal spending in fiscal year 1985; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 991: Mr. PEASE, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SABO, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BATES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 1147: Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 4392: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 4522: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 4590: Mr. FRANK, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4772: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 4813: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan and Mr. MACKAY.

H.R. 4877: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, and Mr. HARRISON.

H.R. 5068: Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 5140: Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CARR, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VANDERGRIFF, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEBB, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 272: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. REID, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.J. Res. 415: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DYSON, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SABO, Mr. SIMON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 446: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SIMON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARR, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.J. Res. 487: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. GRAMM, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLIN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 491: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.J. Res. 514: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. DICKS.

H.J. Res. 521: Mr. LEATH of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.

H. Con. Res. 261: Ms. FERRARO, Mr. BATES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. DURBIN.

H. Res. 450: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MINISH, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DYSON, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Res. 458: Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BATES, Mr. LENT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.J. Res. 473: Mr. O'BRIEN.

SENATE—*Monday, March 26, 1984*

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.—Matthew 20: 27.

Father in Heaven, we thank Thee for the unsung heroes of the Senate—the men and women who work behind the scenes but without whom the Senate could not function. We thank Thee for those who keep records, do research, write speeches, handle mail, answer telephones, operate computers, deal with irate people who demand to see busy Senators, respond to constituents who expect the impossible.

We thank Thee, Lord, for those who provide security, food service, operate the subways, and the elevators, for police who work outside in all kinds of inclement weather, for those who maintain buildings and grounds. Help them to know that they are appreciated and bless them with their families who often sacrifice for the sake of the work. In the name of Him who "came not to be served but to serve and to give His life as a ransom for many." Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Chair.

AWARD OF U.S. MEDAL OF FREEDOM TO SENATOR HOWARD BAKER

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the majority leader is not present this morning. He is at the White House with the President where he is being presented the U.S. Medal of Freedom for his distinguished service and contributions in the field of Government.

This award is the highest civilian medal and is presented in the most unique and special of circumstances.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, is proud of the Senate majority leader, HOWARD BAKER. Time and time again he has found the legislative common denominator where none seemed possible. Patience, courtesy, and accommodation have been the foundation of his approach as the majority leader. Preparedness and foresight that he has exhibited as majority leader have provided a model for all Senators to emulate.

Having had the privilege of serving in the leadership with the Senator from Tennessee since 1977, I have become aware of his real leadership capability. At the time that he and I became the leader and assistant leader, we were in the minority. Senator BAKER was the minority leader. In 1981 he began his service as majority leader, and the experience he had as minority leader has served him well.

Senator BAKER has been the vocal conscience of the Senate Republican majority, yet never has Senator BAKER forgotten what it means to serve in the minority and the importance of the minority views here in the U.S. Senate.

I applaud President Reagan for having selected our majority leader, HOWARD BAKER, for this Medal of Freedom, and I hope that I speak for the Senate as a whole in extending our congratulations to the majority leader for his historical contribution to the Senate and to the U.S. Government as a whole.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, I yield.

(Mr. MATTINGLY assumed the chair.)

HOWARD BAKER RECEIVES THE MEDAL OF FREEDOM AWARD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I want to add my support for what my friend the able majority whip, Senator STEVENS has already said. Our mutual friend, the distinguished majority leader, Senator HOWARD BAKER, is receiving the U.S. Medal of Freedom this morning in a ceremony at the White House. I want to commend the President for choosing to award this highest recognition of civilian achievement to Senator BAKER.

The Medal of Freedom was established by President Truman in 1945 to salute meritorious service in the military or in advancing our national security. President Kennedy expanded the criteria in 1963 to recognize those who have made a meritorious contribution to world peace or cultural or other significant public or private endeavors. Senator BAKER is just such a man.

As majority leader for the past 3½ years and leader of the Republican Senators for the past 7½ years, Senator BAKER has proved himself to be fair, cognizant of the needs and important role of the minority party in this great institution, and a congenial colleague to us all. He has been remarkably capable in synthesizing vastly differing viewpoints on a variety of difficult issues facing our Nation and in facilitating the Senate's working its will.

I know I speak for all my colleagues on this side of the aisle in repeating what I have said so many times before—HOWARD BAKER is my close friend and I applaud him for this recognition of his distinguished service.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the distinguished acting majority leader yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the acting majority leader concerning Mr. BAKER receiving the Medal of Freedom. I do not know of any man who has served in the Senate who deserves this medal more. He is a man of integrity, a man of ability, a man of dedication.

Those are his hallmarks.

Senator BAKER works long hours, and he works strenuously. He has been very patient in dealing with Senators. He has performed his task in a very skillful and wonderful manner.

I am very pleased to speak these few words in his behalf, as I feel that he is one of the most worthy Senators with whom I have served in my 30 years in the Senate.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the President pro tempore.

CHARLIE HOUSER OF ALASKA

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, last New Year's Eve, the Nation lost a dedicated public servant in the line of duty. Charlie Houser, BLM's Congressional Affairs Officer, died following injuries sustained in a helicopter crash while on a field assignment in the Grand Canyon.

Charlie began his career with BLM in Washington, D.C., 22 years ago as a GS-1 messenger in the mail room. He was quickly recognized for his high quality of work and earned three promotions during his first year of service. Special permission was required from the Civil Service Commission for his third promotion.

In 1964, he was promoted to a GS-5 Procurement Assistant and worked his way up to Chief of the Branch of Office Services over the next 3 years. His hard work was rewarded in 1972 when he was transferred to the old Cooperative Relations Division as a Congressional Liaison Specialist. Three short years later he became the Bureau's first black congressional liaison officer.

Charlie's remarkable career with BLM spanned more than two decades.

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

He was always quick to respond to congressional inquiries and was even quicker with his characteristic smile and good humor. We shall miss Charlie Houser, and I know my colleagues join with me in expressing our deepest sympathies to his widow, Lionella, and the rest of the Houser family.

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there will be one special order in favor of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE). The Senate will then have a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to exceed 1 hour in length, during which Senators may speak therein for not longer than 10 minutes each.

Consideration of the urgent supplemental appropriations bill, House Joint Resolution 492, will resume following that period for routine morning business.

Mr. President, the leadership is hopeful that we will be able to dispose of the supplemental by midweek so that we can get to other urgent items, such as the reconciliation bill.

Rollcall votes are possible today, but I cannot announce specifically what they may be on.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

ACID RAIN DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I recently read a very fine report and interview conducted by the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail, an interview with Ann Bartuska, who holds a doctorate in forestry from West Virginia University. She conducts acid rain research at North Carolina State University under a contract from the Environmental Protection Agency.

The interview occurred after her participation in an acid rain forum at the University of Charleston. The forum was sponsored by the Kanawha Garden Club.

The scientist was interviewed by W. E. Chilton III; Don Marsh; and James A. Haught of the Sunday Gazette-Mail. I found this interview to be interesting. May I say that I would recommend that Senators read the participant's responses to the questions asked of her.

I also call attention to another interview reported in the same newspaper, an interview that was had with Consolidation Coal Co. executive Stephen Young. Mr. Young is a former president of the West Virginia Coal Association. He was another participant in the Kanawha Garden Club Acid Rain Forum. Mr. Young was likewise interviewed by Messrs. Chilton, Marsh, and Haught.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both these interviews appear in the RECORD at this point and in the order in which I have alluded to them.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Mar. 4, 1984]

RESEARCHER DISCUSSES ACID RAIN DEVELOPMENTS

(Pennsylvania-born Ann Bartuska, who holds a doctorate in forestry from West Virginia University, conducts acid rain research at North Carolina State University under a contract from the Environmental Protection Agency. After participating in an acid rain forum at the University of Charleston sponsored by Kanawha Garden Club, she was interviewed by W. E. Chilton III, Don Marsh and James A. Haught of the Sunday Gazette-Mail.)

CHILTON. There's some scientific evidence that acid rain dates back hundreds of years and highly acidic cores have been taken from icebergs. Does this rebut or refute the argument that present-day pollutants are causing acid rain?

BARTUSKA. No, it doesn't refute it. We know that there has been an acidic environment for a long time. Growth processes of the forest are naturally acidified processes. Soil-development is a naturally acidic process. The whole southeast has acid soils, and it has nothing to do with acid rain, it's just normal development. Any volcano that spews forth SO_2 (sulfur dioxide) emissions is going to result in acidification. What has happened more recently is a very dramatic increase in acidity that is clearly related to anthropogenic, man-made causes.

You can't put a finger on any one source. It's not utilities necessarily; it's not smelters; it's not the power plant down the street. But we know there was an upswing in SO_2 emission within a certain date, and we have seen an increase in acidity since that date. When the Clean Air Act was initiated there was a decrease in SO_2 emissions and we've seen a concomitant decrease in acid rain. So there is some tie with anthropogenic causes, but there are certainly a lot of natural sources as well.

CHILTON. The soils in much of Canada and the northeastern United States are the kind that are susceptible to acidification, as you pointed out. Is this an argument against a costly acid rain control program?

BARTUSKA. The control programs recently proposed would control only SO_2 emissions, and we don't know enough about what other things are going on, such as nitrous oxides producing nitric acids resulting in added acidification. We don't know enough about heavy metals.

The susceptible areas of the Northeast are naturally acidic because of organic acids, but they have very different responses to nitrate deposition and higher heavy metal deposition. The current control program will not control those two pollutants.

CHILTON. What about Canada? They're screaming about our sulfur emissions, but are they cleaning up their own act? There's a huge iron ore plant at Sudbury.

BARTUSKA. Sudbury has been turned off. The government shut the plant down. But interestingly enough the acidity didn't change afterward within the local area. That was a real surprise from the scientists' standpoint.

HAUGHT. Mr. Young said there has been no appreciable increase in acidity in the past 25 years. Is that correct?

BARTUSKA. There's evidence that shows a decrease in pH (increase of acidity) in rainfall from the 1950s to 1970s. What we've seen recently is that that pH is going back up in the Northeast and it's going down in the Southeast. So there are changes.

HAUGHT. Going up means it's improving?

BARTUSKA. Right. And that coincides with the Clean Air Act.

HAUGHT. Then why the urgent clamor for reform if it's reforming itself?

BARTUSKA. Possibly because it's not reforming enough. But I strongly feel that a lot of statements being made today by the media and by politicans and by groups like the Sierra Club and Audubon Society are based on reports by scientists four years ago. Well, four years ago we implemented a $55-million-a-year research program federally. We now know different things than we did four years ago. We have new hypotheses. We have answered some questions to the point where we don't think it's acid deposition or sulfate deposition. So there's a gap between how fast the scientists have progressed, versus what people are still using to make their decisions.

HAUGHT. In other words, scientists have backed off from positions of four years ago?

BARTUSKA. Yes, they've changed them because we have new evidence.

MARSH. But the government of Canada and the government of the United States, the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives all agree there's an acid rain problem. They just disagree on what to do about it. Are they all misinformed and don't understand the scientific data?

BARTUSKA. I think they're becoming more informed, but they are still selective in what they hear. I was up at a briefing with (EPA chief William) Ruckelshaus right before his Feb. 2 statement. At that time the most current arguments were put forth and there still is some backing off from that. So there is a lag between what we knew or conjectured and what the scientists are now presenting.

MARSH. I went to a meeting in October at which Ruckelshaus spoke. He said acid rain was one of the great problems; it's going to be worse; something must be done. So between October and February he learned—

BARTUSKA. He has learned a lot. He has learned that we don't know very much. He knows now that, instead of thousands of acidified lakes in the Northeast, only 216 in the Adirondacks that we know of actually have been acidified in recent times, within the last 20 years.

CHILTON. And you don't know what caused the acidification? Or you do know? Or you partially know?

BARTUSKA. We partially know. Most of us feel that it's a combination of processes. There's no doubt there's acidic deposition. There is not doubt that the pH of rainfall is lower than it was historically. What we don't know is what is that doing. Do you want to base the emission control program on 216 acid lakes where no fish are surviving—not dead lakes, just no fish—or do you want to wait and learn more about the relationship between SO_2 emissions and nitrous oxide emissions and acidic deposition for fish and for lakes and for forestry?

I think we're seeing more forestry emphasis because we know that trees have died and are dying. We're not saying it's an acid deposition phenomena but it's probably an atmospheric deposition of metals and nitrates and sulfates and hydrogen ions. What we've learned is that it's much more complex, and just addressing SO_2 is not the only answer.

MARSH. I'm taken aback. A serious debate is going on in Congress over a $14 billion pollution bill that is disrupting the coal mining industry across the country—and they're doing it on now-failed knowledge?

BARTUSKA. I heard a presentation in August that still used the same numbers that were used three years ago: "thousands of lakes in the Adirondacks are dead or dying." We know that's not true because we don't know the extent of dead or dying lakes, acidified lakes. The fact that Ruckelshaus and Reagan have proposed additional research for 1985—

MARSH. After David Stockman suggested that states with many electoral votes would be affected—

BARTUSKA. Well maybe—but every scientist who was brought to Washington to meet with Ruckelshaus said there's not enough evidence to go out and start emission controls.

CHILTON. I take it you feel that you're neutral? In other words, you're not being underwritten by the coal industry, you're just an academician, a scientist?

BARTUSKA. I feel that I'm neutral. Our program was established in 1979 by the Environmental Protection Agency to act as their research management organization because they didn't have the expertise to do it. They solicited proposals and N.C. State responded and we got a contract to manage deposition research for EPA for five years.

They have certain things they want to know, such as forest productivity, and we decide who gets funded and how long they're funded and for how much. So we are in effect underwritten by EPA but we're also underwritten by USDA and by some local utilities and by other industry. So, we do have that kind of funding, but I think we're neutral. We have too many scientists who we're funding who are producing too much data to try to be biased.

HAUGHT. You haven't been offered a six-figure salary by a coal company, have you?

BARTUSKA. No, I just listen to my scientists. I think we're learning a lot. What I'm presenting comes as a surprise perhaps to you, but it's not a surprise to people who have been having these conversations for the last year. We're $55 million and three years ahead of where we were four years ago.

CHILTON. A certain amount of hysteria develops in political organization, and that's true on the right and on the left. But why would a Sierra Club, which has a good track record, be so off base on this?

BARTUSKA. I don't know. I think there have been certain scientists who have been very vocal. It's a sad state of affairs because the best scientists are the ones who are the most quiet, but they are also the ones who are producing the data that indicates it's not a simple problem. The most vocal ones are the ones who are most heard, and I think they are the least responsible.

MARSH. What's causing the government of Canada to issue formal protests to our government?

BARTUSKA. Well, Canada has seen extensive acidification of their lakes, a lot of fish-kills, forest damage. Now we're seeing a lot more forest damage in this country and I think forestry is becoming more of an important argument for control than the lake acidification has been.

HAUGHT. If they shut down the Sudbury plant and the acidity didn't drop, is it possible the U.S. could put the $14 billion scrubber system in all the coal-fired plants of the Midwest and it wouldn't change acid rain in the Northeast?

BARTUSKA. My gut reaction is that it would change. I don't think it would be as major a change as is being predicted, because that doesn't deal with the whole problem. It doesn't deal with local sources and with nitric acids.

HAUGHT. And car exhausts?

BARTUSKA. Scrubbers are primarily for SO_2 control. Car exhaust is definitely a source of nitrous oxides.

CHILTON. If you were the chief gauleiter in this country in this business and could dictate what was going to be done, what would you dictate? Just more study?

BARTUSKA. Honestly, I would say more study for another two years and then we'll have another review. I would put more effort into understanding the pollutant interactions, throwing in ozone, SO_2 and nitrous oxides in our studies, because I think we'll find out that there is more of an interaction effect than a single-pollutant effect.

CHILTON. In other words, instead of going for scrubbers, it might be necessary to go for the exhaust of automobiles?

BARTUSKA. No, I wouldn't say that.

CHILTON. Do you think there's still going to be a need to put in scrubbers?

BARTUSKA. Not necessarily scrubbers—SO_2 control. It doesn't have to be scrubbers.

CHILTON. OK, how do you control SO_2?

BARTUSKA. Low-sulfur coal is one option.

CHILTON. OK, how do you control SO_2?

BARTUSKA. It may not produce enough SO_2 to be of concern.

CHILTON. Well, one thing you have to say for Sierra Clubs and such outfits, they have no selfish interest. The people who belong to the Sierra Club don't get any monetary return for their opposition to pollution. They're pure of heart, which we cannot say about utilities and coal companies.

Thank you very much, Ms. Bartuska.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Mar. 4, 1984]

ACID RAIN BILL NOT NEEDED, COAL OFFICIAL CONTENDS

(Consolidation Coal Co. executive Stephen Young, former president of the West Virginia Coal Association, another participant in the Kanawha Garden Club acid rain forum, also was interviewed by Chilton, Marsh, and Haught.)

MARSH. Do you think there is a need for an acid rain control bill?

YOUNG. I certainly don't think there's any demonstrated need.

MARSH. You don't agree that, in the Northeast, forests and lakes are being damaged by acid rain?

YOUNG. Well, the number of lakes that have been acidified total about 219 out of 25,000 lakes examined—and 206 of those are on the Adirondacks Park in New York state. Those 206 lakes represent only 4 percent of the surface area of the lakes in the Adirondacks Park. Data show that the lakes are not becoming more acidified. In fact, trend studies show that from 1972 to 1982, emissions fell by 22 percent. In the same period of time the use of utility coal went up 40 percent, from 349 million tons to 549 million tons.

We're at a place under the Clean Air Act where almost all of the nation's 3,000 counties have achieved compliance with the federal standards for SO_2. So, contrary to what some would lead you to believe, there is no crisis.

Therefore we think the president's approach, which in essence validates the approaches taken by Senators BYRD and RANDOLPLH and Congressman RAHALL and the other three West Virginia congressmen, MOLLOHAN, WISE and STAGGERS, who are cosponsors of Rahall's bill, validates this position on acid rain. Their position is that we have to have a better understanding of the problem before we start throwing billions of dollars after it.

MARSH. Even Rahall in our delegation, which obviously is interested in protecting coal mining, doesn't say there is no acid rain problem.

YOUNG. Oh, I didn't say there's not a problem. What I said was there is no acid rain crisis that should be dealt with with legislation in 1984.

MARSH. Why is Canada lodging diplomatic protests against the United States, thinking that something is happening to its lakes because of sulfur emissions?

YOUNG. Well, almost all the Canadian lakes that have been acidified lie within 180 miles or so of the Sudbury plant, which has been notorious as the greatest SO_2 polluter in the North American continent.

MARSH. How much SO_2 are we putting out in this country?

YOUNG. About 24 million tons annually.

CHILTON. Well, clearly, if we cut down that 24 million tons, this wouldn't be bad, would it?

YOUNG. Of course it would not be a bad thing to cut down on the tonnage

CHILTON. Another thing: isn't it true that West Virginia's rate of emissions into the air is much better than Ohio's?

YOUNG. I don't think you can put it in those terms. You can say that there is a lot more SO_2 going in the air in Ohio than any other state. But you can also say the emissions density in the state of Ohio, the pollution per acre of land, is less than it is in Massachusetts. The National Academy of Sciences has said that the closer a source of emission is to the problem, the greater its impact. Reputable scientists say that, if you really want to do something about New England, it's four times more effective to clean up a million tons of SO_2 up there as to clean up a million tons in Ohio or West Virginia. In other words, you'd have to clean up 4 million tons in Ohio to have the same effect in New England. There's plenty of local pollution in New England.

The National Academy of Sciences report says, if you would reduce all the pollution in the Eastern United States by 50 percent, you could expect to see 50 percent improvement in the acid rain fallout.

But authorities at Massachusetts Institute of Technology have done a study on effectiveness of the proposed plans and they have said that you would achieve an improvement of about 4 one-hundredths of a pH value by reducing the emissions by 45 percent, roughly what the Senate bill would do. To attain a real meaningful improvement in the pH scale, you would have to cut out virtually all SO_2 and nitrous oxide emissions in the immediate areas of the Northeast. All of them. Our own studies show that 45 percent of all the pollution in the Adirondacks comes from New York state and the New England states, 30 percent

comes from Canada, 25 percent comes from the Midwest.

You generally think that winds blow from the west and the concept has been, and it is incorrect that the tall stacks and utility plants put that garbage in the air and it lands 12,000 kilometers away up in the Adirondacks. The truth is, pollutants from power plants in the Midwest generally did not go beyond 185 to 375 miles.

CHILTON. Well, if the stack were only 6 inches tall, all of the pollution would go into the immediate neighborhood. So the tall stacks, let's not kid ourselves, are there for a very good reason: So that the people down below aren't going to be raising holy hell. Is that a fair statement?

YOUNG. That's a fair statement, except that the tall stacks do not affect meteorology beyond a couple of hundred miles.

CHILTON. But it's dispersing, and part of it gets further out and does get up into the Adirondacks.

YOUNG. Well, I wouldn't think it would be that far.

HAUGHT. Wouldn't Americans be justified in being skeptical of coal company research findings since the tobacco industry has been telling us for years that its own researchers find no connection between smoking and lung cancer and heart disease—which contradicts the research of government agencies?

YOUNG. It's not a parallel situation. The main body of scientific knowledge right now is split over whose hypothesis is correct as to what is going on in the lakes and forests in America. There are many credible scientists on both sides who are advancing theories. The National Academy of Science clearly states that more research has to be done before we can have a definitive body of knowledge to pursue.

MARSH. Congressman Waxman of California says acid rain is causing severe problems, and he wants the bill to cut SO_2 emissions 50 percent. I didn't think anyone questioned the damage of acid rainfall. I thought even Reagan agreed that there was a problem with acid rainfall. And I thought that everybody agreed that sulfur emissions were causing it.

YOUNG. We've been following this matter very closely and we're trying to talk from facts. The facts show that there is acidification of some 200 lakes in New England and New York. The causes of the acidification of some of these lakes may well be acid rain—but the truth of the matter is there have been very credible alternative hypotheses advanced which show that the soil in that area, which is far more acidic than the rain, could play a very large factor in the acidification of some of these lakes. The humus and acid bogs associated with some of these may play a factor larger than what's coming down out of the skies.

At the Senate hearing Feb. 15 a senior vice president from International Paper Co., testified. He said that his company is the largest landowner in America with over 600 million acres of property including 1.6 million acres in the Northeast. He said, for example, the conifer litter in the forests in Maine has a 3.2 pH, which is 10 times more acid than 4.2 pH rain. The average rainfall in the Northeast probably has a pH of 4.4. An increasing body of scientific knowledge says the unaffected rain in the Northeast would be about pH 5 without any interference from man-made sources whatsoever.

The environmental community has said that you wouldn't expect to find rain falling at a neutral 7 because there's CO2 (carbon dioxide) in the atmosphere and it dissolves in the air and creates carbonic acid. So you would expect just from that mere chemical phenomena that you have a rain of 5.6.

CHILTON. The lower the number, the worse it is?

YOUNG. Right

CHILTON. Does Europe have an acid rain problem?

YOUNG. Yes. Europe has a problem which is associated either with industrial pollution and/or acid rain. The jury is still out on that. Their levels of pollution are somewhat heavier, for example, near the Black Forest in Germany where there has been significant effects on trees.

CHILTON. What sort of effects?

YOUNG. Trees experience a premature death and unhealthy state in the roots and other conditions. This has been examined by a number of scientists who have advanced two hypotheses: One is that acid rain has liberated aluminum in the soil which has affected the hair roots of the trees and that's where their interchange is with nutrients, so the trees have been sick. The other hypothesis is that something in the air is either affecting the tree at the leaf or in the bark and its probably industrial pollution. It may be something like ozone or heavy metals or something other than SO_2.

MARSH. Steve, if the 50 percent, 12 million ton emission standard were to become law, how many jobs would be lost in West Virginia?

YOUNG. Well, the United Mine Workers has estimated that about 10,797 jobs would be lost in West Virginia.

MARSH. Would that be more severe in the northern higher-sulfur coalfields than in the southern lower sulfur coalfields?

YOUNG. Yes, it would be.

HAUGHT. But some coal groups say we would actually gain jobs, because low-sulfur coal in Southern West Virginia would be in demand, which would boost operations there.

YOUNG. Well, they're saying that for the same reason the American Gas Association seems to see an opportunity here to sell more gas to power plants and the people who made methanol say "We have a clean-burning fuel," and went to the Senate hearing shouting their advantages. Some people would clearly benefit if high-sulfur coal was forced out of the marketplace to be replaced by their own low-sulfur coal. But that's an oversimplification of the science of coal because there are many low-sulfur coals which will not fit into high-sulfur boilers.

Low-volatile metallurgical coal from Raleigh, Nicholas, Greenbrier, Mercer, McDowell, Wyoming counties—those coals won't fit in the boiler. On the other hand, midvolatile sulfur coals are marketable in many of the high-sulfur coal boilers, but there are other boiler problems in using some of those coals.

HAUGHT. Isn't Consolidation mostly involved with high-sulfur coal in the northern fields?

YOUNG. Well, that's true, but we've got a good position in low-sulfur coal as well. We have many mines in Southern West Virginia, some mines in low-sulfur coal in Virginia and Tennessee as well.

MARSH. What is going to happen, do you think, after the election?

YOUNG. Well, acid rain is a political problem right now. If it's dealt with as a scientific problem, they'll decide whether or not there's a crisis and whether or not they can wait on research. After there is documented research, then people can make a judgement on what to do about it. It's not just: Shall we close these mines and put these people out of work and put other coal in there? Ultimately, the question is whether it's a good idea to burn coal in America.

MARSH. Well, thank you, Mr. Young.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have no further need for my time. I see no Senator who indicates that he wishes to have a portion of it. I therefore yield it back.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

CAN DETERRENCE OFFER SECURITY?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how about it? Can our massive nuclear arsenal maintain such a curtain of fear for the Soviet Union that it will desist from using nuclear weapons against us anywhere and on any occasion? There is one simple but inadequate answer. That answer: It has worked so far. For more than 30 years, the Soviet Union has had the power to use its nuclear arsenal to destroy the only other super nuclear power on Earth—and pave the way for the Communist world revolution it preaches. Why has not the Soviet Union used this power? Because of deterrence. Because it fears that if it did, the United States would have sufficient nuclear power left to utterly devastate the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union knows the United States has this colossal nuclear power. So why can we not place continued and full reliance on deterrence? Because the time may come any day that the Soviets conclude that the risk the United States will retaliate under certain circumstances will be small enough to warrant their use of nuclear weapons. What are these circumstances? Why would the United States not retaliate? The most predictable and universal characteristic of mankind, as of sovereign nations, is the instinct to fight back when attacked—provided the means are available for fighting back. And provided one other ingredient is present. A person or a nation might not fight back even if that person has the means to inflict terrible damage on the adversary, provided the adversary can still carry on with an even more devastating counterattack.

So, will deterrence work? Will the Soviets continue to believe that if they attack the United States with nuclear weapons, the United States will retaliate? Unfortunately for us, the answer can not be certain. The Soviets can never be sure we will retaliate. The cir-

cumstances may be so serious for the Soviets and, in their judgment the likelihood that the United States will retaliate so slight, that they will decide to use nuclear weapons. So we can never be sure deterrence will continue to work.

What will make deterrence likely to work or unlikely to work? On what will effective deterrence depend? It will depend on two elements. First, it will depend on the reaction of whoever happens to be President of the United States at the time. He and he alone can make the decision to push the button. So the effectiveness of deterrence depends on the Soviets' judgment of Presidential will to press the nuclear button.

If the Russians should launch a nuclear attack using tactical nuclear weapons to suppress a growing and successful revolt in any of their satellite countries, would we use military forces and would we use nuclear weapons of any kind to assist the revolution on the verge of success against the U.S.S.R.? In that hypothetical situation, the Soviets might assume the risk of U.S. retaliation would be acceptably low. But suppose the Soviets should have smashing initial successes in an invasion against countries of Western Europe. Would we retaliate with nuclear weapons against the Soviet Union?

We now have an array of tactical nuclear weapons. We are constantly enhancing and increasing those tactical weapons. These weapons offset the Soviet numerical advantage in conventional weapons—that is, tanks, planes and troops—in Europe. They represent a deterrence—not a deterrence against the Soviet use of nuclear weapons but against a Soviet conventional attack against Western Europe. We have spent billions on these weapons and if they have any purpose other than to deter a conventional Soviet attack on Western Europe, what is it? But, again, that deterrence can only work if the U.S.S.R. believes we will use those tactical nuclear weapons to defend Europe.

Conceivably, the Soviets might go farther than in any of the suppositions I have offered. Depending on the President, his record and his pronouncements, the Soviets might even consider it a worthwhile risk to institute a "surgical strike" with nuclear weapons to take out three targets in the United States: our land-based missiles, our strategic air bases and our submarine bases. They might spare Washington, New York, and all of our cities. They might confine the strike entirely to prime military targets. Obviously, they would, in the process, kill hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions of Americans. If a President decided to strike back, he would be sealing the death warrant of at least 100 million Russians and 100 million Americans. He would also be jeopardizing the life of every human being on Earth in view of the likely climatic effects—the nuclear winter—that would follow such a catastrophic all-out nuclear war. Knowing all this, would a President press that button? No one really knows. If the Russians knew—and I mean really knew—that he would press the button, deterrence would work.

If they had to guess, it could easily go either way. So, yes, deterrence has indeed, worked for 30 years. But will it work for another 30 or even for another 10 or 1? We will have to live with the terrible fact that no one knows. Life on Earth could literally end any day.

One expert who contends that our reliance on nuclear deterrence has seriously deteriorated is Leslie Gelb, the national security correspondent of the New York Times. I call attention to Mr. Gelb because he is highly respected, he speaks with great authority, and I believe many, many people believe he is as competent as anyone writing on this subject today. Here is what he wrote quite recently:

> The U.S. and the Soviet Union are now on the threshhold of decisions that could make nuclear war seriously thinkable for the first time. In 10 to 15 years, new technologies being developed and tested could, if deployed, fundamentally and irretrievably undermine the basic philosophy that has been the center of both sides' nuclear strategy—mutual deterrence.

Mr. President, that statement is so significant, particularly coming from a competent, highly respected correspondent, that I want to repeat it. Leslie Gelb has written in the New York Times of March 4 the following:

> The U.S. and the Soviet Union are now on the threshold of decisions that could make nuclear war seriously thinkable for the first time. In 10 to 15 years, new technologies being developed and tested could, if deployed, fundamentally and irretrievably undermine the basic philosophy that has been the center of both sides of nuclear strategy—mutual deterrence.

That means that we could be living, are living, in a period that could be as dangerous as mankind has ever lived in within the next 10 to 15 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Times of March 4, 1984, entitled, "Is the Nuclear Threat Manageable" by Leslie Gelb be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Mar. 4, 1984]

IS THE NUCLEAR THREAT MANAGEABLE?

(By Leslie H. Gelb)

A new and heightened fear of nuclear war seems to be gripping Americans and Europeans. It is there in a movie about accidental war, in a television movie about Armageddon itself, in peace marches and the nuclear-freeze movement, in the superpowers' placing their missiles closer to the other's homeland, in all likelihood that nuclear strategy will emerge as a major issue in this year's Presidential campaign.

The new fear is grounded in the Administration's talk about being prepared to fight and win a nuclear war, and in the concern that Soviet leaders share this view. "Fight" and "win" are new words in the lexicon of governmental nuclear strategy, and the concepts are fed by the deterioration in Soviet-American relations, by the large and powerful Soviet land-based missiles, and by the projected deployment of America's comparable MX missiles.

But while these developments are worrisome, they have not changed the basic reality of the nuclear age, which dawned 40 years ago: In a nuclear war there are only losers. Soviet and American leaders know this and have gone out of their way ever since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 to avoid direct confrontation.

However, the United States and the Soviet Union now are on the threshold of decisions that could make nuclear war seriously thinkable for the first time. In 10 to 15 years, new technologies now being developed and tested could, if deployed, fundamentally and irretrievably undermine the basic philosophy that has been the center of both sides' nuclear strategy—mutual deterrence.

If the go-ahead is given to deploy these new technologies, a Soviet or American military planner could, before the end of this century, be able to make all of the following statements to his leaders for the first time:

"We can blind all their satellites, destroy their capital in five or six minutes, before they can react, and, with a few well-placed nuclear airbursts, we can knock out their whole communications network and make them sightless and headless.

"With new pinpoint-accurate missile warheads, I can guarantee that we can destroy virtually every missile in a silo, every submarine in port, and every bomber on an airfield.

"That will leave our adversaries only with missiles in their submarines at sea, and we are now able to locate and neutralize this ultimate retaliatory threat.

"Almost all of their few remaining missiles can be destroyed by our missile defense system.

"We may suffer a few million casualties, but our adversary will be thoroughly and finally defeated. And if we don't do it to him now, it is he who will be able to win by striking the first blow."

Nothing will ever be this simple, of course. Who is to say whether Moscow or Washington would reach this stage first? And how is one to foresee what the very competition to develop these technologies may lead to? But the overriding question for leaders in Moscow and Washington is: Can they manage these mounting nuclear threats?

In the past, revolutions in nuclear technology came singly; now they are coming in one overwhelming package. The first revolution was from atomic weapons to far more devastating nuclear weapons. The second was from single-warhead to multiple-warhead missiles. But neither changed the basic idea that nuclear war could not be won. The revolutions on the horizon threaten that idea.

The American public is clearly worried that these new forces cannot be managed. A variety of recent opinion polls shows that a substantial plurality of Americans believe a

nuclear war will occur within the next few years.

A range of strategic experts interviewed said nuclear war was very remote, but not remote enough for comfort. When a group of mostly middle-of-the-road experts met not long ago in Colorado and were asked to rate the chances of a Soviet-American nuclear war before the end of the century, most responded that it was "unlikely"—1 chance in 20 or 1 in 50, either of which is greater than the risk of an adult male's being killed in an automobile accident over the same period.

It is as if people suddenly sensed a breakdown of the strange nuclear logic described so powerful by Winston Churchill. "It may well be," he said, "that we shall, by a process of sublime irony, have reached a stage in this story where safety shall be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation."

Ever since the Soviet Union joined the nuclear club with the United States in the early 1950's, this logic has created a kind of nuclear peace. Were it not for the fear of nuclear war, chances are that Moscow and Washington would have clashed militarily many times—over Berlin or Korea or the Middle East. While nuclear weapons have helped to prevent war between the superpowers because of their threat of mutual annihilation, their existence has, paradoxically, also inhibited the peaceful settlement of disputes. Given the awesome power of these weapons, the superpowers could not fight and they did not have to compromise. Tensions were rarely reduced by diplomacy, but were held in check by fear.

The new and spreading anxiety today stems from the perception that this essential fear of nuclear holocaust is somehow being eroded.

And so it is, to some degree, by the evolution of nuclear doctrine, which is the way Soviet and American leaders think and talk and organize to deter nuclear war. Official language now stretches the meaning of deterrence to being prepared to fight, control and even win nuclear exchanges. It is a very fine line between deterrance and actual war fighting in thought and deed, and the superpowers seem to be approaching that line.

The barriers to nuclear war are also being besieged by the deterioration in Soviet-American relations. Nuclear war would not occur in a vacuum. The conditions for conflict and confrontation exist now, and practically nothing is being done by either side to mitigate them.

But while thoughts and circumstances are necessary, they are not sufficient grounds for actually starting a nuclear war. The thoughts have been there before and the conditions were worse in the early 1950's and 1960's. Yet, there was no physical way at that time of winning a nuclear war at a cost planners considered acceptable.

That is what could change, in theory at least, before the end of this century. All the technological pieces of a "winning" puzzle could be in place by then: antisatellite weapons, missile warheads with improved accuracies antisubmarine warfare capabilities and defense against ballistic missiles.

However remote the possibility of nuclear war—and the consensus among strategic thinkers is that is it and will remain extremely remote—it is becoming less remote all the time. Not now, but based on decisions being made now, this new technology could contribute to the dangerous illusion that nuclear wars can be fought much like an old-fashioned artillery duel—limited, controlled, prolonged, with a winner and a loser.

But not all the changes in doctrine are bad and not all the new technology is destabilizing. The first order of business is to sort out what it is about nuclear doctrine that is sensible or risky, to build in some perspective about Soviet-American relations, and to try to evaluate what advances in technology might help to keep the peace and which might undermine it.

DOCTRINE AND WAR PLANNING

Doctrine has been the main area of combat for nuclear theoreticians of all persuasions. What our leaders say publicly and in classified papers supposedly reveals what they would do with their fingers on the nuclear trigger in a crisis.

The Reagan Administration essentially has carried forward the doctrines or strategies used by Administrations over the last two decades. Differences with past Administrations are much less different than many critics have charged. But they are different enough—particularly with respect to asserting that nuclear war, once begun, can be controlled and won—to have raised some basic questions about what is really on the minds of Administration officials.

Doctrine or strategy is generally divided into two levels. One is declaratory policy—what leaders say publicly to adversaries, allies and their own people. Along with forces actually deployed and under development, doctrine is a way of deterring and adversary by spelling out what would presumably be done to him if he attacked. The second part of doctrine is actually operational war planning—a variety of procedures for making decisions, selecting targets and dealing with a range of contingencies. These, too, are sometimes made public through press leaks. It is usually a more detailed version of the public statements.

The Reagan declaratory policy is quite consistent with past official rhetoric: It calls for maintaining a military balance, emphasis on deterrence, the necessity of having flexibility or options between doing nothing and responding massively. But the secret war plans of the Reagan Administration seem to carry thinking somewhat beyond previous Administrations in emphasizing actual war fighting and winning as necessary both for deterrence and for defense, should detereence fail.

An opportunity to look at these secret plans presented itself when the Defense Guidance, a key Pentagon planning document approved by Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, was leaked to the news media.

Under the general heading of "Wartime Strategy," the paper read: "Should deterrence fail and strategic nuclear war with the U.S.S.R. occur, the United States must prevail and be able to force the Soviet Union to seek earliest termination of hostilities on terms favorable to the United States."

Among the main requirements for doing this, never fully revealed before, were the following:

"Deployment plans that assure United States strategic nuclear forces can render ineffective the total Soviet military and political power structure through attacks on political/military leadership and associated control facilities, nuclear and conventional military forces, and industry critical to military power. These plans should also provide for limiting damage to the United States and its allies to the maximum extent possible."

"Forces that will maintain, throughout a protracted conflict period and afterward, the capability to inflict very high levels of damage against the industrial/economic base of the Soviet Union and her allies, so that they have a strong incentive to seek conflict termination short of an all-out attack on our cities and economic assets."

"United States strategic nuclear forces and supporting C^3I"—command, control, communications and intelligence—"capable of supporting controlled nuclear counterattacks over a protracted period while maintaining a reserve of nuclear forces sufficient for trans- and postattack on our cities and economic assets."

According to Reagan Administration officals, these precepts were embodied in another secret document, National Security Decision Document 13, approved by the President. Three ideas stand out: developing the capability to strike military targets, being able to control and fight a prolonged battle, and having the power to prevail.

The idea of placing first priority on hitting military targets (enemy forces, lines of communication and airfields) rather than population centers is not new at all. But it has been a perennial red flag for liberal critics of nuclear strategy. To them, it smacks of a war-fighting mentality going beyond an interest in pure deterrence. As they see it, the decision to blow up weapons and soldiers is easier for leaders to take than a decision to kill civilians and risk mutual destruction of population centers.

The fact, is, however, that once the American strategic nuclear stockpile ran into the thousands of warheads and that envisions any action short of an all-out response makes such responses more thinkable and therefore more likely.

It seems to me that the Reagan Administration and its predecessors have the better of the argument about the need to have choices available. Many critics speak of the relentness march toward nuclear war, but rail against all preparations to fight or end it. They generally acknowledge that the threat of massive retaliation against Soviet cities is mutually suicidal and thus not credible, but they will not countenance planning for limited responses, which, they insist, are dangerously fanciful.

Nuclear doctrine is about how to deter and what to do should deterrence fail. Since the early 1960's every Administration has agreed that meeting threats at the level posed is the most credible way to deter, and that having limited nuclear options is the least worst way to minimize the horrible possibility that any slip in deterrence will lead to Armageddon. Perhaps this does erode the horror of nuclear war, as the critics who favor all or nothing maintain. But as Albert Wohlstetter, one of the founding fathers of strategic nuclear doctrine, recently argued in commentary magazine, whatever may be lost in horror is more than compensated for by gains in credibility and morality. The President must be perceived as having choices in order to deter, and he cannot be left without choices should deterrence fail.

The real issue, it seems to me, is not flexibility and limited nuclear options but the related idea of a controlled and prolonged nuclear war. Here Prof. Thomas C. Schelling of Harvard, another path-breaker in strategic thinking, makes the essential point. "There is an enormous difference," he has written, "between a doctrine that postulates the efficacy of 'fighting limited war' as deliberate policy, and a doctrine of

doing everything possible to provide opportunity, in the event the undesired and unintended nuclear war should happen, to stop it, to slow it down, to bring the destruction to a halt. The former doctrine would reflect hubris, the latter prudence. The former may reflect an obsession with victory, the later only with tragedy."

In the Reagan Administration's apparent belief in being able to actually control a nuclear war once begun and to fight it over a period of perhaps months, doctrine has been carried beyond well-established bounds. Such a belief could induce some leader some day to think he could risk starting a nuclear war because he would be able to stop short of complete catastrophe.

But the Reagan Administration went further still by reintroducing the 1950's idea of actually seeking to win a nuclear war. For the last 20 years, Administrations have used words like "preventing defeat" or "avoiding an unfavorable outcome" to describe their belief that there could be no winners in a nuclear war.

Following the uproar caused by the secret use of the word "prevail," Mr. Weinberger stated that "nowhere in all of this do we mean to imply that nuclear war is winnable. This notion has no place in our strategy. We see nuclear weapons only as a way of discouraging the Soviets from thinking they could ever resort them." Mr. Reagan also issued denials.

Nonetheless, the suspicion lingers that the leaders of the Administration had something in mind in choosing that word. There are officials in this Administration who have written and spoken of the likelihood of nuclear war, and the need for the United States to prepare to fight, survive and win it. How widely this view is shared in the Administration is not clear.

The more charitable explanation, and the one that squares most with my own experience with Reagan officials, is that prevailing to them really translates into the goal of gaining strategic nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. Many of these officials helped to draft the 1980 Republican Party platform, which calls for achieving overall military and technological superiority over the Soviet Union.

To many on the Reagan team, nuclear superiority is important not because they are sanguine about fighting and winning a nuclear war, but because they believe that this kind of superiority is translatable into diplomatic power and, in the event of a crisis, into coercing the other side to back down.

The idea is highly debatable, and, I believe, not supported by evidence. Soviet agreement to remove its missiles from Cuba in 1962 appears to have been the result of overwhelming and usable American conventional military superiority in the Caribbean and of President Kennedy's willingness to remove comparable American missiles from Turkey. In no other case since both sides acquired nuclear capability did either side back down or make concessions in the face of a nuclear threat.

To argue that Western Europeans are drifting toward neutralism because of Soviet nuclear superiority is also stretching a point. To the extent that Europeans are drifting, it has been coming ever since Moscow achieved nuclear parity at least a decade ago, and is due since then to a combination of Soviet conventional superiority and lack of confidence in American diplomacy.

As for the benefits of nuclear superiority in a state of emergency, former Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger remarked in an interview: "One should not underestimate the risks leaders will take to win in a crisis." In other words, with so much nuclear punch on both sides, it is in the interests of neither to expect to win a crisis showdown.

Nuclear doctrines prepare leaders to think about nuclear showdowns, but they do not cause the showdowns. That depends on how good or bad relations are between Washington and Moscow.

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Given current frostiness, the possibilities for solving problems seem slim and the possibilities of trouble at least somewhat greater than before.

The Administration does not see it that way. Mr. Reagan, in a speech designed to resume a dialogue with Moscow, insisted that the world was "safer because now there is less danger that the Soviet leadership will underestimate our strength or question our resolve." If it is true that Soviet leaders have been doubting American military power—although my sense is quite the contrary—it is in good part thanks to the fact that Mr. Reagan and his key aides have been publicly asserting American inferiority. As for Moscow's having increased respect for American determination, there is something to that. My impression is that Soviet leaders do take Mr. Reagan more seriously than Jimmy Carter, and they do give him grudging respect for increasing military spending and sending the troops into Grenada. This is, after all, how they play the game themselves. At the same time, they do not think he is a man with whom they can do business.

But trouble spots and tensions are increasing, and as Mr. Reagan himself went on to say, "such activity carries with it the risk of larger confrontations."

Several regional conflicts could trigger global confrontations.

Moscow could decide to strike into Pakistan to root out the Afghan rebel based areas in the hope of putting an end to its long and costly war in Afghanistan. The United States is "secretly" supplying the rebels and has commitments to Pakistan. What happens then?

Either Israel or the United States could strike Syrian forces in Lebanon or in Syria itself. Syria is Moscow's last foothold in the Middle East, it has forces in Syria, and its credibility is very much at stake. Do Soviet leaders sit idly by?

Or what happens if the Russians supply modern fighter aircraft to the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, or if there is a Soviet-backed Vietnamese attack against Thailand, or a serious South African effort to overthrow the Marxist regime in Angola, or American strikes against Iran in the event that that radical Islamic republic pursues its pledge to close oil-supply routes?

None of these are farfetched. The risks of direct Soviet-American confrontation are greater today then ever before; Moscow now has the capability to project military forces beyond its own shores. Until the last few years, only the United States could entertain such notions.

If any local dispute were to grow into a superpower crisis, current atmospherics could be more likely to breed excalation rather than restraint. Everything becomes much more trying when atmospherics are bad. Officials sitting around a table in the Kremlin or the White House will hesitate to suggest compromises for fear of appearing weak. Arms-control negotiations, which are like pulling teeth under the best of circumstances, grind to a halt in tense times.

Compounding military might on both sides enhances mutual fear and perhaps deterrence as well, but it also feeds mutual suspicions, miscalculations and plain stupidity. President Reagan, too, sees that more and more military power and fear are not enough to keep the peace and so proclaimed in his speech that "we want more than deterrence."

TECHNOLOGY AND HARDWARE

The myth is that rapid and large advances in technology have been driving the arms race; the reality is that technology has spent the last 20 years catching up to doctrine.

American leaders wanted choices. They wanted the capability to hit military targets and minimize collateral civilian fatalities as in traditional modern warfare. Technological advances made these ideas practicable. Now, however, the question really is whether technology and procedures for controlling technology are indeed taking us beyond these limited and practical choices and, instead of providing solutions, are becoming the larger part of the problem.

In the last few years, and in the years immediately ahead, seed money has been and will be spent for revolutionary weapons. There are the following: warheads with pinpoint accuracy, missiles that can arrive on target far faster than existing ones, techniques to blow up and blind satellites in the sky, breakthroughs in antisubmarine warfare and defense against ballistic missiles. None of these weapons systems are now operational and the key decisions whether to develop and deploy them will be made in the next few defense budgets. These new weapons go beyond the current mainstays of the American arsenal: the Minuteman land-based missiles, the B-52 bomber, the Poseidon missiles and the Trident submarines.

Morton H. Halperin, one of the pathbreakers in strategic nuclear thinking, established categories for judging whether these new weapons systems would be good or bad or merely wasteful.

The good are those that are relatively invulnerable to attack and not themselves accurate and powerful enough to attack the adversary's military targets first, such as submarine-launched missiles that are now operational. The fact of invulnerability means they can survive an attack and be used to retaliate. Their lack of accuracy and explosive power means they are not threatening to the adversary's retaliatory forces. Such weapons are thus considered to be good, or stabilizing.

The bad, on the other hand, include first-strike weapons that can be launched on target quickly, such as ballistic missiles with high accuracy and high power that are also vulnerable themselves to attack. They thus have to be used first to destroy the adversary's retaliatory capability or face the likelihood that they will be destroyed before they can be used. The bad, in the Halperin scheme, also includes defensive systems that threaten to blunt a retaliatory blow, and thus create incentives for the enemy to attack first.

The wasteful are those systems, such as the B-1 bomber, that contribute little to deterrence but are not threatening, either—and cost a lot.

The goal of the Halperin model is to achieve stability through mutual assured deterrence. This entails doing nothing that

would take away the enemy's capacity to retaliate successfully. As long as each side knows it can gain little or nothing from striking first and also knows it can respond with a devastating blow, there is mutual deterrence.

The alternate model for judging new technology and weapon systems is one subscribed to by most Reagan Administration officials and by outside experts like Mr. Wohlstetter. The Wohlstetter model places greater stress on the need for weapons whose use would be credible (those particularly effective against military as opposed to civilian targets) and save lives should deterrence fail (defensive systems).

By both the Halperin and Wohlstetter standards, a number of new weapons systems are good. These include the new operational Trident submarine, protection of satellite systems (under development), current devices to prevent accidental detonation and theft of warheads, and even existing air-launched cruise missiles that fly slowly to targets.

On another group of new weapons and technologies, the two schools do not see eye to eye completely, but both sometimes recognize the same good and bad elements. These are developing weapons often mentioned in the news, but not likely to revolutionize strategic thinking:

Midgetman, a small, mobile land-based missile. It is not intended to carry a large, first-strike warhead, and its mobility would make it likelier to survive. That is considered a plus by both schools. But both have doubts that any missile confined to military reservations, as these would be, could survive nuclear blasts. If the missiles were allowed off the reservations, protection against terrorists might be a problem.

Cruise missiles based at sea and on land. Slow-flying, like aircraft, they would not threaten in a first strike. Small and mobile, they could ride out an attack and retaliate. But arms-control advocates worry about being able to keep track of and count them.

Low yield, highly accurate warheads. To conservatives, the good news is that such weapons increase the ability to discriminate between military and civilian targets. To liberals that is also bad news, since presumably it would be more thinkable to use them.

Precision conventional weapons to substitute for nuclear weapons. The more accurate guidance becomes, the more long-range conventional weapons can be used in place of nuclear weapons against military targets. But how is the defender to know the contents of each incoming missile until after it explodes? To those who fear war-fighting capabilities, these weapons could provide an easy bridge from conventional to nuclear war.

The two contending schools reserve their most important and usually fiercest quarrels for weapons and technologies that fall into the following categories:

1. Decapitation capabilities and techniques.
2. War-fighting or counterforce capabilities.
3. Antisubmarine warfare.
4. Defense against ballistic missiles.

These are the weapons systems that, if deployed, will revolutionize thinking about whether nuclear wars can be won at an acceptable cost.

DECAPITATION

There are several elements to the idea of decapitation—blinding and destroying the leadership of the adversary in one rapid and coordinated stroke to blunt his response to an attack.

The first is to move missiles within range to strike the White House or the Kremlin and other command centers in a few minutes' time. With the deployment of Pershing 2 missiles to Europe, the United States can have that capability. As of now, the missiles would not reach Moscow, but all it takes is a little more fuel. The Russians have countered by moving their submarines closer to the Atlantic coast of the United States. It is possible for the two sides to agree on some kind of pullback. But as of now, Washington will not consider removing the Pershings and Moscow says it will not even talk about the subject until the missiles are gone.

Warning times could be further reduced by the development of what are called depressed trajectory weapons. Unlike present ballistic missiles, which go out and back into the atmosphere in an arc, these missiles could be propelled to target in virtually a straight line. Negotiations could be started to ban the testing of these weapons, but the Administration has been resistant for reasons that are not clear.

Headquarters become increasingly inviting targets as both the Soviet Union and the United States continue to improve command, control, communications and intelligence, or C^3I. This is a particularly complicated and expensive proposition. The Administration plans to spend about $20 billion to do this over the next five years, and this is probably too little to get the job done—if it can be done at all. The advantage is control—the lower likelihood of accidental launch, less need to delegate authority to launch, and greater ability to have escalatory choices. But is it feasible? The system is no stronger than its weakest link. Aboveground radar stations that receive messages from satellites about attacks are highly vulnerable. Many scientists also contend that the whole system could be put out of commission by a few well-placed nuclear airbursts that would set off an electromagnetic pulse that would destroy all electronic and communications networks.

A highly centralized system also presents an attractive target. Hit that and presumably the rest of the system—if it is not on automatic and uncontrolled pilot—could collapse and retaliation could be blunted.

It is not at all clear what the two countries can do to successfully counteract decapitation strategies.

But there are still opportunities to head off another fast-developing decapitation technology, the capability to destroy satellites. Without these eyes and ears, the victim's response to attack would be weak and uncoordinated. As of now, Moscow has a very modest and not very reliable capability to destroy low-flying American satellites and has proposed negotiations to ban all further development and testing. The United States has just begun to test an even better missile launched from an aircraft. Washington has been resisting talks on the ground that it must catch up first and because it argues that various forms of antisatellite weapons—such as electronic interference and lasers—cannot be adequately controlled and verified.

The most important Soviet and American satellites are far out into space, well beyond being destroyed by present weapons. But in a dozen years, military planners think they will be reachable. Very little work is being done in the Administration—or outside—on how to check this situation.

COUNTERFORCE WEAPONS

These are weapons that can hit military targets, such as missile silos and headquarters, swiftly and accurately, with little collateral damage. Thus the name counterforce rather than countercity.

The Halperin and Wohlstetter groups agree that a single worst thing either side can do is to build vulnerable first-strike weapons. Since such weapons could not survive an attack, their only purpose would be to destroy the other side's missiles first.

The two groups also agree that the large Soviet land-based missiles, of which there are hundreds, precisely fit this category. They both would like to see Moscow get rid of these weapons. But Soviet leaders have refused.

Conservative strategists argue that these big missiles have created an American "window of vulnerability." By this convoluted theory, Moscow could use a few hundred of these missiles, each with many warheads, to destroy almost all American land-based missiles, with the loss of a few million American civilians, rather than many tens of millions. This would leave Washington with submarine-launched missiles only accurate enough to hit Soviet cities and not military targets. Fearful of exchanging population blows, according to this theory, Washington would give in.

The theory is deeply flawed. For it to make any sense, Soviet leaders would have to have complete confidence in the following: that their attack would be perfect, despite the fact that such an attack could never be practiced; that American missiles would not be launched before being hit; that the President would regard upward of 20 million instant American fatalities as a "limited" attack, not calling for a response against Russian cities, and that the President would have to give Moscow what it wanted, even though he would still possess vast nuclear and convention military capacity.

Nonetheless, the worry was great enough so that both the Carter and Reagan Administrations tried to convince Moscow to reduce the number of these large missiles in the strategic arms talks. Moscow refused on the ground that these missiles were its only advantage over the United States, that in every other respect, Washington had the advantage.

The answer of the last two Administrations was to build the MX. The argument that prevailed was that the only way to induce the Soviet Union to cut the number of its heavy missiles was to pose a threat to those missiles. And if even that failed, at least the United States would have equality.

Consistent with their principles, it must be said, MX advocates tried to find basing schemes so that the new missile might not be vulnerable. This would reduce the specter of the MX as a first-strike weapon, since if it could survive it could be used in retaliation. But as is well known, none of the dozens of basing plans proved feasible. Nevertheless, the Reagan Administration has gone ahead with development of 100 MX missiles with 10 warheads each, to be deployed in existing vulnerable silos.

Liberal critics are up in arms. They say that the MX in theory would pose a greater threat to Soviet forces than the Soviet large missiles would to ours. This is because 70 percent of Soviet missile warheads are land-based and thus vulnerable, as opposed to about 20 percent for the United States. But the liberals also contradict themselves.

They cannot deny the window of vulnerability for the United States and insist it applies to the Soviet Union. If the Soviet threat to our land-based missiles is not credible, neither is ours to theirs. Either it means something or nothing to both.

A good deal of this debate hinges on a technical capability, namely the certainty of being able to destroy missiles in silos. As of now, leaders in Moscow and Washington apparently believe that the large Soviet missiles and the new MX missiles will have the necessary explosive power and accuracy to do the job. But the accuracies are inevitably called into question because neither side has ever test-fired missiles over the North Pole, the route they would have to travel in an actual attack. However well the winds and gravity over the pole are mapped, some doubts have to remain about predicted accuracies.

But within the next 10 years, as both countries test missile warheads with terminal guidance, these doubts will be removed. Whatever the error in missile flights, these can be corrected by radars and other devices built into the warheads. Neither Washington nor Moscow has made proposals on this matter.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

As the accuracy of missiles improves, mobile missiles and particulary submarines increasingly become the last line of defense or retaliation. If the submarines are put into jeopardy, this might cause one of the superpowers in a crisis to strike first or be left with no response at all.

For the rest of this decade, the United States expects to have high confidence in the survivability of its ballistic missile launching submarines. Soviet capabilities in this area are not considered prepossessing. But present American capabilities are extensive over much of the oceans.

Pentagon scientists anticipate that before the end of the century, submarine invulnerability could disappear. Both sides could put together a package of satellite-tracking, reconnaissance aircraft, underwater sound systems, and attack submarines that could put each other's ultimate retaliatory threat into question.

Both the Halperin and Wohlstetter groups should be interested in curbing this, but neither has done much work on the arms-control aspects. There is also a strong reluctance in the Pentagon to forgo foreseeable American technological advantages.

ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

The toughest battle over a new weapons system is yet to come, the one over an ABM system. In 1972, when Moscow and Washington signed the treaty severely limiting antiballistic missiles and associated radars, the hope was that both sides would also sharply limit their offensive capabilities. On the contrary, those capabilities have flowered, and the ABM debate is likely to resume some time this year when Mr. Reagan details his new plans.

Why should something that is defensive, designed to save lives or preserve retaliatory strength, stir the passions?

To liberal strategists, ABM's would totally undermine the logic of deterrence. Their theory and the predominant one so far in the nuclear age has been this: Without the protection of a defense system, offense makes no sense. The absence of defense to shoot down incoming missiles guarantees the victim a devastating retaliatory blow. But if a potential attacker could calculate that he could strike first, knock out most of the other side's weapons, and destroy the remaining ones with missile defenses as they approached, then the whole calculation of nuclear risks is transformed.

Many technicians as well as liberal critics remain convinced that no one has been able to design an ABM system that can work to near perfection. Anything short of perfection, where the system could be blinded by destroying vulnerable radars or satellites or overwhelmed by numbers of incoming warheads, would not be worth the perhaps hundreds of billions of dollars needed to build it. To them, ABM's would give the worst of all possibilities, namely, a system thought to be workable, so that risks based on that belief would be taken, but one that would not work in the end. It might engended the hubris to attack, only to result in the tragedy of horrors when it failed.

Conservatives such as Mr. Wohlstetter find this logic profoundly immoral and irrational. Few, including the special panels Mr. Reagan asked to study the matter, aver that an ABM system can be built before the end of the century that can be sufficiently effective against any large-scale Soviet attack. Most, like Mr. Wohlstetter, make the case on more limited grounds for the present.

Responding to his critics in the December 1983 issue of Commentary, he lists three "more likely circumstances" where nuclear weapons might be used and where ABM's would be imperative.

1. "How, for example, to avoid the general holocaust if a politically responsible Soviet authority, facing disaster in a conventional war, should use nuclear weapons in a confined way on the territory of an ally nominally protected by our nuclear guarantee." It seems a strange case. It is highly novel for anyone to suggest Moscow might be "facing disaster" in a conventional war, given its superiority on its borders. But if Soviet forces were to use tactical nuclear weapons against our NATO allies, for example, I presume the response would be to strike at Soviet forces in Europe with tactical nuclear weapons. That, to me, is believable. It would also put the burden of further escalation, especially escalation to each other's homelands, on Moscow's back.

2. "How to avoid the holocaust if nuclear weapons are seized and used against us by men without the authority to use them." This is the terrorist case, it appears. To guard against this, do we defend only Chicago or Washington or all of our cities with ABM's? Do we expect the terrorists to threaten with a missile or a nuclear bomb in a suitcase?

3. "If the authority over nuclear weapons should be acquired along with a small nuclear force by an unpredictable leader, like Qaddafi." Again, we face the dilemma of what to protect. And if we seek to protect all against someone like the Libyan leader, how would Soviet leaders react? Might they not feel the system could also be used against them, that they needed one, too? Could this not start a dangerous race to get to the "perfect" system first and strike before the other side caught up?

Mr. Reagan himself seemed mindful of the risk of a missile-defense race when he gave his so-called "Star Wars" speech of last March. In it, he unveiled his ideas about strategic defense, and spoke of cooperation with Moscow to avoid a destabilizing race. Fred C. Iklé, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, picked up on this theme in an interview. "Maybe we could have implicit or explicit coordination with the Soviets," he said. "If you think of this happening over 15 to 20 years, the competition is less tricky to manage. Otherwise, there would be risks."

Mr. Reagan's new military budget finesses the issue for the moment. He does not recommend early deployment of a missile defense system, but an extensive research and development program. The focus is on defending population, not missiles, but it does not now propose building a perfect or "leak-proof" system. But those who favor a big ABM system—with space-based lasers to hit Soviet missiles as they are rising, other weapons to attack them in space, and ground-based missiles—have a powerful following inside the Administration, and they say the fight is not over.

The kinds of technologies ordered in the new Reagan budget will almost certainly raise questions about compliance with the ABM treaty. And it is likely that the treaty will come under heavy fire within the Administration as its development program moves forward.

Three conclusions can be drawn from this discussion of new weapons and technology.

First, much of what is being done is good. New submarines, the Stealth bomber, hardened satellites, better protection against unauthorized use and accidents, and so on, are fundamentally stabilizing.

Second, a case can be made that the technologies on the horizon will so change strategic thinking as to make viable a pre-emptive attack in a crisis. That means there will be increasing advantages to striking first, if it is believed the other side is about to strike.

Third, there is time to deal with the new technologies. They will not be matured before the end of the 1990's, and in the case of ABM's, later than that. The most difficult and troublesome decisions will occur in the next few years.

HOW A NUCLEAR WAR COULD START

Some wars in history have been begun by fanatics and madmen, knowing they would perish in the end. But in most cases, wars have started by some kind of deliberate decision to protect or spread values and power and to survive, always to survive. The main contribution of the nuclear age to this calculus of war is to throw into sharp relief the question whether war and survival are compatible any longer.

A group at Harvard—Albert Carnesale, Paul Doty, Stanley Hoffmann, Samuel P. Huntington, Joseph S. Nye Jr. and Scott D. Sagan, all members of Harvard's nuclear study group—writes in "Living with Nuclear Weapons": "Ironically, the enormous horror of nuclear weapons' effects means that modern leaders have the equivalent of a crystal ball showing them the devastation at the end of a major war." Thus far, every time leaders have gazed into that crystal ball they have avoided war and have been extremely careful for the most part to avert even confrontation.

How, they ask, could this crystal ball be shattered? Their answer, and the judgment of most of the professionals who think about these things, is: many ways, none likely at all, but some less remote than others:

All-out surprise attack in peacetime. This is generally considered to be the most remote. The absence of crisis means there would be no special stakes to provoke leaders to take such awful risks. Surprise would be extremely hard to achieve, given the intelligence warning systems on both sides. By everyone's calculation, an all-out attack on military, industrial and civilian targets

would still leave the victim with about 2,000 warheads and bombs. These would be more than enough to hurl the attacking society back into the stone age. For such an attack to be at all feasible, there would have to be an enormous alteration of the current nuclear balance with one side gaining a clear advantage in deployed offensive and defensive technology. There is no reason to believe that will happen.

Accidental war. Contrary to much popular mythology, experts rate as a very low the possibility of war starting this way, and certainly far lower than 10 or 30 years ago. By all testimony, no man or boy computer genius can break into the strategic computer system. It does not operate through public telephone lines. Flocks of geese and a faulty computer chip have triggered alarms. But the rest of the system showed error right away, and no alerts were called. Most nuclear weapons in the field, such as short-range missiles, have permissive action links or PAL's, which prevent firing without proper codes. Not so long ago, very few weapons had PAL's. In submarines and in silos, it takes at least two people to turn the necessary keys—after receiving the codes. If terrorists were to steal nuclear weapons, they would find the warhead swaddled in an almost impenetrable membrane, which, if penetrated, would cause the warhead to lose its potential to explode. Terrorists, of course, could build weapons themselves or buy them from third powers. There are no guarantees against terrorism or accidents, but safety procedures are far better than before. In any event, and as horrible as any explosion would be, it is highly unlikely that the accidental detonation of one or several weapons or detonation by terrorists would set off a Soviet-American nuclear exchange.

Limited nuclear exchanges. These come in several varieties, with conservative strategists attaching low probability but high concern to them, and liberal strategists finding these scenarios Strangelovian and nonsensical. All agree that it would make no sense for either side to attack one or several cities or a few land-based missiles. There would be nothing to gain and a lot to lose.

But conservatives continue to put credence in a scenario whereby in a crisis, the Soviet Union launches attacks against American land-based missiles to denude the United States of forces capable of hitting Soviet missiles and thus to corner Washington into an impossible choice: Either attack Soviet population centers and bring retaliation against American cities, or do nothing. For all the reasons mentioned before—including the necessity that such an attack be virtually perfect in destroying all the land-based missiles and killing relatively few civilians and the virtual impossibility of making such a calculation in the absence of any opportunity to practice—this seems only marginally more plausible than the other limited-exchange scenarios. It is noteworthy that Reagan administration officials who were so instrumental in bringing this case to the center of the strategic debate over the last half-dozen years hardly talk about it anymore.

Nuclear proliferation, third-country exchanges and catalytic war. Proliferation is a problem that worries all strategic experts. They are not especially bothered by Britain, France and China having the capability, but newcomers are another matter. Right now, India has exploded a nuclear device; it is assumed Israel has a secret capability, and that South Africa is close. Many others have the necessary skills to build weapons, but no motivation. The most troublesome cases, where there are skills, high motivation and risk of usage, are Pakistan, Iraq, Argentina, Brazil and Libya.

Promethean power in the hands of nations always on the edge of or engaged in regional war, or in the hands of unstable regimes and fanatical leaders—this poses the greatest risk of nuclear weapons being exploded in anger. If the Libyan strongman Muammar el-Qaddafi were to buy bombs and drop them on the United States, no easy matter, this would be highly unlikely to set off a Soviet-American war. But if Israel at some point in the future were to be on the verge of a serious defeat at the hands of its Arab neighbors and fired off some nuclear weapons as a warning, that could set other events into motion—Soviet response, American counter-threats and so on.

Conventional war escalating to nuclear war. This is the case that worries the experts most for this decade, and they do not regard it as being as remote as the other possibilities. Soviet and American leaders know this, too. They have gone far to stay out of harm's way. Washington doles out military aid to the Afghan rebels; it is all right to help them to sting the Russians, but too dangerous to challenge them outright. Moscow, so far as Washington knows, has told Syria not to expect Russian help if it shoots down more American aircraft. Soviet officials also do somersaults to avoid classifying Nicaragua as a "Socialist state" for fear of committing prestige.

But if this wariness were to break down and Soviet and American conventional forces were to start firing at each other and one side began to lose, the risks of escalation would be enormous. If any Soviet leader contemplated using superior Soviet conventional power to overrun Western Europe, those risks—however small—would probably be enough to dissuade him. Once these two mighty armies embraces to kill, the systems would take over. Forces would be put on alert. Small moves would trigger bigger precautionary responses. The benefits of a pre-emptive strike, out of desperation, could appear to be the least unattractive alternative.

"That is why," explained Mr. Iklé of the Pentagon, "President Reagan is moving to build up American conventional strength and is trying to move away from the idea of a short conventional war." Conventional military power that can be sustained raises the nuclear threshold. Defense experts have agreed on this all along. But increasing conventional manpower, mobility and stocks is far more expensive than developing and maintaining nuclear forces. Seventy-seven percent of the Pentagon budget is for conventional forces and 23 percent for strategic. The proposed military budget for fiscal 1985 is already $305 billion. Our allies are simply not going to spend more on their conventional forces, for all their bleating about the dangers of nuclear war. Absent that, as Mr. Iklé pointed out, "We cannot say that there are no circumstances in which nuclear weapons wouldn't be used; we need the risk for deterrence." That is the tradeoff every American Administration has made thus far. None of the likely Democratic Presidential candidates would do this differently.

CONCLUSION

"My dream is to see the day when nuclear weapons will be banished from the face of the earth," Mr. Reagan stated in his speech on East-West relations. Such pronouncements from the White House and the Kremlin have become ritualistic, but they are not realistic, and for political leaders in democracies to say so out loud would be political suicide, so illusions are reinforced and facts are ignored.

Take, for example, Mr. Reagan's own proposal for deep cuts in strategic arms. That means reducing each side's arsenal of about 7,500 long-range ballistic missile warheads to 5,000 by 1990 at the earliest. It does nothing about bombs or cruise missile warheads, which on the American side at least will increase substantially in the coming years. As for the Russians, they are even more shameless in proclaiming the need for general and complete disarmament, but have proved far less willing than all recent American Administrations to reduce nuclear military might.

It is a political law of nature not to take big steps and make big compromises in the absence of trust. It is equally difficult to agree on something large and dramatic when the subject is as complicated as this one.

Beyond that, the best kept dirty little secret of most strategic experts is that they don't want sharp cuts in nuclear arsenals. What is more, their judgment seems sound. In the absence of many complex agreements on exactly what is to be reduced and banned, reductions in and of themselves could make the situation more dangerous.

Again, take Mr. Reagan's initial proposal. That called for a one-third cut in missile warheads from 7,500 to 5,000 and a one-half cut in missiles from 1,700 to 850, no more than half of which could be land-based missiles. The effect of the proposal was to increase the ratio of warheads to potential targets or missiles from three-to-one to six-to-one. In terms of war fighting, this would have made it easier for planners to argue that a successful first strike might be possible. Or, as the national security expert Paul C. Warnke was fond of saying, "If the Russians had accepted Mr. Reagan's proposal, he would have been forced to reject it himself." As it was, Mr. Reagan substantially altered his proposal himself, for this and other reasons.

"A lot of strategic weapons are not necessarily bad and fewer are not necessarily good," remarked Representative Les Aspin, a Wisconsin Democrat who is a strong proponent of arms control. "It depends on what remains and what is eliminated."

Nuclear weapons will not go away for decades to come, if then. That is the reality. The probabilities are that they will not be fired off by accident or in anger for some years to come, at least. Leaders can still clearly see nothing but mutual doom in that crystal ball.

But the possibilities of nuclear war in this century are there and growing.

In nuclear doctrine, it is necessary to have choices between massive retaliation and surrender. But it is risky to assume, as current doctrine would have it, that once a war begins it can be controlled. And it is downright dangerous to believe there can be meaningful winners and losers, as some strategists in this Administration believe. These most recent trends in strategic thinking are highly questionable.

But what has to be understood now is that the future could be different, that the nuclear peace of the last 40 years could be transformed into a nuclear nightmare. What is in the offing is not simply another weapons system or two, not just another phase of the old arms race, but a package of technological breakthroughs that could rev-

olutionize strategic capabilities and thinking.

To be sure, there is time before all of these technologies mature into reliable weapons systems. But not much time.

Meanwhile, arms-control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union are getting nowhere. The two sides have not even been negotiating with each other for months. And when those negotiations resume this year or next, it must be remembered that they deal only with reducing and limiting numbers of nuclear weapons, not with the broader technological problems described here.

Most lamentable, there seems to be a habit of mind developing among Soviet and American officials that the problems cannot be solved, that technology cannot be checked, a kind of combination of resignation and complacency. They have gotten used to both the competition and the nuclear peace. Mankind may not survive on that alone.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL CONTINUES ITS HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the name Amnesty International has become synonymous with a compassionate concern for human rights. This humanitarian organization has worked diligently to end persecution, false imprisonment, torture, and murder throughout the world. By investigating and publicizing incidents of human rights violations, they are able to bring international pressure to bear on those responsible. Often this is enough to secure the release of the victim—sometimes it is enough to save a life or even hundreds of lives.

This month, Amnesty International released a major new report on the worldwide use of torture. What was their conclusion? How much torture is conducted in the world today? They found torture is systematically used as an instrument of state policy in as many as one-quarter of the nations of the globe. Beatings, electric shocks, and other practices too gruesome to mention are regularly employed to extract information and confessions from countless innocent people. The civilized person recoils in horror from the brutalities recounted in this slim volume.

The release of this report marks the beginning of a long-term campaign by the worldwide human rights movement to expose and end the use of torture. It also represents another in a long list of courageous and effective strategies employed by Amnesty International to save lives. Through techniques such as the urgent action network, which quickly relays information on the status of mistreated prisoners so that the international community can urge his or her release, Amnesty International has saved countless lives and fostered a sense of cooperation and urgency in defense of human rights throughout the globe.

Mr. President, I am sure that all of my colleagues agree with me that the efforts of Amnesty International are vital and commendable. The atmosphere of heightened awareness and sense of community that extends from their work is essential to the effective defense of human rights. The value of exposure and consequent international pressure is constantly reaffirmed as victim after victim is released due to the work of Amnesty International.

The United States has a clear obligation to contribute to this atmosphere of awareness and cooperation. Our country was founded on the principle of human rights. Our effectiveness as a defender of these rights depends on our unambiguous reassertion of this principle at every opportunity.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I despair at our reluctance to ratify the Genocide Convention. This treaty, which has been pending in the Senate for more than 30 years supported by President after President and declares the serious mental or physical harm of a racial, ethnic, or religious group to be an international crime, has remained unsigned by the United States since its inception after World War II. Without America's imprimatur on this basic humanitarian document, we leave ourselves exposed to charges of hypocrisy and insincerity in our calls for a respect for human rights.

Amnesty International has demonstrated the power of exposure and international pressure in securing the release of victims of brutality and torture. Our contribution to that pressure is vital, and each day that the Genocide Convention remains unsigned diminishes the strength of our contribution. I urge my colleagues to take action on the Genocide Convention soon; lives depend on it.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 1 hour with statements therein limited to 10 minutes each.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MELCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. KASSEBAUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALUTE TO THE JAPAN-AMERICAN STUDENT CONFERENCE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Madam President, this summer marks the 50th anniversary of an exceptional cross-cultural program, the Japan-American Student Conference. Each summer 90 students from Japan and the United States engage in a stimulating exchange of ideas. They all receive an intensive introduction to the values and behaviors of another culture. Over the past five decades, the Conference has proven to be an extraordinary program for cultural understanding, and today I salute the founders, participants, and sponsors who have insured both the survival and excellence of this program.

Many features distinguish the Conference from the exchange programs which have proliferated in recent years, but two attributes in particular merit special attention. The first unique quality has to do with the origin and operation of the program.

The Conference was conceived and completely planned by a group of Japanese students, and the founders were a group who formed themselves in 1934 to reverse the deteriorating conditions in relations between the United States and Japan.

Impatient with the frugal efforts of the two Governments, they assumed the role of responsible peacemakers. An initial mission of four student emissaries visited American college campuses in early 1934, and the program mushroomed to an American delegation of nearly 100 who participated in the first Conference held in Japan that summer.

Although fiscal realities have compelled students to relinquish the program operations to former participants, the students still completely plan and stage the actual Conference. Such resourcefulness and independent initiatives are not only gratifying, they are an important reminder that our young people can indeed identify a problem and tackle it with an energy and freshness too often lacking in those with more experience.

Yet another notable feature of the program is its content. Unlike most exchange programs which emphasize lessons in cultural understanding and language fluency, the Conference goes further by engaging the participants in intense discussions of the critical, often controversial, issues of the day. The students do acquire an overview of the other culture, but of greater importance, they must confront what may be significantly different viewpoints and thinking processes. While such an encounter may be more stressful than the usual tour of the Jefferson Memorial or the Imperial Palace, the clash of ideas can lead to a level of understanding that is essential for international cooperation. The Conference builds leaders for tomorrow, and from this particular experience, these leaders gain a knowledge and skill in intercultural communication which

will eventually prove beneficial to the people of both nations.

We read and hear often of the "big" projects in cultural understanding which absorb large sums of money, attract much publicity, but often produce little that is of substantial benefit. It is often the quiet, unassuming programs such as the Japan-American Student Conference which effect the significant advances for human relations.

I call upon my colleagues in the Senate to join me in commending the Japan-American Student Conference and those who are responsible for its continuance and to join them in devoting greater effort toward promoting international tolerance and understanding.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant, to 22 U.S.C. 276, as amended, appoints the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) as a member of the Senate delegation to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, April 2 to 8, 1984.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KASTEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EVERYDAY HARASSMENT OF SOVIET JEWS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of a complaint filed with the Soviet Procurator last year in Gorky. It was lodged by Mrs. R. L. Mintz, whose nephew, Leonid Volvovsky, is active in Jewish affairs in Gorky.

Looking for "evidence" that could be used to charge Mr. Volvovsky with activities against the Soviet state, the KGB searched his aunt's apartment on the same day they also ransacked his. Mrs. Mintz is old and infirm, and could not rest or take the medicine she requires while the KGB officers rummaged at length through her personal possessions. In the end they took a sackful of books, pictures, and papers having nothing at all to do with either her nephew or the security of the Soviet state.

There was no point to the treatment Mrs. Mintz received. Indeed, a consistent and horrifying feature of Soviet policy in this area is its inherent pointlessness. Mrs. Mintz' story shows brutality to be a casual, common, everyday routine in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mrs. Mintz' official complaint be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 4, 1983.

Procurator, R.S.F.S.R. Director of Public Prosecutions (for investigation and inquiry of the organs of the Ministry of the Interior).

Copy: Procurator for Investigations in the Gorky Region.

From: Mintz, R.L., Gorky Automobilnaya Street, Dom 20, Flat 102.

Complaint concerning the illegal actions of Senior Investigator of the Regional Procuracy of Gorky, V. Turin, and his accompanying assistants.

2nd June 1983. Physically straining, I did my exercises, got washed, put drops in my eyes, and went to take my sandals in for repair. They said I should come for them by one o'clock in the afternoon. Then I bought some sour cream, and put the bag with it on the table. There was a knock at the door. With the chain on, I asked: "Who is it?" He shoved forward a document: Senior Investigator Turin. "You must be mistaken," I said. "No," he answered. I opened the door, and six men burst in. I explained that I was not feeling well: for several days I had had high blood-pressure. Whatever they were looking for, we did not have and could not have had. Please go ahead, have a look, I said, but because I had not eaten breakfast and was so tired, I could not follow which books and whatever else they were confiscating. I was alone, my head was spinning, there was an unbearable pain in the back of my head. On that day, even before the search, I had scarcely been able to telephone the Polyclinic to ask for an appointment with a doctor. They told me that there were no vacancies left, neither with the physiotherapist nor with the therapist—they said that they had too few doctors!

So the search started. Wherever they found books—in the writing-desk, in the bookcase, where the folders were—they rummaged through them all. Private papers, which were in order in folders, and could not have had any bearing on whatever they were looking for—they examined. Then Turin's assistants began ransacking the bathroom, where there was nothing except household items—these they threw everywhere. Then, without me, they examined what was in a suitcase in the hall. I still haven't checked to see if everything is still in order in the case, because my head up till now has been painful, and my general state is terrible. On the evening of the 2nd of June I learned that, simultaneously with our search, there was one at Lenya's wife's flat (the Volvovsky's). They took all the literature: journals, books, etc.—in which there was nothing and could not have been anything such as investigator Vorob'ev assumed, namely, items and documents containing fabrications discrediting the Soviet state and social system. Everything they took from us, and from the flat of Lenya's wife, was simply: interesting books, journals, personal papers. They amassed from us almost a full sack, and I thought: "Is it really possible that encyclopedias (4 volumes), the Talmud, papers, rolls of film and pictures, colorful pictures with panoramic views, none connected in any way with the Soviet Union, can in some barbaric manner or another relate to valuable cultural items?"

During the search I needed to take heart medicine and to lie down on the couch, on which the witnesses, who were reading "Israel Today," were sitting. They took this journal. Of course this journal is interesting to read, as we read translations from English, French, Spanish and so forth; but there was nothing anti-Soviet in it. The journal portrays life in Israel. Not knowing how to express this, I just longed that they would leave and give me a chance to lie down quietly.

When they gave me a copy of the inventory of what they had taken, I did not sign it, because it was impossible to make out what was written on the copy. I gave it to one of them, another helper of Turin, and asked him to read even a single line—the response was silence. Then they wrote another one, but I was already on the couch, had closed my eyelids, and was not in a state for anything, especially reading; I only wondered why there was so much in the sack. Without a doubt, they must have taken literary works, not only Lenya's books, but also mine and my sister's. It was completely immaterial in what language they were written, not even important if there was a single line in them against the Soviet Union. Why had they taken them?

In such a rude manner they had checked all the bags, photos, and even savings-books. They had shoved their filthy dirty hands into a box of Matzos—after all, it's only food! They even opened and checked a small gold watch in its little box, which my relatives had given me as a present on my 50th birthday. And now I am 74, and my head aches terribly, even when I write these few lines. They did everything they wanted, paying no attention to me. How it was that I didn't have a hemorrhage I myself am amazed! I said to them: "I feel so bad, if you want you can hit me on the head and carry everything away, because there are no witnesses—you yourselves are the masters here."

I'm sad for the books, which you can't buy anywhere, but the main thing is that I am certain that because there was nothing here, and could not be anything here which they would have liked to find, this fact probably saved my life. I have not written everything about this search. If I were to describe it in detail, you would receive an interesting booklet on how not to carry out a search.

An outrageous injustice! They promised to return things after checking. What could they possibly return?—when they so carelessly threw things from the table into the sack, like potatoes or forks with cabbage on them.

How offensive it all is! Perhaps this is what they aimed at—they achieved their goal. Up till now the insult has not passed. Everything aches, and I can't comprehend that all this is possible. For what purpose such injustice?

They went sometime after one o'clock. I had strength to get up from the couch and to go for the sandals. The master had already locked up his kiosk and left, but at my shout he returned, opened up the kiosk, and gave me the sandals. Thanks be to him. At 3 o'clock I came home, hungry and worn out, and at last could lie down.

On the next day, 3rd June 1983, I went away to a cousin's, where they looked after

me the whole day. I was so unwell, they tried to persuade me to have an ambulance called, although I begged them not to. Having swallowed all types of tablets, I had an attack of high blood pressure. 4th June they called a doctor; then I asked them to change the call, as a doctor would only come at the end of the day, and I could not wait so long, not knowing whether I should take any more tablets. At 12 o'clock I had a pressure of 130/60—this is very low. If I had taken more tablets, I could have died. I stopped taking medicine and am now at 150/75. But I'm frightened of ambulances, of injections, since the death of Geogri Lykich, who received an injection given in an ambulance which lowered his pressure to 50, and they could no longer save him.

But why did I write all of this when I was going out of my mind and trying to forget? How many more details I could tell: the contented smirking face of Turin (although he had nothing to be happy about), the gloomy silent faces of the witnesses, the curious faces of the assistants from amongst whom only one of them, Denisov, gave his surname before leaving. The rest were incognito. What were they afraid of?

Therefore I request you to instruct investigator Turin and his assistants to return everything that they took from us.

R. L. MINTZ.

MERIDIAN HOUSE

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, a recent story in the Washington Times indicates how the private sector and government institutions can work together to strengthen our relations with the peoples of other countries. Meridian House in Washington, D.C., extends a bond of friendship to diplomatic and other families arriving here in the Nation's Capital. It promotes better international relations and better human relations. Former Ambassador John Jova and his wife Pamila are always on the job for America in guiding the splendid work of Meridian House. I commend the news article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Washington Times, Mar. 14, 1984]

MERIDIAN HOUSE SPREADS ITS WELCOME MAT

(By Richard Levine)

If a diplomat needs a baby sitter, a call to Meridian House International takes care of the problem.

That may not seem globally important, but diplomats need a night out as the rest of us do, an who knows what such relaxation will do for the comity of nations.

That's one of the things that Meridian House International (MHI), a non-profit corporation, does with its $7.1 million annual budget.

It also puts on art shows, concerts, seminars and other cultural and educational events.

MHI oversees a national network of volunteer hosts for official foreign visitors to the United States in such diverse places as New York, Los Angeles, Chapel Hill, N.C. and Ephrata, Wash.—over 80 communities in all.

"We are a gateway to America," says John Jova, MHI's head.

Whatever else Washington is, it is also a city of diplomats—a changing population of 2,762 have that status; 1,000 new diplomats arrived last year alone. Working closely with the Office of Protocol, MHI sends out volunteer emissaries to greet each new diplomatic family.

"We are, sort of, a welcome wagon," says Maria Chanin Tobar, who runs THIS—The Hospitality and Information Service—one of the five main arms of the MHI mission.

This, having its own protocol, sends out its own volunteer president, Polly LeFaivre, to visit the ambassadors' wives.

One particular visit was recalled by Ms. Chanin Tobar:

"She was from the Middle East, and she was very young. She was in this gorgeous house, and she had these candelabras and wonderful antiques and rugs; the house was just amazing—it was absolutely gorgeous.

"There was this huge silver dish with a cover on top, which they thought could have been for a pheasant or something. It was time to pour the coffee. There came a maid, very dressed—perfectly.

"She lifted the cover on the tray. Underneath, there were Twinkies all cut up, and very nicely placed on cupcakes liners.

"It was so sweet, because here was this nice young wife who wanted to be so American, but sort of do it in the manner to which she was accustomed."

Mr. Jova, often referred to as the nation's "cultural ambassador," is a man who looks and acts ambassadorial, and, in fact, for many years was an ambassador for the United States.

MHI's president is an American, born of Spanish-Cuban parents, who might have been an engineer like his father if he could have mastered math and physics. Instead he was influenced by a grandfather ("a distinguished international type") who was a diplomat, and multilingual.

He studies Romance languages and literature and political science, and when he was graduated from Dartmouth College in the height of the Depression he went to work for United Fruit Company, harvesting bananas in Guatemala.

Even now, he looks back on the presence of United Fruit in Latin America as beneficial.

"It was a constructive influence, no question but that it was. It brought technological know-how, such as accounting, to relatively small farms, and this was the beginnings of industrial development. The pay was 10 cents an hour, but even that was better than others were getting. United Fruit gave employment and trained people." That experience, which he calls a kind of Peace Corps because of the work with both the government and native people, was extremely educational and a stepping stone for what became a career for him in the foreign service.

He served in Basra, Iraq—near where fighting is now going on—Morocco, Portugal and in Washington, and then was, in succession, ambassador to Honduras, Chile and Mexico, under appointments from Presidents Johnson, Nixon and Ford.

On the walls of his spacious office are the laurels that Mr. Jova has collected, including the Grand Cross of the Order of Isabel la Catolica, the highest decoration given to foreigners by the government of Spain; and the State Department's Wilbur J. Carr award for "more than a quarter of a century of unusual dedication and distinction."

There are others, including more personal tributes to his service—gifts and letters from people in many of the countries in which he served.

And there is a wonderful, larger-than-life bronze bust, the gift of a Mexican sculptor, Gabriel Ponzanelli:

"He did it for me. He said he was going to do this, and I thought that's one of those nice things you hear people say. But what was my surprise, just a year and a half ago—I left Mexico almost seven years ago—suddenly, the Mexican embassy called up and said they've got this big, bronze bust . . .

"You know gratitude and friendship are short-lived in this world and when you have somebody remember you years after you've left, it is something that is very gratifying—and that is one of the rewards of my career."

Mr. Jova thinks that Meridian House itself, located on Crescent Place off 16th Street NW, is a wonderful meeting place for diplomats. It is an architectural jewel, an 18th-century French townhouse, 3½ stories high, and rich in such decorative touches as finely crafted brass doorknobs and window openers, small, original paintings over each door and linden trees imported from France on the large rear terrace.

The house, which is on the National Register of Historic Places, was built in the 1920s by Irwin Laughlin, an American diplomat who once was ambassador.

"You get a spiritual delight just being in it, I find," says Mr. Jova. "The design of this house and the spaces are a philosophic approach to life. It is a wonderful doorway to the United States."

NCIV (National Council for International Visitors), another of the five MHI branches, is headed by Dr. Alan M. Warne, and its scope is truly incredible. Because of the nature of the system, it is impossible to count the foreign visitors served in some way by the NCIV network, but Dr. Warne's rough estimate is a half million a year. It serves foreign visitors identified by the United States government as important leaders or persons who will be leaders in their countries in the fields of government, journalism, business and industry.

According to Dr. Warne, there first arose a widespread interest in people-to-people exchange programs following World War II. In 1961, NCIV was created to give form and coordination to the disparate volunteer groups that had formed in local communities so that visitors could move from place to place with ease and efficiency.

NCIV also provides guidance and training to local volunteers, but it leaves the actual trips and tours to each locality.

Dr. Warne says the trips are government-sponsored but free of government influence, and sees this design as its strength.

Visitors might have some negative experiences, but, collectively, the experiences are positive, he says. And, although the program is not solely for America's friends, Dr. Warne says, "We never met a communist who was a better communist for having been here."

"The trips are one step removed from the government," he says, "And are that much more healthy. The control mechanism [for what visitors see and hear] is in hands of local volunteers who have been doing this for many years. I am not telling them how to program their visits."

He says the nation should be proud that the United States government has enough faith in itself and in its systems to "turn people loose—foreign visitors—with our private citizens. Private citizens are able to tell

foreign private citizens what they like and what they don't like about this country.

"It's the truest form of diplomacy. We get persons together without a hidden agenda. They can see who we are as a people as opposed to what our foreign policy is. From a management point of view, I suppose it could be done more effectively, but it works well because it is unstructured and uncontrolled.

"People worry too much about fine tuning. But the cumulative effect is of trust building, and this is the most important thing. Visitors do leave the United States with an honest impression."

He estimates that 750,000 volunteers are involved in international exchange programs, a well-balanced cross section of people from all occupation groups and political persuasions, but who tend to be better educated, more affluent and well-traveled than the average American.

According to the State Department 44 current foreign chiefs of state or heads of government came to the United States through this program since 1960. "That is why we must be as nice as possible to them and try to understand their points of view," said Mr. Jova.

In addition, there were 3,215 other participants holding prestigious positions in all fields in their countries, including 499 in cabinet level positions in government.

It is easy to see that the influence of MHI is broad, from leaders to potential leaders, adults to children.

"If you confine yourself to just receiving the upper crust, people who are already interested in foreign affairs, that's very important, but you are not going to reach the future unless you reach children and youth," says Mr. Jova. "The main thing at Meridian House is the unusual circumstance where we combine in one institution so many facets of international life, helping foreign visitors, orientations, hospitality, children's programs; bringing international affairs to children and to the intellectual life and cultural life of the city."

He recalls, a few years ago, after a lecture by Beryl W. Sprinkel, under secretary for monetary affairs in the Treasury department, a diplomat coming to him and saying, "I had no idea how grave was the debt problem until I heard Dr. Sprinkel speak at Meridian House. For the first time I realized that the debt problem facing my country and Latin America and the world was one of the big problems of the world."

So, the work goes on at all levels. All last month, while an exhibit of original drawings of the famous Babar children books were on display, MHI held periodic readings for Washington schoolchildren, with such stellar interpreters of elephant antics as Mrs. George Bush, Mrs. Caspar Weinberger, Joe Washington of the Redskins, Mrs. Marion Barry and Mrs. Walter Washington.

MHI receives $7.1 million from the federal government each year—$3.1 million for actual programs it runs for visitors and $4 million which passes through as per diem expense money for the visitors, according to Patricia Johnson, vice president for development. In addition it raises $700,000 a year from contributors, a long list of corporate and individual supporters, including Coca Cola, IBM, Dr. and Mrs. Armand Hammer, and Mrs. Hubert Chanler, the daughter of the original owners of Meridian House when it was a residence.

Since 1968, the principal fund-raising event has been an annual ball preceded by dinners at several embassies. This year, the charge will be $200 a person. More than 450 persons usually attend; last year they included United States officials, members of Congress and the ambassadors of 21 nations.

"This is an extension of 30-odd years in the foreign service," says Mr. Jova.

"Who knows? What I am doing now may be more important and more meaningful than when I was an ambassador abroad."

Meridian House International, with 106 staff members, is actually an institution of five separate but related programs:

THIS (The Hospitality and Information Service)—with two paid staff workers and more than 300 volunteers, THIS helps diplomats adjust to Washington. It finds the baby sitters, veterinarians, ballet lessons, gourmet grocers. Recently it helped a Scandinavian woman rent a mobile home for a cross-country trip.

IVIS (International Visitors Information Service) assists in international tourists and official visitors at centers at the two airports and in the city and provides language intercepting and hospitality services for a number of visitor exchange programs.

WIC (Washington International Center) is contracted by the Agency for International Development to provide orientation programs for AID-sponsored foreign students in this country. There were 3,345 of them last year.

VPS (Visitor Program Service) is under contract to develop tours throughout the United States for foreign visitors sponsored by the United States Information Agency—1,454 of them last year.

NCIV (National Council for International Visitors) is a coordinating unit between 42 national agencies that send international visitors to communities throughout the nation and 92 community-based groups that act as hosts to these visitors.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is concluded.

URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984, PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume the consideration of the pending business, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 492) making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, for the Department of Agriculture.

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am going to propound a unanimous-consent request that I have cleared on both sides of the aisle. What it proposes to do is have a committee amendment to House Joint Resolution 492 be considered as agreed to provided no points of order are waived thereon and that the measure as amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The point is simply that, rather than having to go the second round, if that is objected to, of amendment by amendment, this gives flexibility to those who have other amendments besides the committee amendments. It waives no rights. People have the same opportunity to offer amendments as they would in the second option. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

I urge that that the unanimous-consent request be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have an opening statement to make, but let me indicate first that there are a number of amendments that I understand are desired on the part of Members, at least to be offered for consideration. I urge those Members who have amendments to come to the floor and give us an opportunity to take them up.

I am aware that on the Nicaragua and the El Salvador amendments, it is the desire of a number of Members that they not be taken up today, perhaps not even tomorrow. It is hoped that they can be disposed of on Wednesday. In the meantime, I would like to consider a number of other amendments that are floating, as we call it, around, or at least have an opportunity to consider them.

Mr. President, we have before us today, House Joint Resolution 492, a measure generally referred to as the Public Law 480 urgent supplemental. A cursory glance at this joint resolution, however, reveals that this measure contains a number of extraneous items and provisions, wholly unrelated to food assistance to Africa. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I believe I owe my colleagues an explanation regarding the extraordinary metamorphosis of this simple urgent supplemental.

About a month ago, the administration transmitted two urgent supplemental budget requests: $200 million for energy assistance to low-income households hard hit by the severe winter, and $90 million for emergency food relief for African nations devastated by a drought.

The House of Representatives originated and passed two urgent supplemental joint resolutions for these items on March 6. In recognition of the critical need for quick action on these measures, I, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. STENNIS, sought to have both placed immediately on the Senate Calendar, rather than referred to committee. Our request to expedite consideration of these measures was objected to, and as a consequence they were referred to the committee on March 7.

Mr. President, on March 8 the committee met to report both House Joint Resolution 492 and House Joint Reso-

lution 493. At that time we were confronted with highly controversial supplemental requests for additional military assistance to El Salvador and further support of rebels opposed to the Government of Nicaragua. The committee subsequently reported the low-income energy assistance resolution without amendment, reserving the African drought relief as a possible vehicle for these nongermane riders.

Mr. President, I would like to make clear that it was my profound desire to avoid any amendments on these measures, and to pass both of them expeditiously. It is still very cold in a number of states, and many of these states are completely out of funds to help low-income households pay their utility bills. The tragedy of widespread hunger and starvation in African nations plagued by drought, aggravated in many instances by war or civil strife is almost too enormous and horrible to contemplate. But these desperate needs continue unaddressed, unmet, while we debate out procedural and political options.

We finally passed the low-income energy assistance supplemental 2 weeks ago, but because it appeared that the African drought relief supplemental would be delayed by the Central American amendments, we added some food aid money to the first vehicle. Again, I know of no opposition to funds combined in that measure, but althought there is now a conference agreement, the House has not yet agreed to that conference report.

That conference agreement provides $90,000,000 for African food relief, but the balance of that urgent need is funded in the pending measure.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that we could and should have passed both urgent supplementals weeks ago. Unfortunately, we failed to do so. But that is water under the bridge. What we must do now is to redouble our efforts to move this legislation forward, and do so expeditiously.

While I realize that it is perhaps too late to hope that we could remove all our amendments from the pending measure, I urge my colleagues to refrain from adding further complications and obstacles to the rapid consideration of this joint resolution.

Again, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), our ranking member of the committee, as well as colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have cooperated in an extraordinary fashion to try to move these two supplementals in spite of the political problems that we face and the strong passions and feelings that are present on both sides of each of these issues.

I am very hopeful that this will not become a Christmas tree with all the ornaments which people create to add as amendments because that will delay the whole process.

The House of Representatives has already reintroduced both of the original supplementals and referred them to committee, which could give us a sign that if we get into a typical Senate procedure of adding many amendments, I would have great doubt whether the House would be willing to go to conference on such a bill. Instead, they would probably send us one of the clean versions to reconsider. So really the ball is in our court at this point. I do not think anyone can avoid the responsibility that we have on the Senate side to act expeditiously on this African food aid even though we took $90 million for Public Law 480 in the conference only last week and $90 million for the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide a total of $180 million for the most immediate urgent problems. But we still have a balance of $60 million in food aid in this joint resolution for Africa. This is also urgently needed, and I hope we can act quickly on this measure.

With that, I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the pending measure, House Joint Resolution 492, making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1984, was reported by the Committee on Appropriations on March 14, the same day we had this proposed legislation before us for consideration and markup. As passed by the other body on March 6, House Joint Resolution 492 only provided Public Law 480 funds in the amount of $150 million to provide emergency food assistance to certain African countries due to drought conditions. Our committee adopted and now recommends several amendments. The chairman has already explained these matters and I subscribe to what he has said about them.

I want to especially commend and thank our chairman, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, for the way he handled these difficult matters. The committee met for a full morning session marking up this bill and debating these amendments, particularly those parts of the recommendations dealing with Central America. These are difficult but highly important matters and we had some close votes. But the expeditious processing of this bill by our committee is principally due to the considerable talents of our fine and able chairman. It is a pleasure for me to be associated and to work with him on these appropriation matters, as well as others.

The report accompanying the bill more fully explains the recommended amendments so I will not undertake to explain the recommendations in any detail but will only summarize these recommendations. First, at the time of the committee meeting, the committee concurred in the House provision of $150 million in supplemental funds to provide urgently needed food assistance to several countries in Africa, and also agreed to the House language that up to $90 million shall be available from the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory for sale on a competitive basis or barter to the African countries which require assistance or to any country planning to assist those countries.

The committee's agreeing to the House action occurred before our floor consideration of the other urgent bill which included a floor amendment providing $80 million for food assistance. Late last week, House and Senate conferees agreed to provide $90 million in Public Law 480 assistance and $90 million in Commodity Credit Corporation sales in that other bill. That action, of course, will now require an adjustment in this amount of $150 million as contained in this bill.

In addition, the committee-recommended amendments provide supplemental funding and provisions as follows:

An amount of $545.5 million to fund the child nutrition programs for the remainder of fiscal year 1984, the same amount as requested by the President; $300 million in supplemental funding for the feeding program for women, infants, and children, the WIC program. This amount is more than requested by the President but provides full year funding in fiscal year 1984 of the caseload that was reached at the end of fiscal year 1983; the amount of $92.7 million for military assistance for El Salvador is recommended as requested by the President on an emergency basis; $21 million is provided for the Central Intelligence Agency for operations in Central America, again as requested by the President on an emergency basis.

Several general provisions are recommended including, first, a provision dealing with the termination of military assistance to Panama if the Armed Forces of Panama should disrupt or cancel the May 6 election; second, a provision correcting the law dealing with magistrate pay levels; third, a prohibition on the use of appropriations to the Department of Defense for operations and maintenance for construction modifications; or improvement of military facilities, other than temporary facilities, in the nation of Honduras unless specifically authorized and funded by the Congress; and fourth, a provision disapproving a proposed deferral of $14 million appropriated in the fiscal year 1984 Interior Appropriation Act to initiate construction on the Cumberland Gap Tunnel.

Mr. President, let me say further that the bill in its present form represents a great deal of work above and beyond the call of duty by the chair-

man of the committee and his valued staff members.

Also, we have legislated here in the dark in this respect, and I mention it just for the continuity of my position. I am not the only one. We do not have a recommendation on some of the matters contained in these amendments that are considered major from the regular committee that ordinarily has jurisdiction. For example, the Foreign Relations Committee as I understand had before it an authorization bill proposing the aid for the Central American countries. We have been without their counsel, advice, and work, and that of their valued staff.

I deplore the trend in the Senate where we have continued to go further and further for what I think are the minimum essential considerations of a bill or whatever and we try to avoid the regular authorization committee. But one way or another they get skipped. I do not know why they have not reported on these bills. I imagine there is some disagreement upon them. That is the ordinary cause of delay.

I do not approve of it. Although I practice it some, I do not think we ought to get into a pattern of abandoning reliance on our major committees, which are really the ones that do the most effective work in getting sound legislation worked out. I am not trying to give any lecture about it. I have no personal grievance. But I think it is unwise, unsound, and I think the Senate and the country will pay a terrible price if we abandon these legislative committees to try to handle it all through the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee. I say that with all deference to those committee members.

I have nothing further at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his observations. He is quite right. The authorization committees oftentimes will complain—and rightfully so—about riders and amendments that are offered on Appropriations Committee bills which authorize and appropriate at one and the same time.

The other side of the coin, of course, as the Senator has alluded, is that there are times when the authorizing committees have failed to act; the issue may be of some import or magnitude that there is no option left but to take the authorization and appropriation process and combine them, whether it is on a continuing resolution, as we did last year because of the failure of the Foreign Relations Committee to make decisions and to act upon that question.

As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I would much prefer to see our work totally and exclusively restricted to that of appropriating funds after the careful hearings, analysis, and consideration that we conduct. But there are those rare occasions when, due to the exigency of time and the failure of the authorizing committee, we have been left no option. I certainly do not seek—and I know the Senator from Mississippi does not—that additional responsibility, but it also might raise an interesting possibility of combining the authorizing and appropriating processes.

That idea has floated from time to time. Of course, the Senator from Mississippi and I would prefer that those authorizing authorities be transferred direct to the Appropriations Committee. It would be more acceptable than if they transferred them in the other direction. But I do think this points up a number of problems both in general legislative procedure and also in how do we best handle an emergency or a crisis problem except by going the route of an appropriation vehicle when the authorizing committee has not been able to muster enough consensus or develop enough agreement to make a decision. We do not seek it. Sometimes it is thrust upon us.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUDMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering the nomination on page 3 under the title "Supply Corps Officer," that nomination only.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

NAVY

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Culberson Amos, Jr.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this person comes to us highly recommended by the distinguished previous President pro tempore of the Senate, and I urge his confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the minority leader for considering this matter at this time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to ask my good friend if it would be in order for us to proceed to the consideration of other nominations on the Executive Calendar. I have in mind beginning on page 1, Calendar No. 514 and Calendar No. 516, and continuing through Calendar Nos. 517, 519, 520, 521, 523, and 526.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we on this side of the aisle are ready to proceed to the consideration of the nominations which are calendar numbers as follows: Calendar Order Nos. 516, 519 through 523, running to the bottom of page 3, and, in addition to that, Calendar No. 526 and the nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, if the distinguished assistant majority leader wishes to proceed.

Mr. STEVENS. To the items that the distinguished minority leader has mentioned, I would add the nominations for the Navy and the Public Health Service on page 5.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. STEVENS. There is one nomination there that has not been cleared on our side.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering those nominations just referred to.

There being no objection, the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the clerk have any difficulty following the nominations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the acting majority leader restate the nominations?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair request the clerk to lay before the Senate Calendar Nos. 516, 519, 520, 521, 523, 526, and the nominations for the Navy and the Public Health Service appearing on page 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations referred to will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the nominations.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend from West Virginia, the distinguished Democratic leader, for agreeing to allow me to present this nomination at this time.

Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of H. Russel Holland of Alaska to be our State's new U.S. district court judge. Before I speak about Mr. Holland's qualifications, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senator THURMOND and other members of the committee for expeditiously scheduling the hearing on Mr. Holland's nomination and the reporting of the nomination to the Senate. I am especially appreciative of the chairman's courtesy because of the considerable time constraints that he and other members of the committee have been operating under in recent weeks.

Members of the Senate, today it is my pleasure to speak to you about Russ Holland, who is the President's nominee to the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. The Alaska delegation solidly supports this nomination. Mr. Holland is from Anchorage, Alaska, and he is well known and well regarded as a trial lawyer in our State. Mr. Holland has been a member of the Alaska bar since 1963. He was an assistant U.S. attorney in Alaska from 1963 through 1965. He obtained his education, both undergraduate and graduate, at the University of Michigan.

Mr. President, I can speak from personal experience that Russ' knowledge of the law and his lawyering skills are excellent. More importantly, however, is the judicial temperament I believe he will bring to the Federal bench. Russ feels as I do that judges are better off executing the law rather than rewriting it. I know he would not hesitate to do the best job that he can in balancing the collective interests of our society against those of individuals, but he will at the same time exercise the type of judicial restraint that I believe is now needed in our Federal court system.

Again, Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to support and ask for the Senate's confirmation of an Alaskan that I, Senator MURKOWSKI, and all of Alaska are very proud of, Mr. Russel Holland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations I have specified be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Irving P. Margulies, of Maryland, to be General Counsel.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Richard L. Prillaman, [redacted].

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be general

Gen. Donald R. Keith, [redacted].

The following-named officer under the provision of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Richard H. Thompson, [redacted], U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Benjamin F. Register, Jr., [redacted], U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commodore in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

Jack Stephen Smith.
Burton Orville Benson.
James Merrill Strickland.
Martin William Leukhardt.

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER (TAR)

Albert Eugene Rieder.

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

Clay Wayland Gordon Fulcher.

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICER

James John Cerda.

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICER

John Joseph Hever.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICER

David Oliver Smart IV.

THE JUDICIARY

H. Russel Holland, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN THE NAVY, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Navy nominations beginning Jon R. Agne, and ending Michael P. Grief, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, 1984.

Public Health Service nominations beginning Karen C. Carlson, and ending Roger D. Prock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1984.

Public Health Service nominations beginning William P. Castelli, and ending Wayne T. Sanderson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1984.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the various nominations were confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of those nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, during which the distinguished Democratic leader may be recognized therein for as long as he desires to speak. The Senator will present to us another of a series of remarks that he has been making on the history of the Senate. Following the distinguished Senator's remarks, I ask him as a matter of course to put in a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy extended to me by the distinguished assistant majority leader.

I ask the distinguished assistant majority leader if he wishes to provide for other Senators to speak in morning business. In the event Senators should come to the floor, I would be glad to yield the floor at any point at which any Senator wishes to speak or transact business.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would be happy to amend that request to add in addition to the recognition of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that any Senator may speak therein for a period not to exceed 5

31-059 O-87-23 (Pt. 5)

minutes, subject to the Senator's yielding to them, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, again I thank the distinguished assistant majority leader.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would also like to add to that unanimous-consent request that the distinguished majority leader be able to yield time to any Senator who wishes to speak to the pending business, which is the supplemental appropriations bill.

Again, when the Senator is making his statement, if he wishes to yield time to a Senator for that purpose, he and the Senator can work out the time agreement as far as I am concerned.

I would hope that the Senator's statement for the RECORD will not be interrupted. I have enjoyed reading them, as I have told my good friend. One of these days, we ought to make them into a book as a real treatise on the history of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, before the distinguished assistant Republican leader leaves the floor momentarily, I understand that no Senator wishes to talk at this point and that there is no Senator who wishes to proceed with the transaction of the business of the urgent supplemental appropriations.

Am I correct as far as the distinguished assistant Republican leader is concerned?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, that was our information. I say, regrettably because of the number of Senators who are still on their way back to the Capitol, that no one wishes to proceed at this time with calling up an amemdment, including the committee, and, therefore, it is not possible to have other than what amounts to opening statements on the supplemental appropriations bill which is pending before the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Alaska. I shall proceed.

When I am finished, I will suggest the absence of a quorum as the Senator has so requested.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator.

THE UNITED STATES SENATE

THE SENATE IN THE ROARING TWENTIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it was the humorist Will Rogers who said: "I'm not a member of an organized political party—I'm a Democrat." [1] He made that statement, I hasten to add, during the 1920's, at a period when the party had never been more disorganized and in disarray. As the incumbent party going into the elections of 1920, the Democrats found themselves at a decided disadvantage. They took the blame for all the ills of society in the aftermath of the First World War. The removal of federal controls on the economy had stimulated a period of rapid inflation and of labor unrest; the returning veterans of the war were met with unemployment; there were racial tensions and riots in many cities aimed at black people who had moved there in search of wartime employment; there was a virulent Red Scare that trampled upon American civil liberties. With the president seriously ill and incapacitated, there was a growing sense that the government was no longer in control.

Public opinion shifted away from the reform spirit of the Progressive Era and the New Freedom policies of President Woodrow Wilson. The younger generation, as F. Scott Fitzgerald wrote in his first novel, *This Side of Paradise*, "had grown up to find all Gods dead, all wars fought, all faiths shattered." It was not surprising to find society turning to escapism, and to see the great crusades for progressivism and making the world safe for democracy giving way to bathtub gin, flappers, flagpole sitters, and the other oddities we identify with the "Roaring Twenties."

The Democratic coalition which had dominated national politics for the past decade was disintegrating. As Professor David Burner has described in his book, *The Politics of Provincialism*, "The Republican cause was that of the middling elements in American civilization, in country and city alike, and appealed to a wide range of incomes and occupations, while for decades the Democracy had attracted the extremes—the most aggressively Jeffersonian or populist of the farmers, particularly in the South, and the most powerful of the urban immigrant machines." [2] The postwar issues of Prohibition and immigration quotas further divided the predominantly native, dry, Protestant, rural South from the immigrant, wet, Catholic, big-city Democratic organizations of the North.

Democrats had gotten a foretaste of what was to come in the congressional elections of 1918. After controlling the House for eight years and the Senate for six, they lost their majorities in both. The Senate Democratic margin of 53 to 42 in the 65th Congress was reversed to a Republican majority of 49 to 47 in the 66th Congress. The election of 1920, however, was a Republican landslide, giving that party a 59 to 37 margin in the Senate.

In the presidential race, the Democrats nominated Ohio Governor James Cox, owner of a chain of newspapers, as their candidate. Cox was a solid but colorless political leader. For vice president, the party chose the dynamic young assistant secretary of the Navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt—Teddy's distant cousin. But the team of Cox and Roosevelt never stood a chance. The Republicans nominated the tall, distinguished-looking Ohio Senator Warren G. Harding, also a former newspaper publisher. Party leaders chose Harding in a "smoke-filled room," but the delegates surprised everyone by spontaneously nominating Massachusetts Governor Calvin Coolidge from the floor, as Harding's runningmate. Coolidge had gained national fame for his opposition to the Boston police strike of 1919, and his ringing declaration: "There is no right to strike against the public safety, by anybody, anywhere, anytime." [3]

It is instructive, perhaps, to note that, while many senators have become president, only two in this century have gone directly from the Senate to the White House—Harding and John F. Kennedy. Presidential politics generally has not been kind to United States senators. Those called upon to cast votes on every controversial issue often wind up alienating important segments of the voting population. This was true in the nineteenth century, when men like Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Stephen Douglas, Charles Sumner, James G. Blaine, and John Sherman, all towering figures in the Senate, were frustrated in their presidential ambitions. Similarly in 1920, there were senators of the stature of William Borah, Hiram Johnson, Robert La Follette, and Oscar Underwood, who chaired committees, shaped legislation, and defined legislation, and who yearned for the presidency. Not by any stretch of the imagination could Senator Harding be included in this group—but Harding received the nomination.

Warren Harding was a self-effacing, kindly, easy-going sort of fellow who fit perfectly into the club-like atmosphere of the Senate in those days. He was an easy man to like, and everyone said he looked like a president. On the campaign trail he promised "normalcy not nostrums," and while his speeches do not make a great deal of sense when read today, they sounded soothing in those turbulent times. Harding's stand on the issues was so vague that he was able to appeal to both supporters and rabid opponents of the League of Nations, to internationalists and isolationists, to wets and drys, to urban and rural areas. Harding and Coolidge walked away with the election, winning by better than a two-to-one margin over Cox and Roosevelt. Both houses of Congress also went overwhelmingly Republican.[4]

The Republican majority was not monolithic. There were still deep divisions within the party. On the right wing stood the "Old Guard," men like majority leader Henry Cabot Lodge—

Footnotes at end of article.

then the longest serving senator; the gargantuan Boies Penrose; Reed Smoot of Utah, inheritor of Nelson Aldrich's mantle as defender of the protective tariff; George H. Moses of New Hampshire; and James E. Watson of Indiana. Opposed to them were the progressive Republicans, a smaller but extremely vocal group which included La Follette, Borah, Johnson, George Norris, and other Western senators. A decade later, Senator Moses scornfully referred to these Western Progressives as "Sons of the World Jackass," and they wore the title as a badge of honor.

The Progressives were not particularly effective in the 1920's—Borah's biographer called him "The Spearless Leader"—and they were more often seen as obstructionists than creative reformers. In agricultural matters, however, they were able to form alliances with Democrats and farm-belt Republicans to enact legislation to aid the beleaguered American farmers. But while they had the votes to pass farm bills, as we shall see, they lacked the strength to override presidential vetoes.

Farmers were one of many interest groups petitioning Congress for aid during the 1920's, along with veterans, labor unions, and others. Instead, it was business that found the warmest welcome in Washington. After two decades of antitrust legislation and government regulation, American business leaders had a clear agenda they expected to achieve under the Republicans. They wanted lower corporate and individual income taxes; they wanted sharp reductions in federal spending; they wanted a relaxation of federal regulations; and they wanted high protective tariffs. During the administrations of Harding and Coolidge, business got what it wanted. As Calvin Coolidge asserted: "The business of America is business."

One of the first acts of the 67th Congress in 1921 was one of its most significant. That was the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act, which created the General Accounting Office and the Budget Bureau in the Treasury Department. Today this is the Office of Management and Budget. Prior to this act, each department and agency of the government had to come separately to Congress for its appropriations. And, as Professor John D. Hicks noted, "Congress tended to vote appropriations and revenues quite independently of each other, trusting that somehow what came in and what went out would about balance." The Budget Act had previously been passed in the 66th Congress, but President Wilson vetoed it. He considered unconstitutional the provision for the Comptroller General of the GAO to be appointed for a fifteen-year term and to be removable from office by Congress rather than the president. Warren Harding had no such objection and signed the bill into law. After this, each presidential administration would submit an annual budget with estimated expenditures and receipts. Harding's first budget under the new law called for expenditures of $3.5 billion.[5]

Also in 1921 the Harding administration proposed a major reduction of federal taxes. This was the work of Andrew W. Mellon, one of the richest men in the nation, who had resigned from some sixty corporate directorships in order to become Secretary of the Treasury. Secretary Mellon was the leading exponent of the "trickle down" theory of government taxing and spending. He thought government was making a fatal mistake in taxing high incomes. Government should leave the producers of wealth alone, Mellon advocated, so they could wisely invest their money, stimulate the economy and increase employment. Mellon incorporated this philosophy into the administration's revenue program, which included repeal of the wartime excess profits tax, sharp reduction on high income taxes, and corresponding increases in such tax surcharges as a tax on bank checks and automobile licenses; in other words, shifting the tax burden from the higher to the middle and lower brackets. One might call this the 1921 version of "Supply Side Economics."

Democrats and Progressive Republicans in the Senate were incensed with these proposals. As Democratic Senator Gilbert Hitchcock of Nebraska argued on the Senate floor:

"There are virtually only two ways in which the revenues of the United States government can be raised. They must either be raised by taxes on consumption or they must be rasied by taxes upon wealth . . . . Apparently . . . the majority who have drawn this bill and who are putting it through the Senate have a settled purpose in this bill not only of relieving the taxes upon the wealth of the country, but in the pending schedule the majority party has determined to relieve the great, prosperous corporation of the legitimate tax upon their profits . . . which is levied in the existing law."

The new taxes, said Hitchcock, would fall unjustly "upon the man of limited means." Or, as Senator La Follette described it: "Wealth will not and cannot be made to bear its full share of taxation." Despite such opposition, and after a long and protracted debate, the Senate passed the "act to reduce and equalize taxation," by a margin of 38 to 24. After final ironing out in conference committee, the bill went to President Harding, who gladly signed it.[6]

The next pillar in the administration's business program was a high protective tariff, to raise substantially the rates reduced by the Democratic Underwood Tariff. Unlike the last Republican tariff, the Payne-Aldrich Act, there was little organized opposition to what became the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922. One reason for this was the cooption of the farm bloc by the passage of an emergency agricultural tariff in 1921. President Wilson had vetoed an earlier version of this tariff, arguing that it would not affect the real farm problem, overproduction. But representatives from the hard-pressed farm belt pressed for its passage and, when it cleared the Congress a second time, President Harding signed it. Now, during the Fordney-McCumber debate, farm bloc senators could not effectively protest against it. After the passage of this act—which set the highest rates of any tariff up to that time—one farm sympathizer commented:

The farmer's day begins when he is aroused by an alarm clock, and the new tariff bill raises the duty on this item 67 percent. His first act is to throw off the bed covering on which the duty has been increased 60 percent. He jumps from the bed, on which the duty is advanced 133 percent, and dons a summer bathrobe, with the duty up 60 percent and slippers with the duty increased 33 percent.[7]

Mr. President, the real tragedy of the Fordney-McCumber Act was not that it raised the price of consumer goods, but that it caused other nations to retaliate. The 1920's saw the building of tariff walls all around the globe, significantly choking international trade. Tariffs compounded the problems that Europe encountered in rebuilding itself after the First World War, since only by their exports could these nations hope to repay their war debts. As the world's leading creditor, the United States did itself more harm than good in its effort to protect its industry. Farmers, who paid the higher cost for industrial goods, also found that their own agricultural exports were reduced by other nations' trade barriers, further deepening the farm depression in the United States. The tariff also stimulated the growth of industrial monopoly within the United States. It was a great mistake, for which the nation would later pay a heavy price.

The Harding administration and the Republican 67th Congress were eager to remove the federal government from any form of competition with business. Shortly after Harding's inauguration, the War Department announced that it was halting work on the Wilson Dam on the Tennessee River and was accepting bids to sell its Muscle Shoals holdings. Muscle Shoals is a 37-mile stretch of the Tennessee River in northern Alabama, in which the river falls some 134 feet, providing a powerful amount of energy if properly harnessed. During the war, the

federal government had built two nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals for the production of explosives, and these also the government sought to sell. Reformers, led by Senator George Norris of Nebraska, were disturbed at the prospects of turning Muscle Shoals over to private developers. They wanted to tap the natural resources of the Tennessee Valley to provide cheap electricity and low-cost fertilizer to lift the people of that region out of poverty.

In July, the War Department announced that automobile manufacturer Henry Ford had submitted a proposal to lease and develop Muscle Shoals. The administration and the press touted this offer as a great economic leap forward, but Senator Norris, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, had serious reservations. Norris pointed out that Ford had made no offer to continue the government's program of reducing the cost of fertilizer; that Ford was offering $5 million for property the government had spent $106 million to develop; and that he would obtain a 100-year lease on water power generated by government-financed dams. "I am unwilling to give away the birthright of millions of unborn citizens for the enrichment of private corporations at the expense of the taxpayers of America," Senator Norris declared. Through his persistent efforts, Norris was able to block Ford's acquisition of Muscle Shoals, and in 1928 and 1929 the senator successfully shepherded public power bills through Congress. However, both Presidents Coolidge and Hoover vetoed the measures. The Tennessee Valley Authority, as we know it today, had to await a very different president in 1933.[8]

The War Department's effort to unload Muscle Shoals represented but one incident in the Harding administration's effort to divest government property to private developers. A far more famous example of this policy was the Interior Department's leasing of naval oil reserves in Wyoming, at a spot identified by an outcropping of rocks which resembled a large teapot: Teapot Dome. Although conservationists were upset with the government's policy, the transfer of the Teapot Dome oil reserves to the Mammoth Oil Company, the action attracted little attention in the press. It was only after a private citizen in Wyoming wrote to Democratic Senator John B. Kendrick that any hint of impropriety surfaced. Why, the letter writer asked, were the negotiations for Teapot Dome oil held in secret, when the law required public bidding? Senator Kendrick wrote to Interior Secretary Albert B. Fall for an explanation, but received no response. Senator Kendrick then introduced a resolution demanding that the Interior Department provide information on the transfer. This time he received some satisfaction. The Department admitted that the transaction had taken place, and explained that the secret negotiation and closed biddings were necessary to protect national security.

There the matter might have rested. After all, Secretary Fall had only recently been a senator from New Mexico, and as a member of the Senate he had been a close friend of Senator Harding and many other senators. But Senator Robert La Follette was dissatisfied with the explanations Fall's Department had offered and introduced resolutions calling for the Senate Committee on Public Lands to investigate the whole question of leasing naval oil reserves. When the resolutions were adopted, La Follette was the natural choice to head the investigation, but he was busy with other matters and persuaded Senator Thomas J. Walsh, a Democrat from Montana, to take the job. Walsh was a serious-minded, clear-headed lawyer and prosecutor, a perfect choice to head the investigation. When the Interior Department, in a public show of good faith, delivered a truckload of documents relating to oil reserves, a lesser man than Walsh might have given up in the face of the impossibility and the drudgery of the task. Indeed, for over a year and a half, the public and the press heard little about this Senate investigation; it generated no headlines and no glory for its chairman. Even after Walsh was ready to hold public hearings, he found it difficult to make much headway. Secretary Fall appeared in the Caucus Room to deny vigorously there had been any wrongdoing in the oil lands transfers, and to maintain they were simply a matter of good business. Walsh then brought in witnesses to describe the lavish and expensive additions that had recently been made to Fall's New Mexico ranch, but he was unable to link Fall's sudden prosperity to the oil deals. As the *New York Times* observed, "Senator Walsh was up against a stone wall. The wise politicos of Washington believed that he had gone as far as he possibly could go." [9]

At this point in the investigation, it was Tom Walsh and his Senate colleagues who were under attack. The Harding administration was extremely popular, and the press was overwhelmingly hostile to the investigation. Walter Lippmann referred to "that legalized atrocity, the congressional investigation, in which Congressmen, starved of their legitimate food for thought, go on a wild and feverish manhunt, and do not stop at cannibalism." Dean John H. Wigmore of the Northwestern Law School, contemptuously dismissed "the senatorial debauch of investigation—poking into political garbage cans and dragging the sewers of political intrigue." [10]

Just at this point, as the case was on the brink of collapse, Senator Walsh achieved a breakthrough. Edward McLean, publisher of the *Washington Post*, had let it be known that he had lent Fall $100,000 in 1921, which seemed to be the source of Fall's new wealth. I should point out that the *Washington Post* was then a staunchly Republican paper and McLean was a personal friend of President Harding. Senator Walsh wanted to interrogate McLean about this loan, but the publisher was in Florida and pleaded illness as an excuse for not returning to Washington to testify. Undaunted, Senator Walsh boarded a train for Florida. There he was able to ascertain that McLean had indeed lent money to Fall, but that Fall had returned his checks uncashed. Fall, who was also in Florida at that time, refused to answer Walsh's questions about the true source of his income. At last the press scented a real scandal and pursued it with a fury. The investigation became front-page news, and Senator Walsh became its hero rather than its villain.

Further investigation revealed how Fall had gotten his money. He had received large sums from Harry Sinclair, president of the Mammoth Oil Company, which leased Teapot Dome, and from Edward Doheny, whose Pan-American Petroleum Company had been awarded drilling rights in the naval oil reserve at Elk Hills, California. The rest, as they say, is history. Albert Fall went to prison. Another Senate investigation, chaired by Senator Burton J. Wheeler, inquired into the reasons why the Justice Department had not prosecuted Fall, Sinclair, and Doheny. That investigation led to the resignation of Attorney General Harry Daugherty, who was spared a jail term only because of his poor health. Harry Sinclair was cited for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions related to his private affairs. This set the stage for a significant Supreme Court decision, *Sinclair* v. *United States* (1929), which upheld the Sinclair contempt citation and the Senate's right to investigate. In a related case, *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (1927), the Supreme Court also ruled that the Senate had the right to compel private individuals to testify before its committees. These two decisions have provided the legal underpinnings for congressional investigations over the past half century.[11]

A controversial Secretary of the Interior, massive tax cuts, the trickle-down theory, cutbacks in government spending, turning over of government functions to private industry—all this has a familiar ring to it. As Mark Twain once said, history may not repeat itself, but it rhymes.

Scandal and corruption became indelibly linked to the Harding administration—corruption in the Interior De-

partment, the Justice Department, in the Veterans' Bureau. We recall the "Little Green House on K Street" where the "Ohio Gang" hung out, and where the president would journey for an evening of poker. Alice Roosevelt Longworth, daughter of Teddy Roosevelt and wife of House Speaker Nicholas Longworth, described her visits to the White House in the Harding era, where she smelled the cigar smoke heavy in the air, saw the table tops littered with whiskey bottles (despite Prohibition), and found the poker chips spread on the tables. The president was not a bad sort of fellow, she recorded, "just a slob." Historians have echoed her assessment. Although Harding himself was never guilty of corruption, he was victimized by his corrupt friends. Long before the Senate uncovered the truth of Teapot Dome, Harding realized that his administration was collapsing. Depressed and tired, he traveled to Alaska in the summer of 1923, and while on the West Coast he died suddenly.[12]

Harding's death elevated the taciturn New Englander. Calvin Coolidge, to the presidency. As vice president, Coolidge had quietly presided over the Senate. He rarely talked to reporters, and the press had paid little attention to him. Once he became president he continued his reputation as "Silent Cal." Coolidge stepped into the Harding mess, but had been far enough removed from the administration not to be tarred by its scandals. He went about cleaning house, and building his own reputation. In 1924 he easily won the Republican nomination. His election was, however, no certainty. The Republican party, as I have mentioned, was seriously divided. In the 1922 congressional elections, farm state progressives had routed party regulars, and Democrats had increased their numbers in both the Senate and the House. Democrats also hoped to capitalize on the Harding scandals. Unfortunately, the Democrats committed a form a political hara-kiri at their convention in 1924. Deadlocked for 104 ballots in the sweltering heat of a New York City summer, and in their first convention broadcast over the radio, the Democrats finally nominated a reputable, but little-known compromise candidate, John W. Davis of West Virginia. Davis had little hope of healing the deep breaches in the party, between urban and rural, North and South, wet and dry factions, in the short months before the election.

A third candidate also made the race in 1924, and that was Wisconsin's Robert La Follette. Although aging, the old progressive would not slow down. In 1924 he put together a coalition of farmers, labor unions, progressives, and socialists into a Progressive Party, and ran as their candidate for president. Democratic Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana was tapped to run for vice president on the ticket. Despite La Follette's enthusiasm and charisma, his third party came in third in the 1924 election. The nation had decided to 'Keep Cool With Coolidge," and gave the president more votes than his two opponents combined. La Follette carried only his homestate of Wisconsin.[13]

The newly elected 69th Congress contained 50 Republicans, 40 Democrats, and 6 "irregulars" who had supported La Follette's candidacy. The regular Republicans were determined to punish these irregulars by expelling them from their caucus and stripping them of their committee assignments. Robert La Follette was their chief target, but death cheated the old warrior and his enemies of one last battle. In June 1925, exhausted from his presidential campaign, La Follette died. Senator Edwin Ladd of North Dakota also died before the caucus could punish him. Voters frustrated the party regulars by electing progressives to replace the two fallen senators. Gerald P. Nye took Ladd's seat, and Wisconsin elected 30-year-old Robert La Follette, Jr. to his father's seat. "Young Bob" and the rest of his family would have preferred to see his more politically aggressive younger brother, Phil La Follette, become senator, but Phil was too young to meet the constitutional age requirement. Thus the Senate had another Robert La Follette.

The Republican caucus stripped the remaining insurgents of their committees, and awarded a contested seat to Iowa to the Democratic candidate rather than permit a La Follette Republican to claim it. When "Young Bob" arrived in Washington that year, Republican leaders struggled over whether to welcome him or exclude him from their caucus. The new senator showed political astuteness by doing nothing. "It has been rather fun to sit tight and watch them squirm in and out of the proposition," La Follette wrote home to his family. Eventually the caucus admitted him and assigned him to three minor committees. But La Follette insisted that his acceptance of these assignments would not bind him to supporting President Coolidge's program, a promise which he faithfully kept.[14]

There was another new personality in the Senate in the 69th Congress worth mentioning; not a senator but the vice president. Unlike "Silent Cal," Vice President Charles G. Dawes was a talker, and what he said stirred people up. When sworn-in in this Senate chamber, Vice President Dawes gave a most unusual inaugural address, in which he launched into an attack on the Senate rules.

Vice President Dawes attacked the rule "which at times enables senators to consume in oratory those last precious moments of a session needed for momentous decisions." He decried the need of presidents to call special sessions to pass legislation blocked by these last-minute filibusters. "Reform in the present rules of the Senate is demanded not only by American public opinion," Dawes rasped, "but, I venture to say, in the individual consciences of a majority of the members of the Senate itself." Members of the democratic minority did not take kindly to this inaugural lecture, which they interpreted as an attack on minority rights. "Dawes showed as little knowledge of the Senate's rules as he did good taste—not quite as little, but nearly," commented the minority leader, Senator Joseph Robinson of Arkansas.

Alas, having said his piece, Mr. Dawes discovered that he could say no more. Vice presidents can preside; they can cast tie-breaking votes; but they can address the Senate only with the Senate's permission. This limitation has frustrated many men temperamentally unsuited for the vice presidency, from John C. Calhoun to Lyndon Johnson, the outspoken Mr. Dawes among them. Needless to say, the rules Charles Dawes found objectionable remained unchanged during his term as vice president.

Vice President Dawes was quite a colorful figure. The nation's first budget director, he was known for his ever-present pipe and his colorful expressions, particularly his peculiar expletive, "Hell'n Maria." After his inauguration, Mr. Dawes presided dutifully over the Senate, but he was in the habit of retiring to his suite at the Willard Hotel every afternoon for a nap. On March 11, he left as usual, having been assured by the Republican leadership that there would be no votes cast that afternoon. The Senate was debating President Coolidge's nominee for attorney general, Charles Warren. But the debate took a sharply negative turn as Democrats and progressive Republicans attacked Warren's connections to the sugar trust. Fearful that Warren's support was eroding, Republican majority leader Charles Curtis decided to call for a vote, which was expected to be close. A hurried call went to the Willard. Up jumped the vice president, who dressed hastily and rushed out to catch a cab for the Capitol. The vote in the Senate was tied at forty to forty, but the vice president was still not there. A Republican senator announced that he would change his vote, as a tactic to enable him to move for reconsideration, but the Democrats immediately moved to table the motion. Suddenly the disheveled vice president burst through the swinging doors into the chamber. But at that moment, Senator Lee Overman of North Carolina, the only Democrat to vote for Warren, rose and changed his

vote, observing that he was "convinced that this side of the house does not want this man for attorney general." Mr. Warren was defeated 41 to 39. Mr. Coolidge, who reputedly enjoyed long naps himself, did not take kindly to the sleeping vice president who had cost him an attorney general.[15]

The next day, Senator George Norris celebrated the vice president's wild ride in rollicking verse, taking some liberties with the familiar stanzas of *Sheridan's Ride:*

Up from the East out into the Day,
Bringing to the Willard fresh dismay,
The affrighted air with a shudder bore,
Like a herald in haste, to the Chieftain's door,
The terrible grumble, and rumble, and roar,
Telling the battle was on once more,
And Dawes full fifteen blocks away.

And wider still those billows of war
Thundered along the horizon's bar;
And louder yet into the Willard rolled
The roar of that Senate uncontrolled,
Making the blood of the listener cold,
As he thought of the stake in senatorial fray,
And Dawes full fifteen blocks away.

But there is a street from the Willard's feast,
A good, broad highway leading East,
And there, through the flush of the fading light,
An auto as black as the steeds of night,
Was seen to pass, as with eagle's flight,
As if it knew the terrible need;
It stretched away with its utmost speed.
Hills rose and fell, but its heart was gay,
With Dawes now only ten blocks away.

Still spring from those swift wheels, thundering on,
The dust, like smoke from the cannon's mouth;
Or the trail of a comet, sweeping faster and faster,
Foreboding to traitors the doom of disaster.
The heart of the auto and the heart of the master
Were beating like prisoners assaulting their walls,
Impatient to answer the fierce Senate calls;
Every nerve of the auto was strained to full play,
With Dawes now only five blocks away . . . .

With steam and with heat the black auto was gray;
By its flash and its light and its red fire's play
It seemed to the whole great Senate to say:
"I have brought you Dawes all the way
From the Willard—
to save the day!"

Hurrah! Hurrah for Dawes!
Hurrah! Hurrah for this high-minded man.
And when his statue is placed on high,
Under the dome of the Capitol sky,
The great senatorial Temple of Fame—
There with the glorious Gen'ral's name
Be it said in letters both bold and bright:
"Oh, Hell'n Maria, he has lost us the fight!"[16]

Indeed, Mr. President, there is a bust of Vice President Dawes in the "great senatorial Temple of Fame." It stands just outside the east door of this chamber, at the entrance to the Reception Room. Mercifully, it does *not* contain the inscription: "He has lost us the fight!"

Despite Mr. Dawes' comeuppance, the issues of filibuster and cloture that he raised were significant ones that deserve a good deal of additional attention. As I mentioned in my last address, it was not until after the filibuster by the "little group of willfull men" against arming the merchant marine in 1916, that the Senate first established a cloture rule. But cloture was—and still is—difficult to invoke. Minorities in the Senate have made full use of the tradition of unlimited debate in frustrating the majority. Professor Lindsay Rogers, in his classic account of *The American Senate,* published in 1926, defended the "freedom of debate," or filibuster, as one of the tremendous advantages the Senate possessed against the growing power of the presidency. "Because cloture is impossible," wrote Professor Rogers, "Senate minorities are able to force some accountability into the rigid irresponsibility of the American system; if not confronted by the weapon of unrestricted debate, party control, untempered by fear of the electorate, could become a party cloak, effectively concealing what the executive desired to conceal. Whatever may be thought of the rightfulness or wrongfulness of the Senate's power over appointments, treaties, and legislation, there can be no question," Rogers concluded, "of its benefit with regard to checking the executive." And remember, the executive at the time this book was published was Calvin Coolidge!

Filibusters were especially prevalent in the "short sessions" of Congress. In those days a new session of Congress began each year on the first Monday in December. The first session could extend as far into the spring or summer as was needed. But the second session, which also began in December, had to finish its business by midnight on March 3. This was the "short session," which long-winded senators could tie into knots and talk any objectionable legislation to death. This situation continued until the 20th amendment went into effect, setting noon on January 3 as the opening date of Congress, giving each session a full year in which to meet, if necessary.

Today we need a three-fifths vote, rather than a two-thirds vote to cut off a filibuster, but we must contend with such new innovations as the "post-cloture filibuster." Many of us, myself included, have participated in filibusters and fought to break them, depending upon the particular circumstances. Professor Rogers believed that the weapon was worth the frustration and delay that it caused and he described it as a major source of the Senate's power. "The trend," he wrote, "may be toward 'Government of the Senate, by the Senate and for the Senate." One thinks this was something of an exaggeration. The president, even "Silent Cal," was still a most powerful figure.[17]

Take, for example, Congress' fight with the president over farm policy in the 1920's. When we talk about the "Coolidge prosperity" of that decade, we need to remember that not all Americans shared in that prosperity. For farmers the 1920's were years of overproduction, debt, and depression. Senator Norris and other farm state legislators asked how long the prosperity of "Big Business" could last "when the fundamental industry of all was languishing." The Coolidge administration, which epitomized laissez-faire government inaction, offered no program to aid farmers, and so the initiative came entirely from Congress.[18]

The congressional solution was the McNary-Haugen bill, so named for its chief sponsors, Senator Charles McNary of Oregon and Representative Gilbert Haugen of Iowa. McNary has succeeded Norris as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. First introduced in 1924, McNary-Haugen proposed a Federal Farm Board to purchase farm surpluses and either hold them off the market until prices rose, or sell them overseas. In 1926 McNary-Haugen went down to defeat in both the House and Senate, but the farm bloc increased its efforts. On February 11, 1927 the Senate passed the bill by a 47 to 39 margin, and the House followed shortly afterward. But on February 25 Congress received President Coolidge's veto message. "The difficulty with this particular measure," Coolidge stated, "is that it is not framed to aid farmers as a whole, and it is, furthermore, calculated to injure rather than promote the general welfare." Coolidge took special exception to the equalization fee the bill would have charged on farmers' products to offset government expenditures in purchasing their surpluses. The president saw this as pure and simple price fixing. "Government price fixing, once started, has alike no justice and no end," Coolidge declared. "It is an economic folly from which this country has every right to be spared." [19]

While there was some validity to Coolidge's objections, particularly his warning that dumping American farm surpluses overseas would lead to retaliation by other nations, Coolidge's economic policies in general showed a major inconsistency. The president objected to special government programs to help the farmer, but he had no objections to helping business. Coolidge was "in reality a devoted partisan of industry," Professor John D. Hicks wrote in his study of the *Republican Ascendency, 1921-1933.* "He saw nothing wrong with a protective tariff—a tax designed to fit the needs of agriculture. . . . Coolidge prosperity was just another name for industrial pros-

perity." Nevertheless, Coolidge's veto could not be overridden. Again in 1928 Congress passed and Coolidge vetoed McNary-Haugen. Help for the farmers would not be forthcoming.[20]

Another area of inactivity concerned the enforcement of Prohibition. The Eighteenth Amendment had been ratified in 1919, with great hope of eliminating the consumption of liquor and drunkenness, but no one anticipated the wave of lawlessness that would follow, as citizens flouted the law and organized crime moved to control the traffic in liquor. Speakeasies blossomed around the country, and even here in the Capitol a bootlegger known as the "Man in the Green Hat" worked his trade, allegedly having offices in the House and Senate Office Buildings. The bootlegger noted that "drys" in Congress—that is, those members who voted for Prohibition—were better customers than "wets"—those who voted against Prohibition. It was not because drys were such hypocrites, he noted, just because there were more of them than there were wets. Prohibition was a dangerous time, as Senator Frank Greene of Vermont discovered one night in February 1924. Senator Greene and his wife were walking on Pennsylvania Avenue, near the Capitol grounds, when they were caught in a gun fight between bootleggers and revenue agents. The senator was shot in the head, and although he recovered, he was left with a severe speech impediment.

The Prohibition Bureau in the Treasury Department proved completely incompetent in enforcing the law. Neither Presidents Harding nor Coolidge recommended the amount of funding the Bureau needed to do its job adequately. Prohibition became one of those issues that politicians talked about endlessly, but did nothing. It contributed only to a general disrespect for the law.

One department of the federal government which stood out in this general atmosphere of laissez-faire was the Department of Commerce. Partly we can explain this by the favoritism shown by the Harding and Coolidge administrations to business, but even more important was the dynamic Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover is one of those figures in American history who has been so caricatured that it is difficult to cut through the myth to find the reality. So many Democratic candidates have campaigned over the years against Herbert Hoover and his economic policies—I have been one of those candidates—that it may come as a surprise that Hoover got his start as War Food Administrator in the Democratic Wilson administration, and that in 1920, many Democrats hoped he would run for president on their ticket. One of Hoover's admirers in those days was the assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin Roosevelt. "Hoover is certainly a wonder and I wish we could make him President of the United States," Roosevelt wrote to a mutual friend.[21] But Hoover chose to go with the Republicans, and won a post in the Harding and Coolidge cabinets. There he became the best known and most active cabinet secretary, dabbling in everything.

Although Hoover's beliefs were rooted in "rugged individualism," he held some fairly progressive ideas about government's role in society and the economy. As Secretary of Commerce, he commissioned studies into ways of preventing the cycles of boom and bust and for dealing with economic downturns. Hoover was involved in radio regulation, and supported the Federal Radio Act of 1927 which established public ownership of the airwaves and federal regulation of broadcasters. The commission set up under this act was the forerunner of the Federal Communications Commission. Under Hoover the Commerce Department also became involved in air transportation, when the Air Commerce Act set up an aeronautics branch in the department. Hoover involved himself in labor and agricultural issues as well, claim-jumping in the areas of other cabinet secretaries.[22]

When President Coolidge made his surprise announcement that he did not choose to run in 1928, Herbert Hoover became the front runner for the Republican nomination. The Democrats, after their disastrous convention in 1924, pulled themselves together and nominated New York Governor Al Smith for president. The two vice presidential candiates that year made an interesting pair. They were the Senate's majority and minority leaders: Senators Charles Curtis of Kansas and Joseph Robinson of Arkansas.

Known as the "Happy Warrior," Al Smith had been a popular governor of New York and had built a liberal record, but as a presidential candidate he could not transfer his New York popularity to a national following. His candidacy met a wall of prejudice—he was the first Catholic nominated by a major party for the presidency. He was a wet on Prohibition, and he represented the urban, immigrant masses, all factors which worked against him in Protestant, dry, rural areas of the country, even among members of his own party. By contrast, "Coolidge prosperity" and the general health of the economy worked for the Republicans, sweeping Herbert Hoover into the White House.[23]

As president, Herbert Hoover little resembled his two Republican predecessors. There were elements of a reform presidency in his first months, notably his creation of a National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, chaired by former Attorney General George Wickersham, and his support of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, which set up a Federal Farm Board, designed to encourage farmers' cooperatives and to buy and sell some farm goods to raise prices. This was Hoover's answer to the McNary-Haugen bills.

In October, however, President Hoover's fortunes collapsed with the crash of the stock markets. The United States entered into the longest and most severe depression in its history. President Hoover had been in office only a half a year, but he bore the full blame in the public's eye. The crash and depression, however, were the results of the policies of the entire "Roaring Twenties." Andrew Mellon's tax program had poured money back into the hands of wealthy and undoubtedly stimulated the economy and private investing, but the unequal distribution of wealth undermined those efforts. Production outstripped consumption, and supplies mounted on warehouse shelves. The easy credit of the 1920's stimulated consumer buying, but stretched individuals' resources dangerously thin.

Margin buying on Wall Street turned the stock market into a house of cards, liable to fall at the first shock. The federal government's lack of supervision of the markets during those boom years had left the doors open for vast numbers of fraudulent stock deals and unsavory practices, diverting investments from legitimate enterprise to fly-by-night operations. The federal government had abandoned its responsibilities under laissez-faire leadership, and now had to suffer the consequences.[24]

It was appropriate, perhaps, that at the time the stock market was collapsing, the Senate was debating the Smoot-Hawley Tariff, the highest tariff in our history, and the symbol of all that was wrong with our national economic program. President Hoover had called Congress into session for a "limited revision of the tariff," but the legislative process quickly got out of the president's control. Industrial and agrarian representatives in Congress reached mutual agreements on raising each other's tariff rates and engaged in some heavy-handed log-rolling. After the stock market crashed, business looked to the tariff as its salvation. Senator George Norris observed that Washington had filled up with lobbyists clamoring for higher tariffs to protect their industries. The Capitol, he said, was besieged by "hundreds of men, coming on special trains," to plead for one product or another.

After ten months of debate, the Senate passed the Smoot-Hawley tariff by a 53 to 31 vote. Senator Norris called it "one of the most selfish and indefensible tariff measures

that has ever been considered by the American people." "Young Bob" La Follette denounced it as "the worst bill in the history of the Republic." La Follette continued: "As the bill stands today, it is the product of a series of deals, conceived in secret, but executed in public with a brazen affrontery that is without parallels in the annals of the Senate." [25]

Even President Hoover was embarrassed by the Smoot-Hawley tariff. Hoover was a good enough economist to know that building high tariff walls was no solution for a nation suffering from overproduction. Hoover had wanted to strengthen the Tariff Commission instead and let it fine-tune tariff rates, rather than boost rates across the board. A high tariff, he realized, would only stimulate economic nationalism and invite reprisals against the United States. It would hurt rather than help the sagging economy. Still, President Hoover had other legislative matters he wanted Congress to consider, and so he signed the Smoot-Hawley tariff to settle this matter.[26]

The economy did not grow stronger; it worsened. Stocks continued to fall. Businesses failed. Unemployment rose. Homes and farms were foreclosed. Banks closed their doors, taking depositors' entire life savings with them. It was a time of great national tragedy.

In my next address, I shall discuss at length the United States Senate's role in combating the Great Depression, the contrasting solutions offered by two presidents, Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the political fortunes of the Republican and Democratic party. I began my remarks today with Will Roger's witticism on the Democratic party's disarray. I shall conclude by observing that the Depression fused the Democratic party back together again, gave it a new sense of purpose, a new program, a new coalition, and strong new leadership to set about putting the nation back together again.

NOTES TO "THE SENATE IN THE ROARING TWENTIES"

[1] Robert A. Rutland, *The Democrats, from Jefferson to Carter* (Baton Rouge, 1979), 1.

[2] David Burner, *The Politics Provincialism: The Democratic Party in Transition, 1918-1932* (New York, 1968), 6.

[3] John D. Hicks, *Republican Ascendancy, 1921-1933* (New York, 1960), 81-82.

[4] Donald R. McCoy, "Election of 1920," in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and Fred L. Israel, eds., *History of American Presidential Elections, 1789-1968* (New York, 1971), Vol. III, 2345-2455.

[5] Hicks, *Republican Ascendancy*, 51-52.

[6] *Congressional Record*, 77th Congress, 1st sess., 6740-6741.

[7] George H. Mayer, *The Republican Party, 1854-1964* (New York, 1964), 383.

[8] Richard Lowitt, *George W. Norris: The Persistence of a Progessive, 1913-1933* (Urbana, 1971), 197-216.

[9] Hasia Diner, "Teapot Dome, 1924," in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. and Roger Bruns, eds., *Congress Investigates, A Documented History, 1792-1974* (New York, 1975), 2385-89.

[10] Arthur M. Schlesinger, "Introduction," *Congress Investigates*, xx-xxi.

[11] Diner,"Teapot Dome," 2390-2401.

[12] Alice Roosevelt Longworth, *Crowded Hours* (New York, 1933), 324-5.

[13] David P. Thelan, *Robert La Follette and the Insurgent Spirit* (Boston, 1976), 179-192.

[14] Patrick J. Maney, *"Young Bob La Follette: A Biography of Robert M. La Follette., 1895-1953* (Columbia, 1978), 38-39, 42-43.

[15] Paul R. Leach, *That Man Dawes* (Chicago, 1930), 237-256.

[16] Lowitt, *George Norris*, 279-80.

[17] Lindsay Rogers, *The American Senate* (New York, 1926), 1-8, 161-190.

[18] Lowitt, *George Norris*, 292-3.

[19] *Senate Journal*, 69th Congress, 2nd sess. 221-6.

[20] Hicks, *Republican Ascendancy*, 199-200.

[21] Nathan Miller, *FDR, An Intimate History*, (New York, 1983), 167.

[22] David Burner, *Herbert Hoover: A Public Life* (New York, 1979), 159-189: another especially useful source of information on Hoover is the volume of essays gathered by Senator Mark Hatfield, *Herbert Hoover Reassessed, Essays Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Inauguration of our Thirty-First President*, S. Doc. 96-63, 96th Congress, 2nd sess., 1981.

[23] Allan J. Lichtman, *Prejudice and the Old Politics: The Presidential Election of 1928* (Chapel Hill, 1979), passim.

[24] Hicks, *Republican Ascendancy*, 230-233.

[25] Lowitt, *George Norris*, 418-429; Maney, *"Young Bob" La Follette, 74-75.*

[26] Burner, *Herbert Hoover*, 297-8.

(Mr. ANDREWS assumed the Chair during the foregoing remarks.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are five items on today's Calendar of Business that are cleared for action on this side by unanimous consent. They are Calendar Nos. 711, 712, 715, 718, and 720.

I inquire of the minority leader if he is prepared to consider all or any portion of these items at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we are prepared to proceed on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of these items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AMATEUR WRESTLING WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 224) to designate the week beginning April 1, 1984, as "National Amateur Wrestling Week" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and the preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 224

Whereas the sport of wrestling has been recognized since ancient times as a test of both physical development and mental awareness;

Whereas an estimated one million young people throughout the United States actively pursue the sport of wrestling at the amateur level; and

Whereas those young people involved in amateur wrestling at all levels, as well as parents, families, coaches, officials, and others who support these young athletes, ought to be recognized for their accomplishments and dedication to this demanding sport: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the events of the National Open Greco-Roman and the National Open Free Style Championships serve to focus our attention on the sport of amateur wrestling and our respect and admiration for all those who participate in amateur wrestling; and be it further

Resolved, That the week beginning April 1, 1984, is designated "National Amateur Wrestling Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STUDENT AWARENESS OF DRUNK DRIVING MONTH

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 443) designating the month of June 1984, as "Student Awareness of Drunk Driving Month."

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am pleased to support House Joint Resolution 443, a resolution designating June of 1984 as Student Awareness of Drunk Driving Month. On February 1, I introduced the Senate version of this resolution with Senators DOLE and PELL. The Senate resolution, (S.J. Res. 222) enjoyed the support of Senators from both parties and from all parts of the Nation.

This resolution applauds our Nation's students and their efforts to combat drunk driving. All across the Nation, students, parents, and teachers have been working to save the lives of their fellow students, sons, daughters, and loved ones.

Students in grade school and high school have joined in this effort. Many of the best programs focus on the influence of alcohol and other drugs in American life, trying to deal with the problem before it becomes acute. Students who are just beginning to form their opinions on whether to experiment with drinking are often those who can benefit most from the education antidrunk driving campaigns provide.

Mr. President, the laws dealing with drunk driving and the legal minimum age for the purchase of alcohol vary from State to State. This resolution is designed to applaud the efforts of students to ameliorate the efforts of alcohol abuse wherever it exists. Our young people have seen too many funerals for their friends and neighbors and they are responding to these tragic losses. I hope my colleagues will take advantage of the events called for by this resolution and join young Americans across the Nation as they focus attention on the tragic consequences of drunk driving.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL INVENTORS' DAY

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 271) designating February 11, 1984, "National Inventors' Day," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE: A NATIONAL DAY OF CELEBRATION OF GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 247) to designate March 25, 1984, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and the preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 247

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, whereby the power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States of America drew heavily upon the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece in forming a representative democracy;

Whereas March 25, 1984, marks the one hundred and sixty-third anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire;

Whereas democratic ideals have forged a close bond between the people of the United States and Greece; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable to celebrate with the Greek people, and to reaffirm the democratic principles upon which the two great nations were founded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 25, 1984, is designated "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy" and that the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the designated day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate has passed Senate Joint Resolution 247, and would like to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for expediting this bill to the Senate floor. Senate Joint Resolution 247 designates March 25, which marks the 163d anniversary of the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence, as "Greek Indpendence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." I believe that it is fitting that we have so chosen to honor the many contributions that Greek Americans have made to our society over the years. The contributions that they have made to all walks of life have been of tremendous significance to maintaining a free, open, and vibrant society. It is also an appropriate time to honor the close bonds that have developed between Greece and the United States and the ideals of democracy and independence upon which both countries were founded. The commitment that citizens of both countries have made to these principles has served as an important model for other like-minded people the world over.

NATIONAL REYE'S SYNDROME WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 259) to designate the week of November 12, 1984, through November 18, 1984, as "National Reye's Syndrome Week" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution and preamble are as follows:

S.J. RES. 259

Whereas Reye's Syndrome is a disease of unknown cause that usually attacks healthy children under nineteen years of age and kills or cripples more than half of the victims within several days;

Whereas Reye's Syndrome is one of the top ten killers among all diseases of children;

Whereas Reye's Syndrome was a misdiagnosed illness of children until recognized as a specific illness in 1963;

Whereas the reporting of cases of Reye's Syndrome is required in only one-half of the States, 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 national Reye's Syndrome volunteer organizations are established throughout the United States and are supported by thousands of parents;

Whereas such volunteer organizations exist to encourage involvement of the Federal Government in supporting Reye's Syndrome research, to encourage coordinaton 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 a position for the review of data on Reye's Syndrome patients at the Center for Disease Control, 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 the public and the Federal Government are not sufficiently aware of the continuous increase in the incidence of Reye's Syndrome; and

Whereas the Governors of several States have declared 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 12, 1984, through November 18, 1984, is designated "National Reye's Syndrome Week" and 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.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, next I propose to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of S. 518, Calendar No. 581, if the majority leader is agreeable.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no objection on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 518) to establish a program of grants administered by the Environmental Protection Agency for the purpose of aiding State and local programs of pollution abatement and control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering the Environmental Programs Assistance Act which will make permanent the current senior environmental employment (SEE) pilot project, which was unanimously agreed to by the Environment and Public Works Committee. The Environmental Protection Agency will be authorized to employ and direct the efforts of older Americans to provide monitoring, and regulatory and technical assistance in several environmental programs. The program will be managed by the EPA with guidance from the Department of Labor.

In the pilot project begun in 1976, SEE demonstrated the effectiveness of older Americans employed in jobs relating to the protection of environmental resources. For example, in Arkansas, eight senior citizens conducted an EPA-mandated survey of open dumps within the State; in New Jersey, 21 older Americans were hired to gather followup information for an earlier survey of hazardous waste products generated by State industries; and in California, a project studied the extent to which migrant workers were exposed to dangerous pesticides while on the job. It is a rare occasion when the public derives such benefit from an investment as small as the amount expended for the senior environmental employment pilot program.

Retired, unemployed older workers have a wealth of talent and experience that should and must be used. At a time when Federal assistance for environmental programs is being reduced, additional resources are needed to help implement State and Federal programs.

The Environmental Programs Assistance Act will assist in accomplishing such projects as: Air monitoring and emission testing; pesticides inventory and control; water quality and supply sampling and monitoring; technical libraries and public information projects; carcinogenic surveys and followup; hazardous materials routing surveys; health and screening in rural areas and among migrant workers; and noise abatement and control.

The bill requires that SEE participants not replace existing activities within a State. The participants must augment or improve existing programs. SEE will not displace EPA employees. This criterion in the pilot program has brought about ingenious uses of the senior environmental employment program. This trend will certainly continue should this worthy program be given permanent status.

An example of the original use of SEE is an EPA program which was spurred on by medical findings concerning the hazards of exposure to asbestos. In 1980, the EPA launched a program to help educators check school buildings for asbestos-containing materials.

The national manager of the asbestos control program, John Wilson of EPA, commended the program participants:

> The great success of this program springs from each enrollee's unique combination of long work experience and enthusiasm to do what he can do to help people in need. We have thrown these people into some difficult situations, and in all cases they have been able to provide.

The SEE project is already a proven success based upon the pilot program. S. 518 will give the SEE program a 3-year authorization.

This legislation offers us the chance to more fully utilize the experience and energy of our senior citizens, and at the same time to enhance environmental programs.

Mr. President, last year this bill was adopted as an amendment to H.R. 6323, the Environmental Research, Development and Demonstration Act. Unfortunately, H.R. 6323 was vetoed by President Reagan but not because of the senior environmental employment program. Rather, the President had only praise for the objectives of this worthy program

EPA Administrator, Mr. Ruckelshaus, recently wrote expressing his support for passage of this bill before Congress adjourns. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the RECORD.

I encourage the Senate to adopt S. 518.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., November 10, 1983.

Hon. JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to urge the enactment in the 98th Congress of S. 518, a bill introduced by you, which Senators Grassley and Heinz and others have cosponsored. S. 518 would establish a program of grants administered by the Environmental Protection Agency for the purpose of aiding Federal, State, and local pollution abatement programs.

The bill would encourage the training and participation of older Americans in such environmentally-related fields as air monitoring and emission testing, water quality sampling and monitoring, pesticides inventory and control, and hazardous materials routing surveys, among others, all in support of EPA, State, or local environmental programs. To assist in further highlighting areas where such assistance would be needed, the EPA Administrator would be required to submit to the Congress a report within 180 days of enactment, identifying projects which would be consistent with the Act's purposes. The EPA Administrator would also be authorized to make grants or enter into cooperative agreements with public or private insitutions or individuals and to consult with the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator of the Administration on Aging to ensure coordination with similar projects under the Older Americans Act of 1965 or the Job Training Partnership Act. The sum of $250,000 would be authorized to be appropriated for each of four fiscal years to carry out the administrative provisions of the Act.

The Environmental Protection Agency strongly supports enactment of S. 518 before adjournment of the 98th Congress sine die. As you know, in September 1976, EPA and the Administration on Aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, launched a program which provided the basis for a demonstration project utilizing older Americans aged 55 and above to perform vital services for Federal, State, and local environmental agencies to help meet environmentally-mandated responsibilities. This program is known as the Senior Environmental Employment Program (SEE). The demonstration project was extremely successful, and the program was continued on a limited scale.

In recognition of the success of these activities and in order to broaden the scope of the program and to better define the EPA role, proponents of the SEE program included language authorizing specific EPA grant support for the SEE program in S. 2577, the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1983, introduced in the 97th Congress. As you know, the bill was vetoed by the President for reasons unrelated to this proposed language, but special note was made by the President of the worthiness of the SEE program.

In our view, enactment of S. 518 would give the Agency clear authority to award grants and cooperative agreements for SEE-related activities. To this end, it would provide the means of fostering the continued growth of a program which promises dual benefits. It aids our senior citizens anxious to pursue meaningful and productive work while at the same time enables States and localities to redouble their efforts in improving and enhancing the environmental quality of our nation. I should point out, however, that a specific authorization of funds is not necessary for administration of the program.

There are few opportunities when an Agency head can express virtually unqualified support for pending legislation. I am pleased to be able to do so now in the case of S. 518 and urge that it be enacted in the 98th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, early this year, Senators CHAFEE, STAFFORD, HEINZ, SPECTER, PELL, TSONGAS, BRADLEY, DODD, and I introduced S. 518—a bill that has as its purpose the assistance of State and local governments in carrying out environmental protection programs of pollution prevention, abatement and control programs, through grants from the Environmental Protection Agency.

In carrying out this program the act calls for utilizing to the fullest possible extend, the talents of older Americans available for participation in such projects.

Mr. President this is not a new "make work" program. It has been underway since 1976 and known as the senior environmental employment program. It began in September 1976, EPA and the Administration on Aging (AOA), a part of the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare, signed an agreement which provided the basis for the senior environmental employment demonstration project.

The primary objective of the agreement was to demonstrate ways in which older Americans—age 55 and above—could be effectively employed in jobs relating to the prevention, abatement and control of environmental pollution.

To accomplish this, AOA allocated $1 million a year for 3 years for wages and local administrative costs for 10 pilot projects, one in each region. To provide assistance to each region and to the States, EPA and AOA funded a grant to the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) to plan and develop guidelines for the projects based on directions received from EPA headquarters and regional offices.

The demonstration projects were quite successful and were expanded to provide additional support for programs in a variety of environmental programs and agencies.

Both the demonstration and ongoing projects have shown that programs such as this can help States meet congressional environmental mandates. The Congress has also expressed the hope that the SEE program could be expanded to other areas of public service modeled after EPA's efforts. The fields of public health, consumer protection, recreation and social services hold promise for such a successful expansion. Additional activities could be demonstrated by cooperative programs. For example, EPA and the Department of Energy may enter into a cooperative program such as SEE in order to meet some of their closely related objectives.

Two bills have been introduced in the Congress, one by Senator CHAFEE (S. 518) and the other by the Honorable COOPER EVANS in the House (H.R. 569). These bills will authorize the EPA to establish and manage a senior environmental employment corps to serve senior citizens. The program is designed to provide training and employment opportunities to older Americans while assisting Federal, State and local environmental agencies in their efforts to control pollution and enhance the environment.

More recently, I and Senator CHAFEE have written EPA requesting that three positions—two professional and one clerical—and $250,000 in the fiscal year 1984 supplemental be dedicated to the management of this program.

In closing, Mr. President, a great deal of credit for this legislation goes to Senators STAFFORD and CHAFEE who have persisted as the authorizing chairmen to see that this program can emerge from Congress as law. It will give a strategic cohort of our Nation's elderly a chance to continue their contributions of talent and expertise.

I urge the rapid passage of this bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there are no amendments to the bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No amendments have been reported.

AMENDMENT NO. 2845

(Purpose: To insure that agreements entered into in conjunction with certain grants administered by the Environmental Protection Agency are entered into in accordance with prior appropriations acts)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), on behalf of Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 2845.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, after line 7, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Grants or agreements entered into under this section will be subject to prior appropriations Acts.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2845) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2846

(Purpose: To strike the authorization of appropriations for grants administered by the Environmental Protection Agency for the purpose of aiding State and local programs of pollution abatement and control)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk, by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), on behalf of Mr. CHAFEE, proposes an amendment numbered 2846.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 5, line 8, strike all through line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDING UNDER OTHER ACTS OF CONGRESS"

SEC. 5. Environmentally related programs as described in section 3 of this Act shall be eligible for funding through title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2846) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 518

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Environmental Programs Assistance Act of 1984".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) protection of the environment is of primary importance to the citizens of the United States;

(2) enforcement of environment protection programs is suffering due to low finding levels; and

(3) there is a growing need for experienced persons to assist State and local governments in carrying out environmental protection programs.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to assist State and local governments in carrying out environmental protection programs through grants from the Environmental Protection Agency.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized and directed to develop a program, through grants or contracts, designed to assist Federal, State, and local environmental agencies in carrying out projects of pollution prevention, abatement, and control.

(b) The program established under this section may include, but shall not be limited to, projects such as—

(1) air monitoring and emission testing;

(2) pesticides inventory and control;

(3) water quality sampling and monitoring;

(4) water supply sampling and monitoring;

(5) technical libraries and public information projects;

(6) carcinogenic surveys and followup;

(7) hazardous materials routing surveys;

(8) health screening in rural areas and among migrant workers; and

(9) noise abatement and control.

(c) The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall prepare and submit to the Congress within one hundred and eighty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report identifying projects which meet the purposes of this Act. The report shall include the organiza-

tional and administrative commitments of the Administrator in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) The Administrator shall consult with affected and interested representatives of State and local environmental agencies for the purpose of developing mechanisms for the successful implementation of this Act.

(e) In carrying out the program established under this Act the Administrator shall utilize, to the fullest extent possible, the talents of older Americans available for participation in projects funded under such program, and shall consult with the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator of the Administration on Aging to ensure coordination with similar projects in effect, or previously in effect, under the Older Americans Act of 1965 or the Job Training Partnership Act.

AGREEMENTS WITH INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator is authorized to enter into agreements with public and private institutions and individuals to develop and maintain an effective program under this Act.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to—

(1) make grants or cooperative agreements with public or private institutions or individuals to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(2) utilize individuals participating in projects established under this Act in assisting the Environmental Protection Agency and State and local environmental agencies; and

(3) provide training to individuals to prepare them to accomplish environmentally related activities.

(c) The Administrator shall not make any grant to, or enter into any agreement with, any State or local environmental agency for the funding of any activities under this Act unless such agency certifies that such activities will not—

(1) result in the displacement of individuals currently employed by the environmental agency concerned (including partial displacement through reduction of nonovertime hours, wages, or employment benefits);

(2) result in the employment of any individual when any other person is in layoff status from the same or substantially equivalent job within the jurisdiction of the environmental agency concerned; or

(3) impair existing contracts for services.

(d) Grants or agreements entered into under this section will be subject to prior appropriations Acts.

ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDING UNDER OTHER ACTS OF CONGRESS

SEC. 5. Environmentally related programs as described in section 3 of this Act shall be eligible for funding through title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

H.R. 3249 PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I say to the minority leader that I am prepared to ask that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3249 and that the measure be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no objection.

Mr. BAKER. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILL PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, another measure to be placed on the calendar, if the minority leader will agree, is a bill that I would propose to introduce on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN), to change a date in the Export Administration Act, which has been cleared on this side for action at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the matter has been cleared on this side.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill on behalf of the Senator from Utah, and I ask that it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY AFFECTING THE DEPARTMENTS OF JUSTICE AND TRANSPORTATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 124

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, was referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on the Budget, Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report three new deferrals of budget authority totaling $42,632,000.

The deferrals affect the Departments of Justice and Transportation. The details of the deferrals are contained in the attached reports.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 26, 1984.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:22 p.m., message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S.J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to recognize "Volunteer Firefighters Day" as a tribute to the bravery and self-sacrifice of our volunteer firefighter.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 432. Joint resolution designating the week of April 8 through 14, 1984, as "Parkinson's Disease Awareness Week."

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 94-118, the Speaker appoints Mr. FOLEY as a member of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, vice Mr. Zablocki, deceased.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution declaring the week of May 7 through May 13, 1984, as "National Photo Week."

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 432. Joint resolution designating the week of April 8 through 14, 1984, as "Parkinson's Disease Awareness Week."

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary reported that on today, March 26, 1984, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution declaring the week of May 7 through May 13, 1984, as "National Photo Week."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1870. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for credit and debit card counterfeiting and related fraud (with additional views) (Rept. No. 98-368).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HEINZ:

S. 2474. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the tariff treatment accorded to film, strips and sheets of acrylic plastic materials; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2475. A bill granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District Compact entered into by the States of West Virginia and Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. MITCHELL):

S. 2476. A bill to provide for a pay increase for article III judges subject to salary adjustments pursuant to section 461 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. EXON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2477. A bill to promote the export of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus stocks of dairy products and wheat, to develop markets for United States agricultural commodities, to combat malnutrition abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BAKER (for Mr. GARN):

S. 2478. A bill to extend the authorities under the Export Administration Act of 1979 until May 16, 1984; placed on the calendar, by unanimous consent.

By Mrs. HAWKINS (for herself, Mr. EAST, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. JEPSEN, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

S.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution designating the week of April 29 through May 5, 1984, as "National Week of the Ocean"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. MITCHELL)

S. 2476. A bill to provide for pay increase for article III judges subject to salary adjustments pursuant to section 461 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A 3.5-PERCENT SALARY INCREASE FOR FEDERAL JUDGES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation which would give all Federal judges and justices a 3.5-percent salary increase effective January 1, 1984. This bill would give to the Federal judiciary the same pay raise received in January by all other Federal officers and employees, including Members of Congress.

As many of my colleagues will recall, Congress in December of 1981 passed, as part of the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1982 appropriations, a provision requiring express statutory authorization for any increase in judicial salaries. Subsequent to passage of this appropriations rider, the Comptroller General of the United States determined that this provision, section 140 of Public Law 97-92, was permanent legislation, not limited to fiscal year 1982.

This change effectively removed judges from coverage of the Executive Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1975, which had included judges, as well as Members of Congress and high-ranking executive branch officials in the annual payroll comparability adjustments received by other Federal employees. Thus, Federal judges and justices were not allowed the 3.5-percent salary increase received this year by other Federal employees because there was not specific authorization to provide for such an increase. See Decision of the Comptroller General of the United States, File No. B-200923, December 28, 1983, determining that no such specific authorization had been enacted.

This legislation would constitute the required authorization to enable members of the judiciary to receive a pay raise this year. It would not repeal or alter in any way section 140 of Public Law 97-92. Express statutory authorization by Congress would continue to be necessary for any salary increases for the Federal judiciary. In this significant respect, the bill I am introducing today differs from legislation introduced earlier this year by my distinguished colleague from Maine, Senator MITCHELL.

The Mitchell bill would not only give Federal judges a pay raise retroactive to January 1, 1984, but it would also repeal the requirement of specific statutory authorization for judicial pay increases. While I believe that it is fair for judges to receive the same pay increase received this year by all other Federal employees, I am strenuously opposed to changing the existing provision of law which I believe to be sound policy. Repeal of the fiscal year 1982 appropriations rider would definitely steer us in the wrong policy direction.

Rather than including more Federal employees within automatic pay adjustment provisions, we should be including more Federal employees within the requirement that Congress specifically authorize their pay increases. It will be difficult, if not impossible, for Congress to establish any control over Federal spending while automatice pay adjustments and cost-of-living increases in a variety of areas slowly, but steadily increase the costs of Government. Congress should begin by reasserting its control over Federal pay increases, especially for those employees covered by the Executive Salary Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1985, and should face up to the difficult decisions which we were elected to make.

Mr. President, this is one of the reasons that I was a cosponsor and strong supporter of S. 2211, Senator NICKELS' bill to rescind the 3.5-percent pay increase for Members of Congress. At the time S. 2211 was passed by the Senate, I made a floor statement arguing that it would be unreasonable for Congress to accept this automatic pay increase. Unfortunately, the House had not seen fit to take action on S. 2211.

Mr. President, I am in favor of fair and equitable treatment of all Federal employees. That is why I am introducing legislation to give members of the Federal judiciary the 3.5-percent pay increase received by all other Federal workers. I would be strongly opposed, however, to any repeal of the requirement for statutory authorization for such increases. This is a sound principle which should be extended to cover more Federal employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2476

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all salary rates subject to adjustment under the authority of section 461 of title 28, United States Code, shall be paid as of January 1, 1984, in accordance with the recommendations contained in Presidential Message Numbered 74 (H. Doc. No. 98-97), as implemented under section 5305(c) of title 5, United States Code.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. EXON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2477. A bill to promote the export of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus stocks of dairy products and wheat, to develop markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, to combat malnutrition abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

SURPLUS FOOD COMMODITIES TRADE AND DONATION ACT OF 1984

Mr. MELCHER. Madam President, today, on behalf of myself and Senators HUDDLESTON, ZORINSKY, BAUCUS, EXON, ANDREWS, BOREN, and BURDICK,

I am introducing a bill to amend section 416.

Section 416 of the Agriculture Act is the section dealing with surplus food commodities that can be contributed abroad in food aid to countries that we maintain relationships with and who are in need of food.

So far, under present law, the surplus commodities that can be contributed are all dairy products. I wish to amend that to include wheat. Indeed, in a bill that we just passed last week dealing with agricultural commodities we did include an amendment that I and others offered that adds wheat to dairy products under section 416.

It also permits monetization for apportionment of commodities and allows for multiyear programs.

These corrections in addition to section 416 are badly needed and are advocated by all of the international and charitable organizations that deal with American food products abroad.

Also, the AID people who work for us in the various countries that provide for food have also been advocating these changes.

The bill I am introducing today incorporates all those changes I have mentioned, but also adds a little more definite language under the terms and conditions that these various international organizations have found necessary in order to have successful food aid programs in the countries that they work with.

We may not need this bill, per se, since the most needed corrections from section 416 have already been passed by the Senate. However, I am offering the bill and introducing the bill to make sure that the framework of the goals are firmly before the Senate, and that it be applied as sort of the guidelines while the farm bill just passed last week with that provision in it is in conference.

I am pleased to say that in the House of Representatives the committee that has jurisdiction over food aid matters including Public Law 480 as well as section 416 has been working on a similar provision and it is reported out of committee in their foreign aid bill. That committee is the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

So I think the Senate's action last week was very timely in relationship to the actions taken in the House previously.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1325

At the request of Mr. McCLURE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1325, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide financial relief to State and local governments by eliminating a requirement that would result in a duplicative mailing each year.

S. 1980

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1980, a bill to recognize the organization known as the "Polish Legion of American Veterans, U.S.A."

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify and improve the income tax treatment of life insurance companies and their products.

S. 2116

At the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2116, a bill to accept the findings and to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.

S. 2241

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HUMPHREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2241, a bill to clarify the obligations of broadcasters to legally qualified candidates for public office, and for other purposes.

S. 2309

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HART) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2309, a bill to authorize the offer and payment of rewards for information and services concerning terrorist activities.

S. 2338

At the request of Mr. HEINZ, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2338, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow medicare coverage for home health services provided on a daily basis.

S. 2352

At the request of Mr. QUAYLE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2352, a bill to provide equitable treatment for certain hospitals in high wage areas.

S. 2375

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2375, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the operation of the secondary market for loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration.

S. 2413

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2413, a bill to recognize the organization known as the "American Gold Star Mothers, Incorporated."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 203

At the request of Mr. HUDDLESTON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 203, a joint resolution designating the week beginning April 8, 1984, as "National Mental Health Counselors Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 217

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 217, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of May 6, 1984 through May 12, 1984 as "Senior Center Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 241

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 241, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 6, through May 13, 1984, as "Jewish Heritage Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 244

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. JEPSEN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 244, a joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 6, 1984, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 245

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 245, a joint resolution to designate the week of April 15 through April 21, 1984, as "National Recreational Sports Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 255

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 255, a joint resolution to designate the month of May 1984 as "Older Americans Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 257

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 257, a joint resolution to designate the period July 1, 1984, through July 1, 1985, as the "Year of the Ocean."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 259

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 259, a joint resolution to designate the week of November 12, 1984, through November 18, 1984, as "National Reye's Syndrome Week."

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

KENNEDY AMENDMENTS NOS. 2835 THROUGH 2843

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. KENNEDY submitted nine amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 492,) making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, for the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 2835

On page 3, line 6, delete the figure "$92,750,000" and substitute in lieu thereof the figure "$21,000,000".

AMENDMENT No. 2836

At the appropriate place add the following: "The Senate and House Select Committees on Intelligence, in coordination with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, shall conduct a full investigation of death squads in El Salvador and shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives by May 31, 1984, on the extent of death squad activity, responsibility for organizing, directing and carrying out death squad killings, and progress in prosecuting those responsible for such killings."

AMENDMENT No. 2837

At the appropriate place add the following language: "No funds shall be available under this or any other legislation for military assistance to the Government of El Salvador after May 31, 1984, unless the Salvadoran authorities have brought those national guardsmen charged with murder in the deaths of the four United States churchwomen in December 1980 to trial and have obtained a verdict."

AMENDMENT No. 2838

At the appropriate place in the section entitled "MILITARY ASSISTANCE" of H.J. Res. 492, add the following: No funds appropriated in this bill or other legislation shall be available for military assistance for the Government of El Salvador after May 31, 1984, unless that government has initiated a prosecution of those involved in the murder of two American Labor advisers in 1981.

AMENDMENT No. 2839

At the appropriate place in H.J. Res. 492, insert the following: "No additional funds shall be available under this or any other legislation for military assistance to the Government of El Salvador unless the President certifies to Congress by June 30, 1984, that the Salvadoran Government has agreed to participate in unconditional negotiations with all major parties to the conflict in El Salvador which are willing to participate unconditionally in such a negotiation process, and that upon the beginning of such negotiations, the Government of El Salvador agrees to attend and to negotiate in good faith: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall not take effect unless the opposition forces represented by the FDR/FMLN have agreed by such date to participate in such negotiations and to attend and negotiate in good faith.

AMENDMENT No. 2840

On page 3, at the end of line 15, insert the following: "land reform,".

AMENDMENT No. 2841

At the appropriate place add the following: "No United States ground forces shall be introduced into the territory of El Salvador, Honduras or Nicaragua for the purposes of combat unless:

"(1) Congress has declared war or authorized the presence of such forces in advance by a joint resolution signed by the President of the United States; or

"(2) the presence of such forces is necessary to provide for the immediate evacuation of United States citizens, or to respond to a clear and present danger of military attack on the United States.

In either case described in paragraph (2), the President shall advise and, to the extent possible, consult in advance with the Congress."

AMENDMENT No. 2842

At an appropriate place add the following: "No funds appropriated in this or any other legislation may be obligated or expended for the participation of United States Armed Forces in military training exercises in Honduras unless the Congress has authorized the exercises in advance by joint resolution signed by the President of the United States."

AMENDMENT No. 2843

Beginning with line 19 on page 4, delete all through line 2 on page 5.

CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this week, the Senate begins a historic debate on the question of U.S. policy in Central America. The administration has successfully amended House Joint Resolution 492 to include an additional $93 million in military assistance to the Government of El Salvador and an additional $21 million in assistance to the contras in Nicaragua.

Before reaching the merits of this proposed legislation, some comments are in order about the vehicle that the administration has chosen to appropriate this money, and the procedures that the administration has employed to achieve its purposes.

It is indecent that the administration misuses a bill to appropriate money to assist the most desperate millions in Africa—who are now in the midst of one of the most serious famines and droughts in their history—as the vehicle by which the Congress is asked to provide more weapons to the military forces at war in Central America. In order to cast a vote for bread for the people of Africa, it may well be necessary for Senators also to cast a vote for more guns and bullets in Central America.

As for the legislative strategy here, the administration has chosen procedures that short-circuit the legislative process and minimize full consideration of these matters by the duly constituted committees of Congress. I object to the decision to circumvent the authorization procedures by which appropriations are debated and approved in the Senate. Relying on the argument that there is an emergency in El Salvador which requires immediate action by Congress, the administration has bypassed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, rendering that committee inoperative and irrelevant with respect to this so-called emergency military assistance. By going straight to the Appropriations Committee, the administration has avoided dealing with precisely those Members of the Senate who have spent the most time and energy and effort to become expert on the situation in Central America.

By the same token, the administration's decision to attach its request for additional assistance to El Salvador and for the contras in Nicaragua to this legislation is a blatant effort to end-run the House of Representatives. One can only presume that, when it comes to this military assistance, the administration does not want to consult with its critics in the House of Representatives—but prefers to deal with Republican rubberstamps, and then try to resolve this issue in the relative obscurity of a House-Senate conference committee.

These issues are too important to the future peace of this hemisphere and to the future of U.S. relations with the peoples of Central America for debate to be cut short or for the committees of Congress to be circumvented.

Basic questions need to be stated, debated, and resolved before a single additional dollar of military aid is appropriated for El Salvador. Every time there is a problem in the world, whether in Lebanon or with the Soviet Union, whether in Grenada or El Salvador or Nicaragua, the President rushes toward a military confrontation. All that he seems to understand in foreign policy is more guns, more bullets, and more troops. What ever happened to diplomacy? There has not been a single major successful diplomatic initiative by this administration

anywhere in the world since it took office.

President Reagan's instinctive resort to military force as a substitute for wise diplomacy is the fundamental flaw in American foreign policy, especially our policy in Central America. Everywhere we look, the President is seeking to use superior military power as a substitute for a steady, coherent, and balanced foreign policy, based on America's own best values. The President is resorting to the military and the CIA to rescue a failed foreign policy and enforce short-sighted and short-term solutions. In Central America, President Reagan is moving U.S. combat forces closer and closer to conflict.

I believe that the Contadora process offers a far more realistic way to peace in the region. Everything and anything we do in the region should be designed to strengthen the Contadora process, but the President is pursuing policies that actually undermine and discourage the efforts of the Contadora nations.

Instead of reducing the Sandinistas' reliance on Cuba and the Soviet Union, the policies of the Reagan administration have pushed the Sandinistas into greater and greater dependence upon those two nations.

Instead of challenging the Sandinistas' support at home by pushing for a meaningful electoral process that would include vigorous participation by opponents of the regime, the Reagan administration has pursued a policy that has consolidated support inside Nicaragua for the Sandinistas.

Instead of isolating the conflict in El Salvador so that it does not spread into a regional war, the administration has expanded the conflict to the point where Honduras is now in the verge of being draw into the hostilities. In fact, a regional war throughout Central America may well be just around the corner if President Reagan is permitted to continue his policy of militarizing the conflict.

Instead of carefully limiting the military assistance that we send to El Salvador in the interest of pursuing a negotiated settlement of the conflict there, the administration has given the Salvadoran military a blank check, thereby insuring that the war will rage on.

Instead of keeping U.S. troops out of the conflict, the Reagan administration has organized exercises in Honduras that bring out forces to the very brink of the fighting.

Instead of strengthening the new democracy in Honduras, the administration has pursued policies which have weakened that democratic Government.

I believe we need a new approach that will give diplomacy a chance. In an effort to move the United States in the direction of negotiation rather than confrontation, I intend to work with other Senators to amend this legislation and to develop an effective alternative to the Reagan administration's policies of more guns, more bullets, more war.

First, with respect to El Salvador, we should provide only extremely limited military assistance to the new government until we know who will be running that government. I will offer an amendment to the Inouye amendment to provide sufficient military assistance to last only through the end of May—$21,000,000 instead of $63,000,000. At that time, we will learn who has been elected President of El Salvador, and we will know whether that Government will in fact commit itself to human rights, to land reform, and to the elimination of death squads.

Second, any military assistance that we send to El Salvador should be much more carefully conditioned on progress on human rights and other reforms.

No more funds should be provided to the Government of El Salvador after May 31, 1984, unless there has been a verdict in the case of the four churchwomen murdered in December 1980.

No more funds should be provided to the Government of El Salvador after May 31, 1984, unless a prosecution has begun in the case of the two American labor advisers murdered in January 1981.

No more funds should be provided to the Government of El Salvador after June 30, 1984, unless that Government is willing to conduct unconditional negotiations with opposition forces.

No more funds should be provided to the Government of El Salvador unless there is continued progress in land reform.

No more funds should be provided to the Government of El Salvador unless that Government has in fact made progress in eliminating the death squads.

In addition, we must get to the bottom of the persistent allegations that high Salvadoran officials are deeply involved in the death squads, possibly with the complicity or acquiescence of the CIA.

The members of the Senate and House Committees on Intelligence should be instructed to make a full investigation of these allegations and report to the Congress by May 31 of this year.

With respect to Nicaragua, I am absolutely convinced that U.S. assistance to the contras is both wrong and counterproductive. I will offer an amendment striking that assistance from this legislation. There is no justification whatever for this Congress to ratify Ronald Reagan's secret war against Nicaragua. The Senate should have the courage to stop it now, before it is too late.

Finally, I will offer an amendment to prohibit the use of U.S. combat troops in El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua without advance approval by Congress. As we learned from the failure of the administration's policy in Lebanon, even the War Powers Act gives this President too much leeway to commit American troops to combat where the security of the Nation is not at stake.

In addition, we should amend this bill to prohibit military exercises in Honduras unless the administration has obtained advance approval from Congress. The provocative exercises now underway should be canceled, so that the Senate and the House will have the time to conduct a full review of that policy.

We must halt this rush to military confrontation in Central America. We must change course before we find U.S. soldiers bogged down in a war in Central America that will be bloody, dirty, and ultimately unwinnable. We do not need and we cannot afford another Lebanon in El Salvador.

In our relations with that troubled region of the world, let us return to the spirit of the Alliance for Progress. Let us revive the cause of human rights and human progress. Let us stand for what is best in our own people and our own traditions.

PRESSLER AMENDMENT NO. 2844

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. PRESSLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 492, making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, for the Department of Agriculture; as follows:

At an appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following new language:

Because the United States depends upon satellites for preserving the peace through command and control of United States forces worldwide and through early warning of strategic attack, among other functions;

Because satellites are vital for certification of arms control agreements;

Because the United States and other nations rely increasingly on space-based systems for weather forecasting, communications, natural resource exploration and other important commercial activities;

Because the maximum utilization of space technology for commerce and science is assured only under peaceful conditions;

Because the safety of such important missions including those performed by the space shuttle would be compromised by the threat posed by antisatellite weapons;

Because an uncontrolled space arms race would undermine strategic stability and divert resources needed to maintain strong and balanced defenses; and

Because the present pace of military developments, including weapons tests, will soon reduce the prospects of avoiding the weaponization of outer space;

The Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress

assembled, hereby declare That the President should seek agreement with the Soviet Union to—

(1) declare an immediate, mutual and verifiable moratorium of limited duration on the testing in space of antisatellite weapons;

(2) immediately resume negotiations on a mutual and verifiable ban on the testing, production, deployment, and use of any antisatellite weapon;

(3) seek, on an urgent basis, a comprehensive verifiable treaty prohibiting the testing, production, deployment, or use of any space-directed or space-based weapons system which is designed to inflict injury or cause any other form of damage on the Earth, in the atmosphere, or on objects placed in space.

SEC. 2. Such agreements should not restrict operations in space not involving weapons, such as the United States space shuttle program.

IT IS TIME TO STOP SPACE WEAPONS

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I am offering as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 492, the 1984 urgent supplemental appropriation for the Public Law 480 program, the text of my resolution calling for a ban on weapons in space and on weapons designed to attack objects in space.

My resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 129, was reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee over 4 months ago. Although I would prefer to have this resolution considered by itself, it is apparent we are not likely to obtain floor consideration unless it is offered as an amendment to other legislation. Thus, I am offering it as an amendment to House Joint Resolution 492.

Major decisions on the future of U.S. military options in space will soon be made by the administration. If Congress is to play a major role in the development of space weapons policies, it would be more effective for us to act now.

The purpose of my amendment is quite simple. It calls upon the President to seek a mutual and verifiable ban on weapons in space and on weapons designed to attack objects in space. If adopted by both Houses of Congress, this amendment would send a clear message that Congress desires the following actions on antisatellite and all other weapons in space or directed at space:

First, an immediate, mutual and verifiable moratorium of limited duration on the testing in space of antisatellite weapons;

Second, an immediate resumption of negotiations on a mutual and verifiable ban on the testing, production, deployment, and use of any antisatellite weapon; and

Third, pursuit of a comprehensive verifiable treaty prohibiting the testing, production, deployment, or use of any space-directed or space-based weapons system which is designed to inflict injury or cause any other form of damage on the Earth, in the atmosphere, or on objects in space.

Mr. President, the following Senators are cosponsors of the original resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 129: TSONGAS, PERCY, PELL, MATHIAS, CRANSTON, LEAHY, BUMPERS, BRADLEY, MURKOWSKI, MATSUNAGA, and KENNEDY.

The Arms Control Subcommittee which I chair has held several hearings over the past 2 years on space weapons and arms control alternatives. As a result of these hearings, the Foreign Relations Committee has adopted without dissent Senate Joint Resolution 129.

We are on the verge of the most expensive weapons research effort in history. We have entered the advanced testing stage of an antisatellite weapon, without first giving arms control talks a chance.

Some may argue that verification in this area is impossible. But experts consulted by the committee believe otherwise. Testing of antisatellite weapons will make verification all the more difficult. It is therefore vital that Congress act now in urging the President to resume space weapons arms control talks which could guarantee U.S. security without a space arms race.

My principal concern is that a space weapons race will add enormously to U.S. defense costs without providing any increment to U.S. national security. The U.S. ASAT weapon will cost "tens of billions of dollars" according to the General Accounting Office. Can we afford such weapons when U.S. taxpayers are already heavily burdened by previously authorized weapons systems?

Beyond ASAT weapons, there are proposals for advanced ballistic missile defense systems which could cost well over a trillion dollars to implement. Let me repeat: well over a trillion dollars. The down payment which has already been requested is a mere $28 billion—more than the present MX system in its entirety. For this $28 billion we would get only basic research—no hardware—just ideas.

I believe from the fiscal perspective alone the United States must give space arms control our very best efforts. We owe it to American taxpayers to provide an effective national defense at the lowest possible cost. We must examine if arms control can provide us a way out of the developing weapons race in space. If we succeed, we will have enhanced U.S. security because the United States gains from a threat-free outer space environment. For our Nation, this benefit would be even greater than it would be for the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and ask unanimous consent that an article from the Los Angeles Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AVOIDING A CRIPPLING SPACE-WEAPONS RACE

(By Larry Pressler)

In 1969, at the time that the United States entered the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT), the Air Force was about to flight-test a dramatically new weapons technology. This new concept, multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles (MIRV), represented a breakthrough in that each ballistic missile would have the capability to attack several targets. Concerned senators asked that MIRVs be placed on the SALT agenda and that flight tests be canceled in the interim. The Nixon Administration rejected this advice in the belief that MIRVs would provide us with a significant military advantage that the Soviets would be hard pressed to match.

But the Soviets deployed MIRVs much sooner than expected, and now they are a principal cause of American strategic vulnerability.

Today, America is at a comparable juncture with regard to the development of space weapons, and the quest for short-term advantage may lead to similar long-term results. Unless there is a serious negotiating effort, anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons could prove to be the MIRVs of the 1980s.

In the early 1970s, the Soviets deployed an anti-satellite weapon that they have maintained and continued to test. Though this weapon has limited ability to attack large numbers of U.S. satellites, the absence of an American equivalent does make for a strategic imbalance. In the most recent test of this system in June, the ASAT was fired in coordination with launchers of land-based and sea-based strategic weapons, a MIRVed SS-20 theater missile and anti-ballistic missile defenses. This demonstration led some analysts to conclude that the Kremlin views ASATs as an important element for waging nuclear war.

Should current trends in Soviet research continue, the threat to U.S. space interests will not come from ASATs alone. Moscow has an active laser—and particle-beam weapons-development effort that can be deployed in or directed at space. Though this program may not be completed for more than a decade, the Soviets are said to be at least five years ahead of us in the development of these death rays. Taken as a whole, the Soviets now spend three to five times as much as we do on militarizing space.

The United States must take defensive measures against these developments. To begin with, we can reduce risks by stocking backup systems that could be launched if our satellites are threatened. The space shuttle could help put replacement satellites rapidly into position.

Then, too, defense analysts may have wrongly weighed the current vulnerabilities of our space network by understating the weakness of our land-based satellite-control facilities. Given the small number of such locations in relation to the large number of satellites, it could be easier to neutralize our space network from the ground. The plan to add a space-control complex at Colorado Springs is a move in the right direction.

I have far less confidence in military countermeasures in space. Hardening satellites and/or providing them with the capability to maneuver away from an attacker would add significantly to satellite costs and reduce the payload directed at the satellites'

primary mission-and it may not work. Countermeasures invite counter-counter-measures, and escape techniques are futile against beams traveling at the speed of light.

The most desirable remedy to the space-weapons threat is a ban on space weaponry. Arms-control talks aimed at this end have not received the attention that they deserve. The apparent successes on the ground of the yet-to-be flight-tested American ASAT are perhaps the chief cause of the neglect of arms control.

When our version of the ASAT was inaugurated, Washington's primary motive was to draw Moscow into talks aimed at dismantling the Soviet ASAT in exchange for cancellation of the American program. Three rounds of talks were held in 1978 and 1979, but were broken off after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the United States has made no effort to revive them. Strategic planners are reluctant to bargain away the American ASAT now that it appears that it will be significantly better than the Soviets' deployed weapon.

As in the case of MIRV development, the United States has sought short run advantage. In the long run, the benefits will be meager. Given the current dynamics of the Soviet space-weapons development program, the failure to stop ASATs and other space weapons will surely produce new Soviet deployments. In this race, the United States has far more to lose because we will continue to depend on space systems more than the Soviets will. Oceans separate us from areas that are in our national interest to defend, whereas the Soviet Union is in the heart of Eurasia, meaning that, while land lines provide the Soviets with rapid communications to their military forces, the command and control of U.S. military units is best achieved via satellites. Also, the open nature of our society makes it much easier for the Soviets to monitor U.S. military programs without "overhead" reconnaissance than it is for us to monitor theirs.

Pursuing a space-weapons race makes little sense. We face major deficiencies in our existing force structure. Adding another dimension to the U.S.-Soviet competition would require spreading ourselves even thinner. Besides, avoiding war requires some degree of stability in military developments, and introducing a space-weapons race would undermine the delicate balance of terror as well as the predictability that defense officials require for effective force planning.

The United States has every reason to give space arms control a try. With our ability to quickly test and deploy the U.S. ASAT as a backdrop, the Soviets may now negotiate seriously. Should negotiations fail, we would retain our current space-weapons option.●

S. 518

GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 2845

Mr. BAKER (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 518) to establish a program of grants administered by the Environmental Protection Agency for the purpose of aiding State and local programs of pollution abatement and control, as follows:

On page 5, after line 7, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Grants or agreements entered into under this section will be subject to prior appropriations Acts.".

CHAFEE (AND GRASSLEY) AMENDMENT NO. 2846

Mr. BAKER (for Mr. CHAFEE, and Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 518, supra, as follows:

On page 5, line 8, strike all through line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDING UNDER OTHER ACTS OF CONGRESS"

SEC. 5. Environmentally related programs as described in section 3 of this Act shall be eligible for funding through title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act.".

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

● Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I rise today to ask my colleagues to seriously look for a solution to the Federal deficit.

It is very clear to me that Congress and the country cannot wait until next year to bring the obese Federal budget under control. We must put the Federal budget on a strict diet before we find ourselves in the poorhouse.

As the Federal Government consumes more and more of the capital resources of the Nation, our economy becomes less and less productive. In order to make ends meet the Government borrows more money. This year alone, taxpayers will be forced to spend $116.5 billion on interest payments just to service the national debt.

A recent CBS News/New York Times poll indicated that 72 percent of the public were not willing to pay 10 percent more in Federal taxes to reduce the size of the Federal deficit. Mr. President, it is very clear that spending must be reduced.

Government spending is bleeding the country dry. Both sides of the aisle know this, and it is no secret to the American people either. The time is now to draw the line and stop the excessive Federal spending that is strangling the economy.

Last month, my good friend from North Carolina, JESSIE HELMS and I introduced a proposal that will effectively reduce the budget by 10 percent with the exception of social security and defense. This is a simple concept that will go a long way in reducing the Federal deficit. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, our amendment would save $38 billion in fiscal year 1985 and would reduce the deficit to $46.77 billion by fiscal year 1989.

It is our intent to offer this amendment when the first concurrent budget resolution reaches the Senate floor. Very simply, it provides that any budget that comes out of this body would be trimmer and healthier. While some have claimed that Federal spending has been reduced as far as it can, it is clear to me that any budget can stand a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. HELMS raised a similar proposal last year during the budget debate. It was late in the session and everybody wanted to go home for the weekend. Nevertheless, it got 41 votes. My good friend from North Carolina then redrafted his proposal and offered the same amendment as a 5-percent reduction. This received 45 votes.

Awareness and the gravity of our situation has increased. I do not believe we can wait any longer. Our amendment is long overdue. We intend to start now and work to enlist the necessary support of our colleagues to obtain passage. We owe the American people what they demand: fiscal responsibility.

We need to help maintain our current economic strength and insure a bright future.●

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we continue to hear about the economic recovery that Americans are enjoying. Well, as usual, rural Americans—29 percent of our Nation's population—are being left behind. The low-wage rates and narrow economic base that characterizes rural America leaves our small towns and cities vulnerable to both short- and long-term changes in economic conditions.

Poverty continues to be disproportionately grounded in rural areas. Thirty-nine percent of the total number of people living below the poverty line make their homes in rural areas, while rural America as a whole represents just 29 percent of the national population.

Due to pervasive low wage rates, even two family incomes cannot guarantee a better standard of living. In facts, two-thirds of all rural households with one family member working full time live below the poverty line, and in 31 percent of rural households, two full-time incomes still does not lift the family above that level.

Mr. President, this is hardly economic recovery. I ask that the following article "Recovery, What Recovery" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

RECOVERY? WHAT RECOVERY?

(By Thomas N. Bethell)

The recession officially ended a year ago. We're having one hell of a recovery. That's the prevailing view among mainstream economists, who think things will keep coming up roses all through 1984. This is nice for President Reagan, because the media will stop hammering him on unemployment (you can see the change on the nightly news shows already) and his opponents will be skittish about attacking

Reaganomics next year. But it's bad news to at least 30 million people for whom the recession still happens to be the central fact of life. For them, an American tragedy is in the making. They are about to become the invisible Americans of 1984.

Ignored by the White House, they will find new friends on Capitol Hill. A year ago, when unemployment was still climbing toward a peak of 10.8 percent nationwide—a level not seen since the Great Depression—the outgoing 97th Congress debated but failed to pass a bill that might have provided a million short-term public-service jobs. This year, the 98th Congress passed a compromise $4.6-billion bill that primarily beefed up appropriations for highway construction and Corps of Engineers projects. Since these kinds of projects employ people, Congress called its legislation an "emergency jobs bill," and the press went along with the joke.

Then, except for agreeing to extend unemployment benefits, Congress turned its back on the jobless. Now that the official unemployment rate has declined to 8.4 percent and appears likely to drop below 8 percent soon, most members of Congress are becoming downright hostile to any proposal of economic aid to the jobless.

This was never more clear than on November 18, when Congress adjourned for the year with the usual flurry of last-minute action on matters considered crucial to the future of the republic. It authorized the extra $8.4 billion that Reagan had promised to the International Monetary Fund, passed a bill regulating traffic on Interstate 66—which serves congressional aids commuting between Capitol Hill and suburban Virginia—and found time to confer citizenship on William Penn, who couldn't make it to the ceremony because he had been dead for 265 years.

Congress also adopted a $249-billion defense appropriations bill, giving its blessing to MX missiles and B-1 bombers despite evidence that neither weapon will improve our security. If the military-spending bill had been shaved by just 5 percent, the money saved—$12.5 billion—would have been enough to support a public-service jobs program capable of putting more than a million people to work painting schools, fixing bridges, building parks, cleaning streets, fighting soil erosion, improving watersheds, operating day-care centers, helping in hospitals, taking food to the elderly, and learning new skills.

A bit more compassion for the jobless and their communities at the expense of a couple of unworkable weapons systems wouldn't have crippled our defenses. And it wouldn't have added a dime to the federal deficit. So the standard objection to big federal jobs programs wouldn't wash. But Congress did not care. It just wanted to go home.

And it did, awarding itself a two-month break while dust began gathering on thousands of pages of proposed legislation—bills debated in 1983 but now probably doomed to stay on the shelf until at least 1985 because of the congressional tendency in election years to produce "nothing but fluff and partisan rhetoric," as House Budget Committee Chairman James Jones (D-OK) put it.

Among the bills abandoned in the rush to adjourn:

The American Conservation Corps Act, which would have created the beginnings of a nationwide program aimed at giving unemployed young people jobs and experience in resources conservation, much as the old Civilian Conservation Corps did for 3 million Americans during the Depression.

The Community Renewal Employment Act, intended to channel $10 billion to thousands of hard-pressed communities for repair and maintenance of roads, water/sewer systems, schools and libraries, clinics, parks and public lands, and public transportation systems, and for such services as health care, emergency food and shelter, and child care. This bill would have created an estimated 500,000 jobs.

The Fair Practice in Automotive Products Act, better known as the domestic-content bill. It would have required foreign car manufacturers to put some American-made parts in the cars they sell here, a move which could have helped ease unemployment among U.S. auto workers, who have watched 215,000 jobs disappear in their industry since 1978 (the recession started early for them and, thanks partly to Congress, it won't be ending any time soon). Auto workers are still suffering from a 27-percent unemployment rate.

The National Employment Priorities Act, a bill requiring companies to give advance notice of major layoffs and plant closings (which have cost 110,000 jobs in California alone since 1980). It would also have provided federal aid to communities abandoned by runaway industries.

The Training Act of 1983, which would have encouraged employers and employees to establish tax-deductible "individual training accounts" (ITAs). An employee could use accumulated ITA contributions for retraining, job search assistance, and relocation expenses.

Advocates of federal housing and community-development programs can take satisfaction from having helped the jobless, at least indirectly, by successfully steering a $15.6-billion housing authorization through Congress. The bill will mean better shelter for several thousand distressed families, and it will certainly create some jobs in housing construction. But it got through Congress only because of skillful last-minute maneuvering by a few key supporters, not because of any widespread congressional concern for the afflicted.

What can we expect in 1984? "A Mount Everest of congressional irresponsibility," predicts Rep. Newt Gingrich of Georgia. He's in a position to know. Like other GOP loyalists, Gingrich—who is personally and philosophically close to Budget Director David Stockman—will spend next year helping the White House churn out its familiar propaganda, stirring fear that the insatiable Democratic lust to "tax and tax, spend and spend" would take us back to the inflationary chaos of the Carter years. Democrats will fight back, of course, hurling equally familiar charges of callous indifference at the White House, but the fracas will be mainly smoke and noise.

In this mindless acrimony, most efforts to pass new legislation will be doomed. And supporters of existing social programs will be kept busy defending against the next round of budget-cutting proposals, which the Administration is preparing to release when Congress reconvenes at the end of January.

HUMDINGER

"Even the most committed pessimists are reluctantly concluding that America is enjoying one humdinger of an economic recovery," President Reagan says. Is he right?

The President, as you may have noticed, has a tendency to oversimplify complex subjects. In the case of the economy, the subject is so complex that there's a huge yawn-factor built into any serious discussion of what's happening. That works to the President's advantage. As House Majority Leader Jim Wright (D-TX) has pointed out, "The President's economic statements date back to when he was on the lecture circuit for General Electric. Imbedded in his mind are the lines he could rely on to get applause."

The old scripts still work. Reagan still gets applause: his public approval rating at the end of November was above 60 percent. But that doesn't make him right. No humdinger, this recovery.

Close inspection shows, first, that the recovery is uneven and, in historical terms, not spectacularly strong. Second, its duration is likely to be comparatively brief—probably long enough to get Reagan reelected, but not long enough to get us through his second term without another recession, because Reagan's unprecedented $200-billion-plus deficits will eventually force up interest rates as government and business compete to borrow money.

Third, this recovery isn't the kind of rising tide that lifts all boasts, to borrow President Kennedy's metaphor. Many boats have been tossed on the rocks by a brutal economic storm which economists, with characteristic blandness, call "structural" unemployment. That adjective refers to the structure of the economy, but the storm does structural harm to small boats, too. This recovery won't repair hull damage, let alone float the most battered boats again.

In human terms, perhaps as many as 50 million Americans have been battered by the recession. Those still being hurt include millions of young people currently coming into the job market for the first time and discovering that nobody needs them. The unemployment rate for the 16-21 age group as a whole is 21 percent, and for black teenagers it's 50 percent. Suppose the average overall unemployment rate drops to 7.5 percent next year. Young job-seekers as a group will still be suffering from a 19-percent unemployment rate, and black teenagers will be enduring a 45-percent rate. Some recovery!

The ranks of the afflicted also include an estimated 3.5 million blue-collar worker who have been laid off since the recession began and who won't be going back to their old jobs no matter how rugged the recovery. Their old jobs are gone. In other words, their job slots don't exist any more, for one or more of four general reasons:

The industry that employed them is shrinking (steel, for instance); the company that employed them went under (as more than 22,000 companies did last year, a failure rate four times as high as in non-recession years); the company is still operating but management has shifted to "out-sourcing," which means it's making widgets in Korea instead of Kalamazoo; or the company is making the same number of widgets but with fewer workers. (Managers call this "enhanced productivity." Workers call it a speed-up).

Sure, many of the workers affected by this kind of unemployment will find other jobs, somehow, somewhere, sooner or later. But many won't. As many as a million workers have three strikes against them: they're victims of structural unemployment, they're at least 50 years old, and their skills are not readily adaptable to other work.

"What do you say, finally, to someone who was a second helper in a blast furnace?" asks Staughton Lynd, the author

and attorney who directs Northeast Ohio Legal Services in Youngstown. "He's not worth a damn outside that kind of steel mill." And that kind of steel mill isn't worth a damn against modern German and Japanese competitors.

That's why as many as 20,000 of the 50,000 unemployed workers in the Mahoning Valley around Youngstown may never find real jobs again. They're old and scuffed and their skills are irrelevant to potential employers, but they're too young to retire. They are, in other words, little boats with big holes in their hulls and no rudders. They need extensive repairs, the kind that can be made only by federal jobs programs of the kind Congress doesn't care about.

What about women? In rural areas, especially, they have been coming into the labor force relatively slowly and relatively recently. The recession has had effect of knocking many of them back out, although the numbers here tend to get jumbled, because it has also had a perverse reverse effect: In this recession, wives of laid-off workers in basic industries have been scrambling out of the house to find whatever's available, at any wage, in any kind of service job.

When that happens, there's a nice clean statistical trade: John is jobless, but Mary has joined the labor force. Maybe statistics don't lie, but if John was dumped from a $13.61-an-hour, 40-hours-a-week union job at a refinery and Mary barely clears the $3.35 minimum wage in a 16-hours-a-week part-time job at a luncheonette, it should be obvious that statistics can be slippery.

Of the approximately 45 million women in the labor force today, about a third have entered it since the recession began, according to estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and they've been entering at a markedly faster rate than during the immediate pre-recession period. A little arithmetic leads to the conclusion that the employment status of perhaps as many as 5 million women may be especially precarious, mainly because they're working cheap or part-time or lack seniority (and are thus likely to be hit by the next layoff) or all three.

This is the stuff of an economic and social nightmare. We have a civilian labor pool of approximately 112 million Americans, growing by more than a million a year. By official count, 102.7 million are working, and 9.4 million are not. What the President calls a "humdinger" of a recovery appears to be, in fact, a short-time economic trend unlikely to bring the unemployment rate below 7.5 percent before 1987 (using the Administration's own projections)—assuming that the recovery lasts that long. And few, if any, alert economists would bet money on that. Those projections mean that, at a minimum, 8.8 million Americans will be struggling with joblessness four years from now—in "good" times. If, in the meantime, we run into another recession, and unemployment breaks though to new postwar highs (as has happened in each of the past three recessions), we could be talking about 20 million unemployed or underemployed men and women. When you factor in families, that's 50 to 60 million Americans in distress.

We're riding a humdinger? It looks more than a rollercoaster. And just because the little car is moving upward on the tracks right now doesn't mean it isn't going to go down again. Don't forget, we've just experienced "a textbook application of scorched-earth economics," as policy analyst Peter Edelman puts it, "squeezing inflation out of the system by driving people out of work." Painful as that may be, it's only a temporary cure, because not one of the broad, basic causes of economic illness have been addressed by the Reagan administration. It's not hard to list the big ones:

Deficits? Growing. Necessary tax increases? They're being postponed again. Corporate capital? It's still being used for mergers instead of research-and-development, plant-upgrading, and quality-control. We're spending too much public money on unproductive investments (primarily weapons) and too little on investments with high but delayed dividends (education, conservation, community development). Our central cities and small towns are still falling apart. We haven't done anything to control foreign competition or multinationals shopping around the world for cheap labor. Our big banks with big uncollectable loans to Third World countries are, as they say, "exposed." We're trapped in a religious war in the Middle East and we're promoting a barroom brawl in Central America. Another oil embargo could cripple us, and a handful of determined terrorists in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia and a few other hot spots could set that scenario in motion.

This is quite a collection of things that might go *bump* in the economic night. True, the President has had a terrific run of good luck. And it may well see him through the election.

But if you think rollercoasters only go up . . . better hang on tight.

THE TUNNEL AT THE END OF THE LIGHT

More people are working now than were working a year ago. That's the only point the President wants us to keep in mind, and he's getting considerable help from the press. His point is correct, as far as it goes. But it doesn't go far enough. The President is counting on our bad memories and our impatience with details to help him obscure what's happened while he's been in charge.

Remember, the official unemployment rate stood at 7.4 percent in January, 1981, when President Reagan took office. It hovered at approximately that level for eight months, until Reagonomics started taking effect in October, 1981 (the beginning of fiscal year 1982). The official unemployment rate for October reached 8 percent. In November it climbed to 8.4 percent (precisely the same rate Recorded for November, 1983, two years later). By December it had reached 8.9 percent. The climb continued throughout 1982 before peaking at 10.8 percent and starting back down.

Has the unemployment rate dropped with amazing speed? Yes, if you believe the White House and most of the media. No, if you look at the numbers and the calendar, preferably at the same time.

Just listening to all the babble here in Washington when the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that the November unemployment rate had descended to 8.4 percent, it would be hard to tell whether you were watching the economy or an opening night on Broadway. Here's how the new rate was greeted:

"Remarkable!"—Larry Speakes, White House.

"Remarkable!"—News report, Washington Post.

"Remarkable!"—Editorial, Washington Post.

"Stunning!"—ABC News.

"Stunning!"—CBS News.

"Stunning!"—Associated Press Radio.

"Striking! The strongest economic recovery since World War II!"—Business Week.

"More Americans at work than ever before in the history of our country!"—Ray Donovan, Labor Secretary.

"Will mean happier holidays for millions of Americans!"—USA Today.

For sheer skill in news management, you've got to hand it to the White House. Look at it this way. Could you sell a car that runs on three cylinders, gets seven miles to the gallon, and has no shock absorbers, turn signals, or windshield wipers? Most Washington journalists would buy such a vehicle, apparently, if Ronald Reagan offered it to them. He sells the economy that way—"Shucks, fellas, last year it had four flat tires"—and they buy it. And then they take it on the road, proclaiming to anyone who will listen (and that's a lot of people, if the polls mean anything): "It's a 1984 Reagan. Hey—great car. Four new tires!"

Nevertheless, the simple fact is that the unemployment rate needed about a year to climb from 8.4 percent to 10.8 percent, and it has needed about a year to fall back to 8.4 percent. That does not mean that things will be fine from here on. It does confirm that virtually all of Reagan's term of office has been spent letting unemployment climb high enough to halt inflation by wiping out the buying power of millions of Americans for a relatively long period of time. (For example, a recent Boston College study of a group of laid-off auto workers found that 47 percent of them had exhausted half of their savings and 25 percent had exhausted every last dime.)

With the help of smoke and mirrors, this wretched method of controlling inflation contributes to a process called "building consumer confidence." With inflation temporarily under control, and millions of still-employed Americans adjusting to previously unthinkable circumstances (a 12-percent mortgage on a two-bedroom $90,000 house), consumer spending eventually increases and businesses start rebuilding inventories, which gives manufacturers reason to manufacture something, and makes them feel good.

This is called "recovery". It creates enough of a boom to make money on Wall Street for a small percentage of the citizenry, and it creates a market for magazine articles arguing that the rich must be doing something right, inasmuch as they are still richer than the rest of us. But the term itself is deceptive.

In medical science, "recovery" means that the patient is well. In economics, it means only that he is up and lurching around the room. When the patient is as big and unruly as the American economy, many things could happen next. Maybe the patient will put on his clothes and go home. But maybe he will get tangled in his tubing and fall down the stairs and break every bone in his body. Best to stand back at a safe distance and watch. If only we could.

WHY RURAL PROBLEMS OUTLAST RECESSIONS

This recession was underway early in many parts of rural America and won't end any time soon, because many rural areas still depend heavily on industries susceptible to economic trends that began developing long before this recession hit the nation as a whole. The recovery may mask those trends for awhile, but they're still there. That's why so many rural workers have the vague sense that they're always in a recession.

Coal miners in Appalachia are fighting a runaway industry. With considerable help in recent years from federal coal-leasing

policies, companies have been developing huge strip mines in the West, motivated by forecasts in the 1970s of a vast market for coal in the mid-1980s. It hasn't materialized. Result: intense competition between western surface mines and less profitable undergound mines in Appalachia. Victims: thousands of miners, their families, and their communities.

Textile workers in the Southeast are fighting a runaway industry too. Workers have been battered by more than 200 plant closings in North Carolina alone since the recession began, costing more than 57,000 jobs. But the recession isn't the main cause—the big problem is the use of American capital to finance cheap-labor textile plants abroad. That pattern began before the recession, and recovery won't put a stop to it. Textile workers in other parts of the South must also battle poverty-level wages, another problem that predates the recession and will linger long after.

Timber industry workers have bounced through one recession after another. High interest rates in 1978 knocked housing construction into a slump from which it has never fully recovered. But a greater problem for workers and their communities has been the tendency of the industry to shift its base from the Pacific Northwest and northern Midwest to the Southeast. That means sustained high unemployment in the abandoned regions and a mixed blessing, at best, in the South: work, but not for many people (because the industry is increasingly automated), and coexistence with yet another tough, anti-union industry.

Farming is still the economic backbone of much of rural America but it no longer provides stable employment for large numbers of people. Against a general population increase in rural areas in the '70s, 42 of the 66 counties in South Dakota lost population—an example widely duplicated across the Great Plains. Much of this is due, of course, to mechanization, a process that proceeds without paying much attention to recessions (and accelerates during recoveries). And seasonal farmworkers still bump along on the bottom of the economy in good times and bad.

Economic diversification has generally benefited rural America in recent years, but again the blessings are mixed. Basic industries pay better than the service sector, as a rule. McDonald's is a cleaner place to work than a coal mine, but the hourly wages and benefits are about one-fifth as high. It may sound high-tech to have a job on a computer assembly line in Minnesota, but the work is boring, the supervisors stop-watch your toilet breaks, union organizing is frowned on—and the pay is low.

For these and other reasons, working conditions in rural America can be rough regardless of recessions. Median rural income is about 78 percent of urban. Poverty in America, as tabulated by the Census Bureau and the Department of Agriculture, remains disproportionately rural: only 28 percent of America's people live in rural areas, but 39 percent of America's poor can be found there. Low wage scales mean that in rural areas you can be a full-time breadwinner and still be poor: in 28 percent of the poor families in rural areas, the head of the household works full-time. In 31 percent of the poor families in rural areas, the family remains poor even though two family members work full-time. That's almost twice the percentage for urban families with two wage-earners.

Figures like these mean it's nonsense to believe a short-term recovery can resolve deep, basic problems afflicting millions of people. Rural Americans need long-term planning—at the local, state, and federal levels—and they need the short-term support that many federal programs provided, back in the days when voodoo and vaudeville were not part of economics.

STRUCTURAL STRESS: 'WHO DO YOU PUNCH?'

No matter how you juggle the numbers and the rhetoric, the basic imbalance remains the same. Throughout the rest of the decade, more and more Americans will march into the labor market only to find fewer and fewer jobs that match their skills.

That's a rough but serviceable definition of structural unemployment, a problem that the recovery hasn't solved and won't solve. Martin Feldstein, the as-yet unmuzzled chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, says structural unemployment accounts for nearly 60 percent of the total. Putting it another way, six out of every ten workers currently laid off can't expect to be called back to their old jobs—and there's not much hope of finding the same kind of work somewhere else.

A new study, Distressed Workers, written by Vanderbilt University economist Daniel Saks under the auspices of the National Planning Association, predicts that large numbers of the structurally unemployed will face chronic unemployment or poverty wages or both throughout the rest of the decade. Regardless of the strength of the recovery, "serious structural problems in the labor market will leave concentrated groups in distress," Saks writes.

Structural employment problems created widespread distress even in what we now think of as the Good Old Days. Saks estimates that 11 million Americans—about 10 percent of the work force—were in economic distress in 1979, before the recession began. Of that number, 4 million could find only occasional work and 7 million were working at poverty-level wages.

Saks describes four categories of workers who will have particular difficulty in the turbulent job market of coming years:

Young would-be workers lacking skills or opportunities to break into the labor market.

Disadvantaged workers whose normal earnings will be too low to lift their families out of poverty.

Dislocated workers who have been accustomed to steady work at good pay but find—while still in their prime years—that those kinds of jobs are disappearing.

Older workers, often with health problems, who have little earning power or retirement income.

Saks notes that because the problems of each group are significantly different, policies must be developed with that in mind. Young people rejected by the labor market need alternative and remedial schools and intensive residential training programs like the Job Corps; disadvantaged workers need income-maintenance programs, including public service employment programs; dislocated workers need individual counseling along with protracted retraining; and older workers need increased opportunities to retire earlier and increased health-care programs.

These approaches would represent a 180-degree change from the direction we've been going under a determined President Reagan and a befuddled Congress. Moreover, although reports like Distressed Workers are valuable, when they get into policy recommendations they tend to understate the complexity of the problems faced by individual workers, even the most resourceful, when they come up against structural unemployment.

Take the case of Ron Bricker. He's a 40-year-old Pennsylvania steelworker who got laid off last April, enrolled at a state-financed job retraining center, and made headlines when President Reagan visited the center and Bricker handed him a resume.

Reagan telephoned Bricker the next day with a job offer from Radio Shack, which had contacted the White House and was prepared to train Bricker as a computer service technician. Administration publicists were ecstatic, not only because they could demonstrate presidential compassion for the jobless but because they would be able to use Bricker as an example: With a lot of gumption and a little help from the Gipper, down-and-out worker in fading industry jumps to computers, rides wave of future. A natural. Perfect for Hollywood.

But Washington County, Pa., isn't Hollywood and the real world isn't so simple. Bricker had been making $13 an hour in his old job, enough to support his wife and son and keep up the payments on a modest but new home. Trained as a computer technician, Bricker began collecting a technician's pay: $6.50 an hour. His take-home pay—$196.50 a week—turned out to be $2 less than he had been collecting in unemployment compensation. Bills began piling up. He fell behind on payments. After two months with Radio Shack, he quit, deciding he'd do better looking for work elsewhere.

"I figured computers were the future," Bricker told an Associated Press reporter, "but the money isn't there."

The steel mill has picked up some orders recently and Bricker has been recalled to his old job. But he expects to be laid off again before long. He doesn't know what will happen after that.

"I'm really bitter about what's going on in this country," Bricker says. "I want to reach out and punch someone, but I don't know who to punch."

He's in good company. Millions of Americans have discovered that they can't trade up in the job market, through circumstances beyond their control, and they don't know who to punch, either. There are no simple answers to the problems they face, but it should be obvious that they need a lot of help. They need a whole battery of public and private programs to help them through the difficult years ahead. They need programs that are carefully planned and thought out, properly coordinated, and, perhaps most important, sustained—programs that aren't switched on and off whenever the mood swings in Washington.

Counting all the members of Congress and the occupant of the White House, there are 536 elected big-thinkers in Washington. If they can't figure out how to help the Ron Brickers of this world, sooner or later the Ron Brickers of this world will figure out who to punch.

REAGAN'S BOX SCORE

49-Year Record: The number of unemployed people reached 12,036,000 in December, 1982, the highest number since 1933.

42-Year Record: The unemployment rate reached 10.8 percent in December, 1982, the highest rate since 1940.

All-Time Record: Initial claims for unemployment insurance reached 703,000 during the week of September 18, 1982, the highest one-week total ever.

All-Time Record: The number of people employed part-time because they couldn't find full-time work reached 6,845,000 in January, 1983, the highest number on record.

All-Time Record: The number of discouraged workers—those who have given up looking for work and are no longer counted among the unemployed—reached an estimated 1,849,000 in the fourth quarter of 1982, the highest number ever recorded.●

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN DEFENSE POLICY

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues a statement presented recently by my good friend and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator TOWER. The chairman's farewell statement before the Senate Budget Committee captures both the frustrations and rewards of being involved in the formulation of our country's national security policy. It is the voice of experience, and speaks to the most fundamental relationships between the Congress and executive branch in formulating our defense policy, in setting national priorities within the Federal budget, and in managing efficiently our resources allocated to national defense. Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Senate, I ask that Chairman TOWER's statement before the Senate Budget Committee on March 6, 1984, be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN TOWER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

A NATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA FOR THE CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present to this committee, for the third and final time as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my personal views on our country's future requirements for national defense.

In preparing for this hearing, I had given thought to updating testimony presented over the last 2 years, wherein I outlined many of the current and future challenges to our foreign policy, emphasized the need to continue rebuilding our defense posture, and identified some of the practical and financial pitfalls that prevent efficient execution of the defense program in an unstable defense budgeting environment.

I commend these issues to you once again; they are central and enduring. Clearly, the problem of redressing the current military imbalance with an adversary that still maintains a broader based and more aggressive weapons modernization program is just as persistent today as it ever has been. The foreign, domestic, and economic implications of a widening gap between the relative military capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union should weigh heavily in our national planning—including that done by this committee—for the foreseeable future. We will do the country a great disservice if we avoid this central problem and its enormous implications for the Nation's future well-being.

On second thought, however, I concluded that these issues will play, unfortunately, an extremely limited role, if any, in the context of the immediate search for a solution to this year's budget impasse. The plain truth is that Congress has not listened to these arguments over the past 2 years, and probably will not seriously consider them in its deliberations on the President's fiscal year 1985 budget. Despite this administration's best efforts to present a defense budget based on visible threats and long-term security requirements, the Congress is determined to consider defense issues only in the context of near-term affordability.

This is an old, but I sense, growing problem, one that is now polarizing the relationship between Congress and the President on the issue of national defense and is frustrating efforts to develop and execute a balanced and stable defense program.

Insofar as the Congress is part of the problem, it must be part of any solution. This has caused me to reflect upon a national security agenda for the Congress that might assist in reestablishing fundamental points of reference for leaders of both branches of Government and of both parties, as we attempt to secure the long-term interests of the United States in a volatile and uncertain world. This agenda has five important elements, from congressional self-examination and reform to consensus building and leadership. We should begin by reviewing the proper role of Congress in setting national priorities and formulating the Federal budget.

REVIEW OUR RELATIONSHIP TO THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Holding the power to tax and spend, Congress, of course, has played, and will continue to play, a major role in the Federal budget process. But in more recent years, some in Congress have assumed an almost sanctimonious attitude that I believe vastly inflates our individual and collective competence.

Some have taken to ignoring Presidential budgets—not just parts of them, but whole budgets. Rather than working our will through the committee system, we ask the President to "send us a more realistic budget," or we barter back and forth in highly informal, politicized, and public "negotiations." Members of Congress, even freshman Members, write their own prescriptive budgets for the entire Federal Government.

So, the first priority should be to assess the basic relationship of the Congress with the executive branch. The Congress may decide that these current trends are appropriate. In fact, as the chairman of an authorizing committee, no one has had a greater interest than I have in protecting the prerogative of congressional oversight. However, I suspect that such a review would highlight several key, constitutionally derived limitations.

We are a relatively unorganized group of 535 individuals with no real executive authority, whose collective decisionmaking capabilities are diffused and painfully limited. Our knowledge of, and responsibility for, governing Federal agencies is also limited. Our government was organized to include only one executive branch, and the taxpayers should be paying for only one.

It is a weak government indeed that is ruled exclusively by the lowest common denominator of its legislature and the perpetual acquiescence of its executive. No Senator or Congressman is elected to serve all the people. Before we reject it out of hand, we must acknowlege and respect the need in our form of Government for Presidential leadership, lest we presume to set a course for the Nation substantially at odds with that which he has proposed. A President's statement and agenda of national priorities is not inviolate but, in principle, I believe it should carry more weight than that of any committee of Congress.

After reviewing in general terms our proper role in setting national priorities and formulating the Federal budget, the Congress should turn to an internal reassessment of its increasing involvement in defense and foreign policy.

RECONSIDER CURRENT TRENDS IN CONGRESSIONAL BEHAVIOR

Here again I am concerned about current trends in Congress. When the President convened a bipartisan commission to address social security issues, its results were accepted and enacted into law. While similar commissions have been organized on Strategic Forces and Central American policy, their results and recommendations still face repeated debate and challenge. When we, in Congress, act upon difficult issues such as taxes and social security, we tend not to want to revisit them anytime soon. However, this does not seem to hold true in defense and foreign policy. It is not my view that the work of bipartisan commissions should necessarily be rubber-stamped by the Congress. I do believe, however, that the work of such outside experts on important long-term problems in defense and foreign policy deserve as much serious consideration as that given to the resolution of domestic problems.

The area of arms control is another example of how our responsibilities for congressional oversight are taken to the extreme in areas far removed from our immediate constitutional duties. Too few can resist the temptation to publicly advise the President on how to negotiate with the Soviet Union, and propose their own schemes for arms control. In the recent past, more often than not, congressional intrusion has played the foil to U.S. negotiating positions, while the Soviets wait stoically for further U.S. concessions at the bargaining table. Many times, the source of our intrusion in foreign policy is domestic politics; that is, the desire to fulfill the narrow wishes of America's many ethnic minorities, or to enhance one's credibility in the media.

In defense policy, the Congress—occasionally including my own committee—is engaged in too much micromanagement at the expense of the broader review of defense requirements and priorities. Moreover, Congress itself is often the source of the restrictive rules, regulations, and guidelines that prevent the efficient use of taxpayer dollars. The defense authorization and appropriation acts contain over 100 general provisions, many of which tell the Department of Defense what it cannot do to spend defense dollars more wisely.

The provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act require the payment of prevailing wages, usually union rates, for contracting on Federal construction projects. If Davis-Bacon were eliminated, the fiscal year 1985 military construction program, if approved intact, would cost roughly $300 million less than has been requested.

In attempting to protect Federal employees, the Congress also restricts DOD's ability to contract-out for various services. The additional cost to the taxpayers exceeds $500 million in budget authority over a 3-year period.

And, of course, base closures and realignments—correctly viewed as legislative infeasible—are worth billions over time.

In addition, congressional action on individual defense programs can also be a primary cause of increased costs. We have stretched out programs, and even continued those for which there is no longer a valid military requirement, such as the A-10. In some cases, we have promoted dual-sourcing where the real demand is barely sufficient to support one producer, or insisted upon sole-sourcing where competition would be excluded.

Many of these restrictions, and they are almost too numerous to count, amount to congressionally mandated waste. It is also interesting to note that while Congress has never had a stronger grip on defense management than it has today, we have never complained louder about waste, fraud, and abuse. While I will continue to try to seriously address these issues, I will not be moved prematurely by those who decry the Defense Department's so-called waste, fraud and abuse, and so propose enormous cuts in the defense budget, but in fact fail to support the legislative changes necessary to achieve reforms.

Addressing this larger problem head-on—that is, the lack of congressional self-restraint—is perhaps the precursor to a third item on the agenda.

LEGISLATIVE REFORM

After looking back to our constitutional roots and comparing them with current congressional practices, I believe the Congress should be willing to consider legislative reforms, such as a reorganization of the committee system and the congressional budget process, to remove unnecessary layering and overlapping jurisdictions.

This committee has already received testimony from many witnesses on potential changes to the congressional budget process, and I will devote more thought to this issue in the coming months. For now, I can only say that it is getting somewhat embarrassing, in responding to questions about reform of this budget process, to explain that we are so bogged down in the process that we haven't got the time to consider changing it.

Without making reference to any specific proposal for legislative reform, I would clearly be inclined to inject the current system with a greater capacity for institutional leadership and self-discipline. I believe the need for such leadership is clear. During the last 15 years, the average years of service in the Senate has declined from 11.6 to 8.5 years, the lowest average since 1955. The 97th Congress had a greater proportion of Senators serving first terms (56 percent) than any Congress since 1923. The drift of power away from the full committee and towards subcommittees has thus been recently combined with a period of higher turnover and declining experience and longevity among Senators.

In addition, we have too many committees with overlapping jurisdictions. The 92 hearings held by the Armed Services Committee last year accounted for only 54 percent of the Senate hearings in which the Department of Defense presented testimony. I speak with a vested interest, but also, I believe, in the interests of the Senate in arguing that the committees of greatest expertise should be given more exclusive responsibility for recommendations to the Senate. It should also be evident that, except in the review of conference agreements, the Senate need not vote on the same issue more than once a year. Serious consideration ought to be given to whether or not we really need a separate authorization and appropriations process, and whether their consolidation might not result in a reduction in the congressional workload, and in more cohesive and clear statements of legislative intent.

FIDELITY AND LEADERSHIP

If the Senate can reassess its relationship with the executive branch, move away from the current tendencies toward narrow self-interest, and reorganize itself to speak more clearly on issues of national importance, then I believe we would be prepared to offer the kind of leadership for the country that was envisioned in the Constitution.

Senator Russell once asked a colleague about the results of recent elections. The colleague replied that his margin of victory over the years had been steadily climbing, and he was now getting over 85 percent of the vote. Russell responded to the effect that this margin of victory was much too high for a Senator, because it showed that he was doing too much following and not enough leading. The more time we spend in the Senate, he argued, the more leadership we own the Nation.

And so, a fourth item on the national security agenda is the need for Congress, particularly the Senate, to provide greater leadership, and to cultivate among our constituents a greater appreciation for America's role in the world and the broad requirements of our defense and foreign policy.

This will undoubtedly be a considerable challenge. Somewhere along the way, we have failed to impart to the current generation, including many in Congress, an adequate appreciation of international affairs. While many claim to understand the dangers and costs of war, too few are schooled in the balance of diplomatic and military arts required to prevent it. Rather than providing background and insight to America's long-term interests, too many Members return from their factfinding trips abroad with "clientitis," an affliction generally associated with junior Foreign Service Officers.

Leadership and statecraft have a special place in the Senate, but they do not come naturally in our political system. In my view, we must work harder to strike the proper balance between moving the country in the direction our constituents want it to go—frequently toward disengagement and isolationism—and leading the Nation toward where we must go if we are to maintain a global political and military balance of power in the years ahead. This, indeed, is our highest duty.

REBUILD A BIPARTISAN CONSENSUS ON DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

All these thoughts, Mr. chairman, are focused on what I believe is one of the Nation's highest priorities: Rebuilding a bipartisan consensus on defense and foreign policy.

In foreign policy, the results of our rancorous disagreements are all too obvious. In defense, while the results are less open to public view, they are no less detrimental.

The current impasse on defense is largely the result of contrasting approaches to the strategic problem of how best to meet our international obligations. The administration maintains that these obligations, and the military requirements identified to support them, should provide the basis for the defense budget request. Conversely, the Congress generally seems to argue that domestic politics and available resources should determine "How much is enough" for defense.

In my view, we must soon come to a resolution of these differences. In the last 3 years, the Congress has made major reductions in the defense budget—in fiscal year 1982, a reduction of $7 billion; in fiscal year 1983, $18 billion, and in fiscal year 1984, $17 billion—and it appears as though substantial reductions in fiscal year 1985 are inevitable. We, in Congress, complain about mismanagement and waste in the Pentagon and yet it is these large annual funding changes which make sound program management impossible and cost overruns a certainty.

I would characterize the immediate future of the defense program, in financial and programming terms, as very unstable. The Department of Defense is planning for future increases beyond what appears to be politically feasible; and some in Congress are considering reductions from the President's request well beyond the bounds of prudent risk. In reaching the correct budget figures for fiscal year 1985 and the outyears, I would emphasize four important objectives: Consensus, commitment, stability, and steadiness of purpose.

I hope that we, in the Congress, and the administration can approach this problem with open minds; the administration, sensitive to the need to restore a bipartisan consensus on national defense, and we, in Congress, true to our constitutional obligation to provide for the common defense.

There will always be risks in compromise, but the potential long-term benefits to the Nation could make it well worth the effort.●

PROPOSED ARMS SALES

● Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of proposed arms sales under that act in excess of $50 million or, in the case of major defense equipment as defined in the act, those in excess of $14 million. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that such information is available to the full Senate, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the notifications which have been received. The classified annexes referred to in several of the covering letters are available to Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

The notifications follow:

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1984.

In Reply refer to: I-00517/84ct.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 84-35 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter of Offer to Singapore for defense articles and serv-

ices estimated to cost $280 million. Shortly after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media of the unclassified portion of this Transmittal.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C. GAST,
Director.

TRANSMITTAL No. 84-35

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act

(i) Prospective purchaser: Singapore.

(ii) Total estimated value:

	Millions
Major defense equipment [1]	$130
Other	150
Total	280

[1] As defined in section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

(iii) description of articles or services offered: A quantity of eight F-16/79 aircraft with government-furnished aeronautical and avionics equipment for installation during production, aircraft spares, support equipment, and training.

(iv) Military department: Air Force (SDA and YFA).

(v) Sales commission, fee, etc., paid, offered, or agreed to be paid:

(vi) Sensitivity of technology contained in the defense articles or defense services proposed to be sold: See annex under separate cover.

(vii) Section 28 report: Included in report for quarter ending December 31, 1083.

(viii) Date report delivered to Congress: March 22, 1984.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

SINGAPORE—F-16/79 AIRCRAFT

The Government of Singapore has requested the purchase of a quantity of eight F-16/79 aircraft with government-furnished aeronautical and avionics equipment for installation during production, aircraft spares, support equipment, and training at an estimated cost of $280 million. It is anticipated that these aircraft will remain in the United States for some time after the sale to allow Singapore Air Force personnel to receive training from the United States Air Force.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country which is a continuing force for peace and regional stability in Southeast Asia. Singapore's strategic location astride the narrow entrance to the Strait of Malacca commands the primary route between the Indian and Pacific Oceans, one of the world's busiest waterways. Through this strait passes the bulk of West to East tanker traffic from the oil rich Middle-East. Sale of the F-16/79 to Singapore would support United States' security objectives by improving Singapore's capability to defend itself, promoting closer ties between Singapore and the United States, and permitting Singapore to play a greater role in regional defense.

Recognizing that its small size could make Singapore a target of aggression, Singapore's defense strategy has been to make it clear that an attack would be unprofitably expensive. The F-16/79 will modernize the Republic of Singapore Air Force's (RSAF) aging fighter force and improve its capability to counter the present and projected regional threats. The F-16/79 will provide the RSAF with the opportunity to train a cadre of pilots and technicians in the operation and maintenance of a technically sophisticated aircraft.

The sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be the General Dynamics Corporation of Forth Worth, Texas.

Implementation of this sale will require the assignment of six additional contractor representatives to Singapore for 24 months.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.

DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1984.

In reply refer to: I-00004/84ct.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 84-34 and under separate cover the classified annex thereto. This Transmittal concerns the Department of the Army's proposed Letter of Offer to the Philippines for defense articles and services estimated to cost $30 million. Shortly after this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to notify the news media of the unclassified portion of this Transmittal.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C. GAST
Director.

TRANSMITTAL No. 84-34

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act

(i) Prospective purchaser: Phillipines.

(ii) Total estimated value:

	Millions
Major defense equipment [1]	$20
Other	10
Total	30

[1] As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

(iii) Description of articles or services offered: A quantity of 24 M167A1 20mm towed Vulcan anti-aircraft artillery with associated support equipment, concurrent spare parts, publications, services, support, and training equipment.

(iv) Military department: Army (ULI).

(v) Sales commission, fee, etc., paid, offered, or agreed to be paid: None.

(vi) Sensitivity of technology contained in the defense articles or defense services proposed to be sold: See annex under separate cover.

(vii) Section 28 report: Included in report for quarter ending December 31, 1983.

(viii) Date report delivered to Congress: March 22, 1984.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

THE PHILIPPINES—VULCAN ANTI-AIRCRAFT ARTILLERY

The Government of the Philippines has requested the purchase of a quantity of 24 M167A1 20mm towed VULCAN anti-aircraft artillery with associated support equipment, concurrent spare parts, publications, services, support, and training equipment at an estimated cost of $30 million.

This proposed sale is consistent with the U.S. Government policy of assisting the Philippines in its force modernization program. Further, the sale will be viewed by neighboring friendly countries as evidence of U.S. interest in maintaining regional peace and stability.

The VULCAN anti-aircraft artillery to be sold is to be used in the modernization of the Philippine air defense forces.

The sale of this equipment and support will not affect the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be the General Electric Company of Burlington, Vermont.

Implementation of this sale will require the assignment of three additional U.S. Government personnel to the Philippines for two weeks and two contractor representatives for one year.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this sale.●

NATIONAL ENERGY EDUCATION DAY

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, Friday, March 23, 1984, marked the celebration of National Energy Education Day (NEED). This important project promotes the development of energy education programs in our schools and communities. NEED also seeks to develop student leadership skills and participation in energy conservation and education programs.

At a time when this country is still heavily dependent on imported oil, NEED prepares future leaders for the important energy decisions they will be called on to make to secure our energy outlook. As this year's chairman of the 1984 National Energy Education Day Project, I am proud to be associated with this important national effort and congratulate those who have made this day so successful.

Mr. President, I ask that a recent article appearing in the National Science Teachers Association's "Energy and Education" be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

GUEST EDITORIAL

(Senator John Heinz, a member of Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is Chairman of the Alliance to Save Energy, a nonprofit coalition of government, business, labor, and consumer leaders dedicated to increasing the efficiency of energy use, located in Washington, D.C.)

In the decade since Arab oil ministers imposed an embargo on oil sales to the United States, our nation has made some progress in increasing the efficiency of our energy use. Oil imports, total energy use, and energy use per dollar of gross national product have all declined since 1973. However, if I were to assign a grade to our endeavors to promote energy-efficiency in our homes, factories, and schools, I would give us an incomplete grade.

The crisis atmosphere that surrounded the first embargo in 1973 and the subsequent oil shocks have been replaced with a disturbing attitude of complacency. Most Americans believe we have done all we can to use energy more efficiently. They think little about paying up to $1.50 for a gallon of gas for their cars.

Can we further reduce our consumption of both foreign and domestically produced sources of energy, while improving our standard of living? As Chairman of the Alliance to Save Energy, my answer is a re-

sounding 'yes,' We must educate the nation to dispel the belief that we have done all we can to promote conservation and efficiency. We've got a long way to go before we can successfully pass the energy test first imposed more than ten years ago.

A recent study by the Alliance, supported by the John A. Hartford Foundation, estimates that commercial and industrial firms—which consume 60 percent of our electrical energy—have invested in only 15 percent of the electricity conservation projects that are economically attractive. These opportunities include reliable, proven technologies such as adjustable frequency drives for motors, high efficiency fluorescent lighting, insulation, and energy management systems.

Another Alliance study, sponsored by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, showed that capital-intensive basic industries—steel, chemicals, paper, aluminum, petroleum refining—can reduce their total energy costs by 10 percent by investing in conservation projects such as waste-heat recovery, computerized control of industrial processes, and upgrading and reuse of by-product gas. The rate of return on these conservation investments frequently exceeds 30 percent.

There is no shortage of conservation ideas. The problem is that management has not been educated sufficiently about the cost-effectiveness and the need to invest in energy efficiency. In an era of international competitiveness, American business managers cannot continue to overlook cost-cutting investments. They must being to capitalize on "conservation energy."

Homeowners also still have substantial opportunities to reduce their energy bills. For example, Alliance projects have shown that installing a flame retention burner in an oil furnace, or equipping a gas furnace with a device that captures heat before it is lost up the chimney, can cut homeowners' fuel bills as much as 30 percent. These procedures to upgrade the efficiency of home oil and gas furnaces are available, and pay for themselves quickly, but are widely unknown.

As educators and public leaders, we must insure that our youth are prepared to face the energy challenges of tomorrow. I urge you to actively participate in National Energy Education Day (NEED) on March 23, 1984. NEED's goals are to promote the development of energy education programs in all our schools, and to develop student leadership skills and participation in energy conservation and education programs. As Chairman of the NEED project, I am keenly aware of the vital role teachers can play in preparing our future generations of homeowners, business managers, and policymakers for the energy decisions they will be called upon to make.

I would like to take this opportunity to challenge you, as science teachers and community leaders, to aggressively promote in your courses an increased understanding of energy policy issues, and the vital role that energy conservation must play in our energy future. Only by increasing our energy efficiency will we finally be able to pass the energy test.●

SAM TENENBAUM—MAN OF STEEL

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, when President Kennedy said that an individual can make a difference, he was obviously referring to individuals like my friend, Sam Tenenbaum.

Sam is one of those people whose words and deeds demonstrate his deep compassion and commitment. Where he sees injustice, he attempts to right it. Where he sees indifference, he attacks it head on. He is always generous with his time, and generous in his efforts to help others.

In the February 26, 1984, edition of Columbia, S.C., the State, Jan Collins Stucker focused on Sam and his crusades in an article entitled "Man of Steel." Those of us who know Sam are confident that this iron-willed man with a heart of gold will continue to make a difference for years to come.

I would ask that the full text of this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

MAN OF STEEL

(By Jan Collins Stucker)

Samuel Jay Tenenbaum doesn't wait for other folks to do what's needed. When it comes to giving, he's first in line, offering his enthusiam, dedication, funds, whatever will help get the job done.

"He puts his time and energy and money where his mouth is," says Dwight Drake, a Columbia attorney and close friend. "I don't know a soul in the state who spends more time on causes, and it's not in name only. Whatever you're involved in, you can count on Sam being the most committed person in the group."

For years, South Carolina's dismal ranking in primary and secondary education has rankled Tenenbaum. He is convinced the state will not be able to attract progressive, high-paying industries until the schools are considerably better. So when Gov. Dick Riley was looking for someone to raise funds for his current educational campaign, his friend Tenenbaum volunteered.

Tenenbaum, vice president of Chatham Steel Corporation in Columbia, raised not only $85,000 for the campaign's media advertising, he also signed a $43,000 personal bank note to make sure the $100,000 goal would be met.

It's a typical response from the hard-driving, 40-year-old steel executive, who leads the charge on more worthy causes in South Carolina than most people know exist.

The downtrodden and helpless get the lion's share of Tenenbaum's spare time. "There's a fire in me when I see injustice," he says. "The argument against getting involved is that the other person will do it. But I can't accept that. Most people don't do it."

Tenenbaum's parents, Meyer and LaBelle Tenenbaum of Savannah, Ga., hold that point of view and worked to instill it in their children. Mrs. Tenenbaum remembers the time near the end of World War II when she and her husband invited 24 soldiers, stationed at a nearby World War II Savannah military base, for Passover dinner at the family's cramped apartment. They knew none of the GIs, and didn't have enough chairs to seat such a group around their table.

But that didn't faze the elder Tenenbaums. "We often used to do things like that," Mrs. Tenenbaum says. "My husband and his brothers always cared about people, and we didn't want those soldiers to spend Passover alone."

Taking a leaf from his parents' book, Sam Tenenbaum belongs to—or more often heads up—an astonishing number of civic religious, political and arts organizations. He has been chairman of the S.C. Arts Commission since 1981; first vice president of the Columbia Jewish Welfare Federation since 1981; and board member since 1983 of the Governor's Task Force on Critical Human Needs, the Children's Hospital and the Communications Authority Task Force.

He's also on the national council of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee and serves on the Government Affairs Committee of the Steel Service Center Institute.

Tenenbaum's former affiliations are legion, as well, and include the Urban League, the Anti-Defamation League, the S.C. Democratic Party (he was finance director in 1979) and the S.C. Cambodian Relief Fund.

In 1981, he was named Man of the Year by the South Carolina B'nai B'rith for his many contributions to Jewish causes, which include serving as chairman of the Columbia United Jewish Appeal Annual Drive from 1979 to 1981.

Tenenbaum's wide-ranging activism confuses some people, says Morris J. Blachman, a University of South Carolina professor, fellow Jew and longtime friend. The confusion arises, Blachman thinks, because Tenenbaum "is driven to do these things, but not by the motives that drive most people. He's not seeking more power, more money or political office. He does these things because of his sense of community involvement."

But why do so much? Tenenbaum replies, "One of the basic tenets of Judaism is that we must perfect the world. So I guess my activism is my contribution to making the world perfect. I know I won't be able to do it, of course. But I have to try."

To some, Tenenbaum seems two different men. There's the aggresive, intense, impatient brash dynamo whose zeal and determination to get things done—coupled with his towering ego and seemingly boundless energy—often intimidate the very people he's trying to help.

"He's more like a fullback than a halfback," says Gov. Riley, who often uses his friend's business and fund-raising acumen for administration projects. "He charges and doesn't look up. And if he's tackled, he gets up and goes right on."

Charles T. Ferillo, top aide to Lt. Gov. Mike Daniel and an old friend and political ally of Tenenbaum's, says his friend "can be one of the most bullheaded individuals you'll ever meet. Arguing with Sam can be like speaking into a high wind."

But Ferillo and other friends also speak almost reverently about the other Sam Tenenbaum: the scrupulously honest, enormously generous man who loves people, gives unselfishly of his time and money, is a devoted son and brother, has deeply-held, patriotic values and has a soft, sensitive side he doesn't show most of the world.

Drake still remembers the summer of 1970, when he was a very poor law student and desperately needed money. Tenenbaum gave him a job cutting the grass at Chatham Steel and later upgraded him to cutting steel, "even though Sam didn't need another employee."

That soft heart was evident when Tenenbaum was still a child, his mother says. She loves to tell about the time when Sam, 8, stayed home from School one day to ride one of his pet ducks, laid up with a bad leg, around the neighborhood in a wheelbarrow cushioned with newpapers. Her son was

afraid the duck would get lonely in the back yard, she says.

Today, a physically imposing bear of a man with jet black hair, Tenenbaum plays as hard as he works. After a day of hectic business and civic activities, it's not uncommon for him to rush home and whip up an exquisite gourmet supper for friends, topped off with the best wine, brandy and cigars.

"I love to cook, and I love to eat," he says. He also loves to read (usually devouring four or five books at a time), listen to music, play racquetball and jog, the latter in a not always successful effort to keep off excess poundage.

"He does everything intensely," Drake says and laughs. "I went skiing with him in Austria in 1972, and he nearly worked me to death having a good time, learning everything and seeing everything."

A trip to Israel that Tenenbaum organized in 1981 for 94 South Carolinians, including Gov. and Mrs Riley, had similar overtones. "It was a fabulous trip," recalls one participant. "But we were exhausted by the end, seeing and doing everything we possibly could. There's no sitting around with Sam."

Tenenbaum is aware that his intense, frenetic style puts off some people.

"But it is hard to keep it under wraps," he explains. "I am like a downhill skier. Once the leap has been made, I am full speed ahead.

Tenenbaum's decision to dedicate his fervor to causes stems from being raised a tolerant Jew in the segregated South. Tenenbaum was taught that "other people were inherently as good as I was" by his father, a once-penniless Polish immigrant who became a lawyer and then a successful businessman, and his mother, a college-educated woman from Connecticut. His parents' veiws left an indelible impression, committing Tenenbaum to humanist causes from his earliest days.

Tenenbaum cannot overemphasize the importance of the dual influences of the South and Judaism in his life. "You had the perception that you had to be twice as good as anyone else" to deflect the ever-present discrimination, explains Blachman of growing up in the South. And Tenenbaum says, of growing up in a family where social activism was dished up along with the pabulum, "My family taught me it was a privilege to live in America, and that we have a resulting obligation to contribute to society."

After earning a bachelor's degree in history from Emory in 1965, Tenenbaum headed north. From 1965 to 1967, he attended the University of Minnesota, where he was awarded a master's in American studies in 1967.

Raised in a house where books, music and culture were treasured, Tenenbaum at one time wanted to study medicine. He changed his mind while in college, and in 1967, joined his father's company in Savannah to learn the steel business from the bottom up. In 1970, he was dispatched to Columbia to open the South Carolina branch of Chathem Steel Corporation. At the Columbia branch, Tenenbaum is a fair, shrewd businessman who supervises 45 people.

An older sister, Davida, 42, lives in New York City, where she is an independent art researcher and antique dealer. Younger sister, Karen, 30, is an early childhood development specialist in Los Angeles.

Dinner-table discussions about world events were part of growing up for Tenenbaum and his two sisters. "I guess being Jewish, the world is just part of the agenda," he says.

So was developing a devout commitment to Judaism. Like many Jewish children, Tenenbaum attended Hebrew school three or four times a week, in addition to his regular studies. He attended the local synagogue every Friday night and most Saturday and Sunday mornings, too.

The emphasis in his upbringing on world affairs made him a staunch supporter of Israel and an inveterate letter writer to newspapers about the volatile situation in the Middle East, even though those letters sometimes bring him hate mail.

His interest encompasses the Jewish community in the city, state and country, as well. "He's one of the most active Jews in the city of Columbia," says Howard Kosovske, rabbi of the Tree of Live congregation in Columbia. "You can't understand Sam if you don't understand Judaism."

"I'm as American as anybody else," Tenenbaum says. "Im as Southern as anybody else. I eat barbecue and pecan pie. But being Jewish is very important to me. I put a lot of my time and resources into it."

Since he turned 40 in August, some friends have teasingly told Sam Tenenbaum he's mellowing. It's true the energetic bachelor recently helped design and build a 2,500-square-foot retreat for himself in the Lexington woods. He spends as much time as possible these days in the bold concrete, glass and steel home that was featured last year in the New York Times Magazine and Architectural Record and will be in next month's House and Garden.

He also admits to making more of an effort to "be a little less busy. You do get tired. I want to help so many groups and people that I get overcommitted and can't do a good job. So I'm trying to learn to say no."

He thinks more these days about settling down, marrying and having children. "When you're unmarried and have no children and hit 40, you confront your own mortality," he says. But he adds that his commitment and intensity toward various causes "are probably as great or greater than ever, because there's only so much time."

"It's the quality of life you help make for others that's important in the end," he notes. "My favorite saying by the ancient Jewish sage, Hillel, sums it up."

"Hillel said, 'If I am not for myself, who am I? and if I am only for myself, what am I? I guess I try to live by that."

JOHN FLING: AN EVERYDAY SANTA HELPING OTHERS IN COLUMBIA, S.C.

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it is not often enough these days that we get a chance to read about those Americans who dedicate their lives selflessly to helping others in need before themselves. I was delighted yesterday to read of one such person.

For nearly 40 years, John Fling of Columbia, S.C. has helped the elderly, the blind, and the forgotten in his community provide for the bare essentials of their lives. He has shopped for their groceries, helped pay the rent, driven them to the doctor, and put joy back into their lives when no one else would.

While many talk of doing good, and look to others to do the job, John Fling has truly followed the biblical teaching, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." I wish to commend highly his spirit of community duty and voluntarism. He makes us all proud.

I ask that the March 25, 1984, article in Parade magazine describing Mr. Fling's story be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HOW ONE MAN HELPS OTHERS

(By Sue Anne Pressley)

"Miss Charlotte" Sulton is heard before she is seen, warning her 14 cats (she has another 30 outdoors) in a fond, quavery voice to "stay right there, you little scalawags." Then she peeks through a crack in the door of her small green house—a tiny, arthritic woman 91 years old, eyes swimming hugely behind almost useless glasses. Miss Charlotte, a widow, has glaucoma.

"It's John, Miss Charlotte," John Fling calls loudy, rocking his heels on the creaky front porch.

"It's John." That's all Fling has to say as he makes his rounds through the downtown streets and suburbs of Columbia, S.C.

Each day, through baking summers and frosty winters, Fling looks out for his people—the elderly, the blind, the retarded, the eccentric, the forgotten. He brings food when the refrigerator is empty, rent money when eviction is passively awaited and good times when life seems choked with bad.

John Fling, 62, does not work for a social services agency. He is not the ambassador of a church or civic club. What he does, he does independently, giving away most of the small salary he makes delivering auto parts for a Chevrolet dealership and forgoing the requisite pleasures of American life: He and his wife have no telephone, no television and no car.

Fling's people have a special name for him. They call him the "Everyday Santa."

"What can I do for you today, Miss Charlotte?" asks Fling in his booming Georgia accent, bending close to the red knitted cap covering her head. "What do you need?"

He has brought her 50 pounds of cat food this visit and a steaming-hot chicken dinner. Much as he'd like, he can't bring her what she really wants.

"I wish I could see!" Miss Charlotte says in a high, excited voice, "I'm tired of falling down!

"Sometimes I think I ought to go to a home, but I wouldn't do that to my cats. That wouldn't be fair."

"Yes, Miss Charlotte," Fling says, forsaking his usual jocular manner. "I know."

Later, as he drives away, Miss Charlotte lingers on his mind. "I met her five years ago," he says. "She had run out of food. She told me she had her funeral arrangements all taken care of. I called the funeral home, and they had never heard of her." Fling sighs. "I guess when the time comes, I'll have to take care of her."

It is a cool, gilded late afternoon in early fall as Fling makes his visits in his blue-and-white company truck. The State Capitol is weekend-quiet, its legislators and bureaucrats have all gone home. This could be any city of 100,000 people that concerns itself with commerce and government. John Fling, however, may very well be one of a kind.

It is not his appearance that sets him apart as much as his presence—a cracking sort of energy that leaves one with the impression that he may very well live forever. He looks ordinary enough—tall, robust, silver-haired and bespectacled—dressed

always in a blue cap, blue-and-white work uniform and shiny black lace-up shoes.

His actions, nevertheless, are extraordinary.

As much as an observer can understand, Fling is driven by duty, a touch of ego and, as improbable as it sounds, a philosophy that follows biblical teachings to the letter: "Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself."

This philosophy—which drives him to give at least 40 hours a week to his extra tasks—is firmly tied to his background. He was the 12th of 19 children born to a poor but God-fearing sharecropper and his equally principled wife in Gabbettville, Ga. Fling's family, along with his Depression-era boyhood, leads to a steady patter of jokes.

"If my daddy was going to the store," he says, "a list was not necessary. There was never anything we didn't need." And, "My mother was pregnant a total of 5380 days. When we were ordered to go to bed, we knew another baby was on the way."

"Early in life," Fling continues soberly, "I learned that you share everything in this world. My parents—they gave their lives for us. They did without and did without and did without. Doing for other people gives me a satisfied mind."

He has been drawn especially to the blind, the elderly and the young. "People frown on me sometimes when I help Cambodian and Vietnamese families," he says as he stops beside a sprawling old downtown house. "But I look at the children. Those children are going to be here, and once they're here, they're your neighbors, whether you like it or not. And the Scriptures say you look after your neighbors."

"Now take this family," he says, getting out of the truck. They are a Vietnamese family of eight, U.S. residents for one full week. "The day after they moved in, we were all cleaning up. I looked around, and they were spraying Raid on the windows and Windex on the roaches."

As if on cue, the family runs outside, greeting Fling with wide smiles and a chorus of "Hey, John! Hey, John!"

Ten-year-old Oanh Dao points out her new goldtone watch, a gift Fling slipped onto her wrist during his last visit. Studying it seriously, she announces only five hours ahead of schedule. "It is exactly 12 o'clock."

On this visit, Fling must attend to an urgent matter—school supplies for the three young members of the family, who will be starting school the next day. He counts out $6 from his wallet and leaves amid cries of "Bye, John! Come back soon, John!"

Some of Fling's people wander into his life. Some, he finds. Others, like Edith Lewis, seek him out.

"Can you come by, once a week, at least," she wrote him four years ago, "and see if I'm still alive?"

As Fling pulls into Mrs. Lewis's driveway, her 16 dogs—all sizes, all barking—tumble out the door of her aqua-and-white mobile home. The home would have cost $2000, but Fling wrangled donations and presented it to Mrs. Lewis for a mere $1.

Edith Lewis, 77, an erect woman with long gray hair and finishing-school grace, shivers in the faint chill breeze and watches as Fling unloads 125 pounds of dog food from the truck. Blind old Blackjack, her most faithful dog, stands aloof in the doorway. The others break into a hungry frenzy.

Questioned sternly by Fling, Mrs. Lewis confesses that she herself is in need of food. "I simply haven't been able to get out," she says, swiping a strand of hair from her forehead. She will allow Fling to do her shopping if, and only if, he takes the money for the groceries. Reluctantly, he accepts her $15. Thirty minutes later, he returns, handing her two bags of groceries. The receipt reading $32.35 is crumpled in his pocket. He presses $1 in change into her hand.

As Fling drives off, Mrs. Lewis is putting things away in the broken-down refrigerator in her yard.

"I'm going to have to find her another refrigerator," he mutters to himself and riffles through a stack of about 50 telephones messages left for him at work. Someone needs a ride to the doctor next Thursday. Someone else needs a kerosene heater. Urgent: We need bread and milk. With cooler weather, the pleas for help increase.

It is not uncommon for Fling to take out a loan from his employers to tide over a landlord threatening to evict a jobless mother and her five children. In the last 10 years, he has signed over three cars he owned—old Bel Airs and Impalas in impeccable condition—to people whose jalopies had broken down a final time. His latest truck, which belongs to the company, has already logged 35,000 miles in six months.

He and his wife, Jane—a quiet, sweet-faced woman, the only daughter of a prosperous Austrian immigrant—live in a rent-free apartment owned by Jane's mother. They raised two sons there: Richard, 37, now a sergeant in the Army, and "Little John" Fling, 31, owner of a heating and air-conditioning business.

During their marriage, Jane Fling has spent her time as a frequent visitor to nursing homes and as a quiet crusader on her own religious quest. Educated as a Catholic, she is now a Seventh-Day Adventist dedicated to her prayer meetings and church literature.

"We're opposites," says Fling, stopping the truck outside his home. "I tell people, the only thing we have in common is that we got married on the same day."

Jane Fling swings the door open wide to greet a visitor.

Sunlight, the day's last, slants through the brown-and-orange cotton print curtains at the kitchen window. Jane speaks deliberately about her husband.

"I want him to do what he wants to do," she says. "What he feels is right. He's like this about me—he allows me to do things I want to do. I don't think couples should smother each other.

"See, I don't want a lot of things. What I want most in life is the knowledge of God. Material things like fur coats and wine don't bother me. The Lord gives people different gifts. He gave John the gift of service."

"Yep," says Fling later, as he climbs back into his truck. "If she didn't go along with it, I wouldn't do it."

Fling now directs the vehicle smoothly through the downtown streets of Columbia. This is where, in 1947, he first became involved with the city's needy.

At the time, he helped his father-in-law operate a string of newstands. His charges were some 100 scrappy paperboys who worked to put food on their tables at home. Fling never allowed any of them to run around without a warm coat or a hot meal.

In those years, he was also a deacon in the Baptist chruch. But 15 years ago, when he began driving a bus for the South Carolina Federation for the Blind, he realized, he says, that he could do more for others by making his own independent rounds. Since then, he has collected dozens of awards for his work.

"Agencies, they don't really get involved with me," Fling says shortly. "We have agencies for the handicapped, the blind, the elderly and the retarded. But what agency do you call to pick up food stamps or take you to the grocery store or mow your yard or take your dog to the vet or pick up a sick child at school?

"Who is going to make sure that the blind don't become hermits?"

For if Fling is a savior of sorts to people in tight fixes, he is also an entertainment director for blind people like Loretta and Billy Eubanks, a couple in their mid-30's who were virtual shut-ins before his appearance in their lives a decade ago. The Eubankses have a sighted son, Kevin, 12, who learned as a toddler that a visit by Fling usually meant an excursion.

Routinely, Fling will load up a dozen blind people and their children into a van and trek off to the beach or the mountains for a day. And he has invented a couple of contraptions for pure fun—a jogging pole that allows blind people to exercise and a go-cart with a walkie-talkie rig-up that enables them to zip across a pasture, merrily executing daredevil turns as Fling provides directions.

The sky is a star-studded black as Fling drives into the Bell's Bottoms section of Columbia, an area of mean little houses and shadowed streets. He enters a house of slack faces, 14 persons crammed into two rooms, and goes directly to a little girl on the floor—Lisa—all curly blonde hair, twig-thin legs and uncomprehending eyes. She is a victim of Reye's syndrome, a virus that has left her deaf, mute and isolated. She weighs only 18 pounds. She is 8 years old.

"Does little Lisa have enough baby food?" he asks.

"I mashed some potatoes for her," the child's mother answers, eyes downcast.

The wallet reappears, and Fling produces his last $4.

"You cry," he warns the woman sternly, "and I'm leaving."

It is time to go anyway. Chris, a tall, shaggy-haired boy of 14, stands outside, staring at a box of jigsaw puzzles in the bed of the truck.

"You want 'em?" Fling asks.

Chris nods.

"Well, then," says Fling, hitching himself up into the truck, "go ahead and take 'em."●

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, we are about to complete this day of action by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there be a special order in favor of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the special order in favor of Senator PROXMIRE, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until the hour of 12 noon in which Senators may speak for not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM 12 NOON UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12 noon the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, after the Senate resumes session at 2 p.m. tomorrow the unfinished business, House Joint Resolution 492, will be once more laid before the Senate.

It is hoped that good progress can be made on that measure. It is essential that it be passed this week and the leadership on this side hopes that we can accomplish that in time to take up at least one other matter before the week is out.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have inquired of the minority leader if he has anything further. He does not. I see no other Senator seeking recognition. I, therefore, move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to, and at 4:40 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1984, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26, 1984:

THE JUDICIARY

Edward Leavy, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon, vice Robert C. Belloni, retiring.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26, 1984:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Irving P. Margulies, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Richard L. Prillaman, [redacted], age 55, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be general

Gen. Donald R. Keith, [redacted], age 56, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provision of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Richard H. Thompson, [redacted] U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Benjamin F. Register, Jr., [redacted], U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commodore in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

Jack Stephen Smith
Burton Orville Benson
James Merrill Strickland
Martin William Leukhardt

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER (TAR)

Albert Eugene Rieder

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

Clay Wayland Gordon Fulcher

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICER

James John Cerda

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER

Henry Culberson Amos, Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICER

John Joseph Hever

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICER

David Oliver Smart IV

THE JUDICIARY

H. Russel Holland, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Public Health Service nominations beginning Karen C. Carlson, and ending Roger D. Prock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 9, 1984.

Public Health Service nominations beginning William P. Castelli, and ending Wayne T. Sanderson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 9, 1984.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning Jon R. Agne, and ending Michael P. Grief, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 12, 1984.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PEOPLE OF ARIZONA HAVE A RIGHT TO KNOW WHERE I STAND

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the House of Representatives here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of Arizona have a right to know where I stand on the issues decided by the House, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all-inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for specifics, or to visit my district office at 300 North Main in Tucson or 1419 North Third Street, Suite 103, in Phoenix.

The list is arranged as follows:

KEY

1. Official rollcall number;
2. Number of the bill or resolution;
3. Title of the bill or resolution;
4. A description of issue being voted on;
5. The date of the action;
6. My vote, in the form Y-yes, N-no, and NV-not voting.
7. The vote of the entire Arizona delegation, in the form (Yes-No-Not voting);
8. An indication whether the motion or amendment was passed or rejected; and
9. The total vote.

100. H.R. 2066. National Science Foundation Authorization. Brown, D-Calif., amendment to increase by $49 million the bill's $50 million authorization for a new high-technology instrumentation program. Rejected 150-255: Y(2-3-0), May 2, 1983.

101. H.R. 2066. National Science Foundation Authorization. Winn, R-Kan., amendment to delete from the bill a $50 million authorization for a new high-technology instrumentation program. Rejected 150-257: N(3-2-0), May 12, 1983.

102. H.R. 2066. National Science Foundation Authorization. Gregg, R-N.H., amendment to earmark $25 million in high-technology instrumentation funds for elementary and secondary schools. Rejected 150-251: N(3-2-0), May 12, 1983.

103. H.R. 2066. National Science Foundation Authorization. Passage of the bill to authorize $1.34 billion for the National Science Foundation in fiscal year 1984, including $50 million for a new high-technology instrumentation program. Passed 297-111: Y(2-3-0), May 12, 1983.

104. H.R. 2587. Department of Energy Civilian Research and Development Programs. Science and Technology Committee amendment to deauthorize for the continuation or termination of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Project. Adopted 388-1: Y(4-0-1), May 12, 1983.

105. H.R. 2587. Department of Energy Civilian Research and Development Programs. Mineta, D-Calif., amendment to redirect $5 million of construction funds for a vitreous state laboratory at Catholic University of America. Adopted 261-113: Y(1-3-1), May 12, 1983.

106. H.R. 2587. Department of Energy Civilian Research and Development Programs. Winn, R-Kans., substitute to reduce total authorizations in the bill to $2.97 billion, from $3.29 billion. Rejected 140-228: N(3-1-1), May 12, 1983.

107. H.R. 2587. Department of Energy Civilian Research and Development Programs. Rangel, D-N.Y., amemdment to redirect $5 million for construction of a chemical research center at Columbia University. Adopted 215-150:Y(1-3-1), May 12, 1983.

108. H.R. 2587. Department of Energy Civilian Research and Development Programs. Passage of the bill to authorize $3,288,271,000 for civilian research and development programs at the Department of Energy in fiscal 1984. Passed 230-132: Y(1-3-1), May 12, 1983.

109. H.R. 2733. Critical Agricultural Materials. Brown, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to continue, through September 30, 1988, research and development programs on production of guayule rubber, to expand the program to include other agricultural crops that have a potential for producing materials of strategic or industrial importance, and to authorize a total of $50 million for the activities. Motion agreed to 326-96: Y(2-3-0), May 17, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (283) in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

110. H.J. Res. 265. Temporary Extension of Certain Federal Housing Programs. Gonzalez, D-Texas, motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution to continue most of the housing and community development programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Farmers Home Administration and other agencies through September 30, 1983. Motion agreed to 418-6: Y(4-1-0), May 17, 1983. A two-thirds of those present and voting (283 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

111. H.R. 1416. Securities and Exchange Commission Authorization. Wirth, D-Colo., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize fiscal 1984 and $111.1 million in fiscal 1985 for the Securities and Exchange Commission. Motion agreed to 322-100: Y(3-2-0), May 17, 1983. A two thirds majority of those present and voting (282 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

112. H.R. 2681. Securities and Exchange Act Amendments. Wirth, D-Colo., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to make technical changes in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Motion agreed to 361-63: Y(4-1-0), two-thirds majority of those present and voting (283 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

113. H.R. 2936. Veterans' Appeals Board Expansion. Montgomery, D-Miss., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to increase from 50 to 65 the authorized number of members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans Administration. Motion agreed to 423-2: Y(5-0-0), May 17, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (284 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

114. H.R. 2602. Trade Programs Authorizations. Gibbons, D-Fla., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize $21.2 million for International Trade Commission, $627.8 million for the U.S. Customs Service, and $11.9 million for the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative in fiscal 1984. Motion agreed to 380-45: Y(4-1-0), May 17, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (284 in this case) is required for suspension of the rules.

115. H.R. 2973. Interest and Dividend Tax Withholding. Rostenkowski, D-Ill., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to repeal provisions of 1982 legislation (PL 97-248) requiring banks and financial institutions to begin withholding taxes from interest and dividend income on July 1, 1983. Motion agreed to 382-41: Y(5-0-0), May 17, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (282 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules. A "nay" was a vote supporting the president's position.

116. S.J. Res. 51. Andrei Sakharov Day. Passage of the joint resoution to designate May 21, 1983, as "National Andrei Sakharov Day" in honor of the 62nd birthday of the dissident Soviet physicist who was exiled to the city of Gorky and refused permission to emigrate. Passed 420-0: Y(5-0-0), May 17, 1983.

117. H.J. Res. 226. Digestive Diseases Awareness Week. Passage of the joint resolution to designate the week of May 22-28, 1983, as "National Digestive Awareness Week." Passed 408-13: Y(4-1-0), May 17, 1983.

119. H. Res. 200. Lavelle Contempt of Congress Resolution. Adoption of the resolution to cite Rita M. Lavelle, former assistant administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, for contempt of Congress for refusing to testify in response to a subpoena of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. Adopted 413-0: Y(5-0-0), May 18, 1983.

120. H.R. 2990. Debt Limit Extension. Frost, D-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment) on the rule (H Res 196) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to raise the public debt limit to $1.389 trillion through September 30, 1983. Motion agreed to 249-171: Y(2-3-0), May 18, 1983.

121. H.R. 2990. Debt Limit Extension. Adoption of the rule (H Res 196) providing

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

for House floor consideration of the bill to raise the public debt limit to $1.389 trillion through September 30, 1983. Adopted 263-156: Y(2-3-0), May 18, 1983. (The bill was subsequently passed by voice vote.)

123. H. Con. Res. 113. MX Missile Development. Adoption of the concurrent resolution to permit use of funds appropriated in fiscal 1983 to develop a basing method for the MX missile and to conduct MX test flights. Adopted 239-186: N(3-2-0), May 24, 1983. A "yea" was a vote supporting the president's position.

124. H.R. 2948. Veterans' Housing Benefits Amendments. Montgomery, D-Miss., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended to provide financial assistance to unemployed veterans facing foreclosure on home mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans Administration. Motion agreed to 394-23: Y(5-0-0), May 24, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (278 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

125. H.R. 2807. Meals of Older Americans. Andrews, D-N.C., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to increase authorized funding levels for meals served under the Older Americans Act by $6.8 million in fiscal 1982, $16 million in fiscal 1983 and such sums as may be necessary in fiscal 1984. Under existing law, spending ceilings for the program were $93.2 million in fiscal 1982, $100 million in 1983 and $105 million in 1984. Motion agreed to 386-31: Y(3-2-0), May 24, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (278 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules. A "nay" was a vote supporting the president's position.

126. H.R. 1707. National Traffic Safety Board Authorization. Mineta, D-Calif., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize the National Traffic Safety Board to spend $22.6 million for fiscal 1984. Motion agreed to 372-43: Y(4-1-0), May 24, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (277 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules. (The House subsequently vacated passage of the bill and passed by voice vote S. 967, a similar Senate-passed bill, thus clearing the measure for the president.)

128. H. Res. 203. Lebanon-Israel Agreement. Adoption of the resolution to support the May 17, 1983, agreement between Israel and Lebanon on the withdrawal of Israeli military forces from Lebanon, and calling on Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization to withdraw their forces from Lebanon. (Adopted 408-0: Y(5-0-0), May 25, 1983.

129. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 209) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to make $4.8 billion in supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1983. Adopted 212-195: Y(2-3-0), May 25, 1983.

130. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Roybal, D-Calif., amendment to reduce the funds in the bill for restoration and expansion of the West Front of the Capitol from $70.5 million to $49 million and allow only restoration, not expansion. Adopted 325-86: Y(2-3-0), May 25, 1983.

131. H.R. 3069. Supplemental Appropriations, Fiscal 1983. Passage of the bill to appropriate $4,809,430,665 in supplemental funds for fiscal 1983. Passed 309-92: Y(3-2-0), May 25, 1983.

133. S. Con. Res. 26. MX Missile Development. Adoption of the concurrent resolution to permit use of funds appropriated in fiscal 1983 to develop a basing method for the MX missile and to conduct MX test flights. Adopted 223-167: N(3-2-0), May 26, 1983. A "yea" was a vote supporting the president's position.

134. H. Res. 177. Disapproving Energy Conservation Deferral. Adoption of the resolution to disapprove the president's proposed deferral of $4,500,000 in fiscal 1983 budget authority for energy conservation programs. Adopted 280-107: Y(3-2-0), May 26, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the president's position.

135. H. Res. 178. Disapproving Fossil Energy Research and Development Deferral. Adoption of the resolution to disapprove the president's proposed deferral of $8,750,000 in fiscal 1983 budget authority for fossil energy research and development programs. Adopted 265-121: Y(3-2-0), May 26, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the president's position.

136. H. Res. 181. Disapproving Mariana Islands Hospital Deferral. Adoption of the resolution to disapprove the deferral of $3.2 million appropriated for the construction of a hospital in the Northern Mariana Islands. Adopted 266-116: Y(3-2-0), May 26, 1983. A "nay" was a vote supporting the president's position.

137. H.R. 3133. Housing and Urban Development Department Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Adoption of the rule (H. Res. 211) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 17 independent agencies through fiscal 1984. Adopted 274-99: Y(3-2-0), May 26, 1983.

138. H.R. 3133. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Boland, D-Mass., motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the bill to make fiscal 1984 appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 17 independent agencies. Motion agreed to 324-2: NV(2-0-3), June 2, 1983.

139. H.R. 3133. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Wirth, D-Colo., amendments offered en bloc to increase fiscal 1984 funding levels for the Environmental Protection Agency by $219.7 million. Adopted 200-167: Y(2-2-1), June 2, 1983

140. H.R. 3133. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Boland, D-Mass., motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill back to the House with amendments. Motion rejected 144-225: Y(2-2-1), June 2, 1983. (Rejection of the motion was required under a new House rule in order to attach riders to the bill).

141. H.R. 3133. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Dannemeyer, R-Calif., amendment to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from using any funds provided by the bill to impose sanctions during fiscal 1984 on any area for failing to attain any national ambient air quality standard established under the Clean Air Act. Adopted 227-136: Y(4-0-1), June 2, 1983.

142. H.R. 3133. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Boland, D-Mass., motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill back to the House with amendments, recommending passage of the bill. Motion agreed to 241-120: Y(3-1-1), June 2, 1983.

143. H.R. 3133. Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Passage of the bill to appropriate $54,431,088,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 17 independent agencies in fiscal 1984. Passed 216-143: Y(1-3-1), June 2, 1983.

144. H.R. 3135. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Walker, R-Pa., amendment to reduce by $1.1 million the bill's funding for the staffs of House committees. Rejected 142-213: N(2-2-1), June 2, 1983.

145. S. 639. Lebanon Aid. Hamilton, D-Ind., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize $101 million in military aid and $150 million in economic aid for Lebanon in fiscal 1983 and to require the president to seek authorization from Congress for the expansion of U.S. participation in a multinational peacekeeping force in Lebanon. Motion agreed to 276-76: Y(2-2-1), June 2, 1983. A two-thirds majority of those present and voting (235 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

147. H.R. 3135. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Fazio, D-Calif., motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the bill to make fiscal 1984 appropriations for the legislative branch. Motion agreed to 301-10: Y(4-0-1), June 3, 1983.

148. H.R. 3135. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Gregg, R-N.H., amendment to reduce funding for House committees by $6 million, from $44 million to $38 million. Rejected 133-189: N(2-2-1), June 3, 1983.

149. H.R. 3135. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Bartlett, R-Texas, amendment to cut $6.9 million from the recommended $67 million for members' expense accounts. Rejected 156-160: N(2-2-1), June 3, 1983.

150. H.R. 3135. Legislative Branch Appropriations, Fiscal 1984. Hunter, R-Calif., amendment to cut $9.3 million from official congressional mail costs, reducing the amount from $107.1 million to $97.8 million. Rejected 134-173: N(3-1-1), June 3, 1983.●

FRED HUMMEL—PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD WINNER FOR SAN CARLOS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Public Service Award Advisory Committee for the city of San Carlos has chosen an outstanding individual for its 1984 award recipient, and I am proud to share with my colleagues his name and some of his accomplishments.

Fred Hummel, a resident of San Carlos for many years, has been involved in so many community activities that to name them all would be impossible. He has unselfishly volunteered his time to such worthwhile causes as the Boys Club, the Recreation Center for the Handicapped, the Boy Scouts, the PTA, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, San Carlos Art Festivals, the Campfire Girls, and many other special San Carlos events. He is always one of the first to volunteer when his city needs experienced

organizational help, but also has dedicated countless hours to the children in the community when they needed leadership in their activities.

Mr. Hummel is a well-known, well-respected, and much loved member of his community, and I commend the San Carlos Advisory Committee for its excellent choice. Fred Hummel magnificently demonstrates a sincere concern for the well-being of others, and is most deserving of his city's first Congressional Public Service Award.●

ANTISATELLITE WEAPONS

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the information of the Members of the House an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer on antisatellite weapons. The Inquirer has made a number of important points about the dangers of deploying ASAT's. I believe the Inquirer reflects the views of the people of Philadelphia that ASAT's and the entire concept of a "Star Wars" defense is a mistake which will make us more, not less, vulnerable:

ACT NOW TO AVOID SPACE WARS

Soviet leader Konstantin U. Chernenko stirred interest in Washington by calling for "real actions" on nuclear arms treaties by the Reagan administration to signal a "drastic change" in U.S.-Soviet relations.

One action that would benefit both countries would be to move back to the negotiating table on the issue of anti-satellite missiles (ASAT's).

There is strong bipartisan concern in the Congress about the Reagan administration's enthusiasm for deploying new weapons in space. Much of the controversial, administration-backed "star wars" technology for a missile defense system in space is still on the drawing boards. But the development of ASAT's is at a critical stage.

Satellites have become the central nervous systems of the superpowers' military machines. Deploying weapons that threaten to knock out satellites will further destabilize U.S.-Soviet relations by heightening fears of a first strike so devastating that retaliation would be impossible.

The Soviet Union already has a slow, ground-based and rather simple anti-satellite weapon that can attack U.S. satellites in low orbit (about one-third of those in space). But it can't reach the United States' more important early warning and communications systems much higher up. Top U.S. officials have said publicly that America would not have trouble jamming the electronics of the Soviet weapon.

The United States is developing a mobile, swifter and much more sophisticated ASAT weapon, scheduled for its first test against a target in space this fall. At its present development stage it doesn't threaten high-orbit satellites but potentially it could do so.

Three rounds of Soviet-American talks on ASATs came to a halt in 1979 when the United States backed off over the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Congress signaled its unease over current ASAT development by requiring the administration to report March 31 on its "good faith" efforts to negotiate an ASAT ban with the Soviets, before testing against satellites in space.

So far, however the administration seems busier finding reasons not to negotiate than overcoming obstacles to fruitful talks.

Last summer, the late Soviet President Yuri V. Andropov—perhaps reflecting Soviet worries about U.S. capability for a space war—said he would halt Soviet ASAT tests unilaterally so long as planned U.S. tests did not proceed. Of greater interest, the Soviets proposed a draft treaty to the United Nations last autumn suggesting the dismantling of existing ASATs and the banning of new ones.

Pentagon officials opposed the moratorium idea because the Soviets already had a weapon. Now administration officials are saying a comprehensive ban is unlikely because it can't be verified. This is obfuscation. Why raise such problems until there are specific proposals on the table? There are ways to begin addressing the problem short of a comprehensive ban.

The time for a full ASAT ban is rapidly running out. With development of the next generation of ASAT's the fleeting chance may pass. Congress should press President Reagan firmly for evidence of the "good faith" in seeking ASAT negotiations that so far has been lacking.●

JOINT PRATT & WHITNEY-AIR FORCE PROGRAM SAVES TAXPAYERS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS THROUGH SPARE PARTS REJUVENATION

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleague's attention to a March 19, 1984, article in the Hartford Courant about Pratt & Whitney and the Air Force's successes in saving the taxpayer money on spare parts. A joint program between Pratt & Whitney and the Air Force has produced two low-cost methods of rejuvenating engine parts. The program has already saved the Air Force millions of dollars in spare parts costs, and the rejuvenation process will also save years of production time. This kind of productive cooperation is to be commended and encouraged:

AIR FORCE SAVES MILLIONS WITH PARTS-REPAIR PROJECT

(By Robert Waters)

The Air Force and the Pratt & Whitney Group, which both came under heavy fire last year during investigations of soaring Pentagon costs for spare parts, are fighting back.

A joint Air Force and Pratt & Whitney program has been under development for several years, producing two low-cost methods of rejuvenating engine parts, making them "as good as new," Pratt & Whitney said Sunday.

The processes already are saving the Air Force millions of dollars in spare parts costs, and these savings are expected to increase as the methods are used more widely, a company official said.

The rejuvenation processes also may save years of production time. Replacing worn-out parts of an engine that is no longer in production can sometimes take more than two years, said Charles Torrey, materials project engineer for Pratt & Whitney's Government Products Division in West Palm Beach, Fla.

"The rejuvenation cost is 10 percent of what it would be to buy a new part, sometimes even less," said Torrey.

As an example of the value of the new processes, Torrey cited the engines that power the SR-71 Air Force spy plane, known as the Blackbird.

First built by Lockheed Aircraft in 1964, the needle-nosed Blackbird has set speed and altitude records.

In 1974, it flew from New York to London in one hour and 56 minutes. A few days later, the Blackbird beat the sun on a flight from London to Los Angeles, covering 5,645 miles through seven times zones in three hours and 47 minutes.

The Air Force reportedly has nine of the Blackbirds still in service.

But the Pratt & Whitney J58 twin jets that powered the secret spy plane to its record performances are no longer being made.

This means that when a J58 engine part wears out, the Air Force must either cannibalize the part from an old engine or tool up to build it from scratch.

Torrey said buying a J58 part called a diffuser case ordinarily would cost about $25,000. He said it also would take at least two years to produce it. But with the new processes, Pratt & Whitney can rejuvenate the worn part in four to eight weeks at a cost of $8,000, Torrey said.

The two rejuvenation processes are aimed at problems known to engineers as blade growth and "creep." These occur when the microstructure of parts, such as turbine blades, breaks down. The parts become deformed or stretched, and then weaken and become brittle, Torrey said.

The two rejuvenation processes are known as HIP (hot isostatic pressing) and thermal/time.

HIP subjects the parts to intense heat and pressure, which slightly soften the parts and remove internal defects. Torrey said. In the thermal/time process, he said, the used parts are heated intensely for periods predetermined by engineers. This returns the microstructure to its original state. Torrey said.

"The parts are as good as new," he said. "We're even rejuvenated some parts twice. We've not found a limit yet, but I suspect there is one."

Torrey said HIP seems to work best for cast, rotating engine parts such as turbine blades and vanes. Thermal/time appears most effective for fabricated parts, such as diffuser cases and transition ducts, which don't move during engine operations.

Torrey said the Air Force and Pratt & Whitney are still experimenting with the processes at the United Technologies Corp. division's Florida plant. He said they first began using rejuvenation in 1975 on J58 parts.

It is also being used now on first-stage turbine vanes of Pratt & Whitney's top-selling F100 engine, which powers the Air Force's F-15 and F-16 fighters. Pratt & Whitney estimates that rejuvenation of F100 parts

alone will result in annual savings of $10 million.●

AN APPROACH TO FULL EMPLOYMENT

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, we all rejoice in reports indicating that the unemployment rate has dipped somewhat lower. However, I believe that many of us are uneasy about the prospects for more joblessness when the steam runs out of the deficit-propelled economic recovery the Nation is experiencing now. The fact is that the next recession may be even more destructive of employment and of national income than was the recession of 1981-82. No program is in place, or even in sight, to prevent that from happening.

I want to share with the House an interesting approach to full employment which has been advised by Dr. John H. G. Pierson, an economist who has served in the State and Labor Departments and as adviser to the United Nations. Dr. Pierson, who lives in Honolulu during the summer, inexplicably spends his winters in Connecticut and the brief summary of the economic performance insurance he has proposed was printed in the Greenwich News for December 15, 1983.

The article follows:

A NEW ECONOMIC APPROACH TO FULL EMPLOYMENT

To understand "economic performance insurance" or EPI, think of our economic system as driven by two engines: production, which provides the jobs and generates income; and spending (consumption and investment spending), which motivates production and employment by providing a current and prospective market for goods and services. Each engine pumps out to the other and each depends for fuel on what the other pumps out.

All this is familiar, of course. So is the fact that the system doesn't tend to keep running at a full-employment rate automatically, as the classical school of economists assumed.

What is not so familiar is the idea that a balanced circular flow at the full-employment rate, while it won't come about naturally, can nevertheless be created artificially by tuning both engines occasionally so that each reinforces the other with optimum support.

Once they are revved up by stages to the right pitch, neither one can easily get very far out of line, and comparatively minor tuning should then suffice. Furthermore, the system's chronic obstructions and leaks will then be considerably easier to identify and correct; hence a prospect of still less tuning. This in essence is the EPI idea.

EPI would not rely on trying to find remedies after something important has gone wrong, or do the opposite and set about filling prospective gaps glimpsed in forecasts, or pay attention to just one engine and let the other take care of itself.

Instead, EPI would have our government, year by year, prescribe an operating rate for each engine separately. It would equip our system with two throttles, one on each engine. And it would issue standing orders for each throttle to be opened or closed a little whenever that engine would otherwise fail to hold to its prescribed operating rate.

Translating this: the government would annually set an employment level (bottom and top limits) and also a consumer spending rate (bottom and top limits) to be adhered to throughout the next year, would decide in advance on the means to be used—kinds of public works and services to be accelerated or decelerated, the kinds of taxes or transfer payments to be varied—when necessary for keeping the actual trends within the preset limits, and that would designate the agencies responsible for both kinds of contingent action.

(Total spending—the GNP—would not be targeted and held in line, as the analogy might suggest, but consumer spending would be, in order to avoid unsuitable restraints on business or the government itself. Secondly, the top limits on employment and on consumer spending would be a good reason why EPI would help check inflation; others would be the elimination of the costs of cushioning management and labor against recessions, and the psychological dividends from the government's own assumption of due responsibility.)

The EPI regulators should clearly not be submitted to constant strain. In the analogy, engineers should be out on the lines finding ways to improve the flow in both directions and so reduce the need for throttle adjustments at either end. Visualize here the enactment, over time, of tax reforms and other measures that spread purchasing power and boost consumer spending, plus steadfast help to competition and vigilance against monopolistic restrictions, to keep increased spending from lifting prices instead of production and employment.

It has been said that some employer interests are opposed to full employment on any sustained basis. The EPI approach would weaken the opposition, however, because the employment level chosen as corresponding to full employment (the prescribed speed of the first engine) would reflect the judgment of the President, as modified by the Congress in it review of the President's recommendations, concerning the amount of frictional unemployment essential for proper mobility in existing labor-market conditions. Advocates of a 3 percent allowance, or 4 percent, or any higher or lower figure would all presumably have some influence on the final selection.

It is also said that actually guaranteeing full employment would force expansion of the public sector at the private sector's expense, whether intended or not. That would be untrue under EPI, however, because of the method of deriving the guaranteed consumer spending rate (the prescribed speed of the second engine) from the total market estimated to be necessary.

The key quantity subtracted from that needed GNP—along with anticipated private domestic investment, state and local government purchases, and net exports—would be a federal government component made up of items the President and Congress concluded should be in the budget for their own sake, not just to fill gaps. Although the public jobs throttle would at times still have to be opened or closed a little, because of net error in the various advance estimates, what this approach means is that basically all parts of the full employment not public by choice would be reserved to the private domain.●

GRENADA WAS A SOVIET DAGGER AIMED AT U.S. INTERESTS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the months following the U.S. intervention in Grenada, it has become increasingly more clear that the U.S. military not only executed a successful rescue of American students, but also served a vital strategic purpose in blocking the expansion of Soviet influence in the Caribbean. U.S. forces in Grenada discovered trained, professional Cuban soldiers in unexpected numbers, in addition to huge caches of weapons and ammunition. Documents that were seized also revealed Cuban plans to turn Grenada into a forward base for their exportation of terror throughout the region. Our actions cut short Castro's plans for Grenada and the region none too soon. Within months, Grenada would have been converted into a veritable fortress, a Cuban satellite well-stocked with arms and personnel.

A Soviet controlled, well-armed Grenada would not only have proved dangerous to other Caribbean nations, but would have threatened air and sea lanes vital to America's interests and well-being. As Marvin Leibstone explains in his article entitled, "Grenada Was a Soviet Dagger Aimed at U.S. Interests," the United States could not permit the Soviet Union to turn the sea lanes in the Caribbean into theaters of terrorism and other acts of aggression.

Mr. Reagan's actions reflected an American foreign policy characterized by unswerving resolve and firmness. In the years ahead, it will be of paramount importance to maintain a strong foreign policy especially in the face of rising threats to freedom and democracy throughout the world. It is for this reason that I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Leibstone's article and to once again reflect upon the possible implications had the United States not intervened in Grenada:

[From the Baltimore News American, Mar. 13, 1984]

GRENADA WAS A SOVIET DAGGER AIMED AT U.S. INTERESTS

(By Marvin Leibstone)

Examination of captured documents now confirms that the Soviet Union was transforming Grenada into a platform for sabotaging U.S. interests in this hemisphere.

Soviet and Cuban control of Grenada began five years ago, after Marxist-Leninist Maurice Bishop ousted eccentric, British-educated Sir Eric Gairy. It ended last November after the U.S. invasion, when 49 Soviet, 53 Cuban and 15 North Korean advisers were returned to their governments.

In those five years Grenada became a warehouse for Soviet assault rifles, surface-to-air missiles, mortars, artillery pieces and armored personnel carriers; its army of 2,180 was Cuban-trained.

Copies of treaties seized during the invasion indicate that by 1985 Moscow, Havana and Pyongyang would have delivered 7,000 automatic and semi-automatic weapons and 15,000 hand-grenades, six-fold that needed to defend Grenada but standard supply for units fighting the U.S.-backed Salvadoran army. Moscow and Havana also helped build a 9,500-ft. runway at Port Salines capable of accommodating any jet fighter, bomber or transport plane in the Soviet inventory and enabling Cuban aircraft to reach Angola without refueling.

North of this airfield was a Cuban-managed terrorist training camp and half-completed submarine base. And Moscow was considering basing SS 20 intermediate range missiles on Grenada, which accounts for the presence of 15 Soviet rocketry experts.

Ruin for Moscow and Havana began, ironically, with the man each welcomed to power. Maurice Bishop seemed, to Soviet Ambassador Genaidy I. Sazhanev, increasingly soft and incompetent.

After three years of Bishop, 60 percent of Grenada's economy remained free enterprise. In June 1983, Bishop, against Soviet and Cuban advice, visited Washington to repair relations and reaffirm his island's non-alignment status.

Soviet and Cuban diplomats responded by cultivating Bishop's hardline rivals, Deputy Minister Bernard Coard and Gen. Hudson Austin. U.S. intelligence sources believe Ambassador Sazhanev persuaded Austin to stage the October 20 coup. Austin obeyed, but angry Grenadans demanded Bishop's release from house arrest. Bishop was let go and immediately murdered by Lt. Colonel Hubert Lane, a Grenadan trained by the KGB in Moscow.

President Reagan's decision to intervene, however, did not come until neighboring nations asked for assistance. The U.S. deployed under 2,200 troops, hardly dominating numerically the Grenadan military in that lion-over-mouse equation painted afterward by critics.

Why would the Soviet Union and Cuba want Grenada, which is only 344 square kilometers with 121 kilometers of coastline, as a swing-point and base for military operations?

An obvious reason, suggested by the Kissinger commission, began when the Soviet and Cuban manner of supporting Latin American insurrections proved to be a bust. Efforts to damage power centers like Buenos Aires and Caracas failed, in each case Marxist-Leninists losing to a government that obtained U.S. help.

The Carter presidency, however, demonstrated the U.S. would provide emergency military assistance only when its more crucial interests were threatened. Hence Soviet and Cuban support for Nicaragua's Sandinistas, El Salvador's FLMN and the Guatemalan rebels.

In other words, Moscow and Havana, unable to influence Latin America by dominating power centers, went for the weaker underbelly—Central America and the Caribbean—with Grenada the focal point.

Meanwhile, the region became more and more important to the U.S. which, to soften the impact of future oil price hikes or unexpected interruptions of the flow of Persian Gulf oil, raised its imports of Venezuelan and Mexican crude. Moreover, 44 percent of Alaskan crude was soon reaching refineries near Grenada, via Panamanian pipelines and the Panama Canal. Captured documents show, too, that the purpose of the submarine base was control of the Trinidad Straits, a deep water entrance to the Panama Canal, where 40 percent of U.S. trade passes each year.

In effect, Soviet planners recognized, by 1979, that U.S. strategic dependency had shifted somewhat. If the Soviet Union was to hold the U.S. to the same level of vulnerability imposed by dependence on Mideast oil, it would have to act in Central America.

A boon for Moscow, of course, was the Sandinista takeover of Nicaragua. Soon thereafter, the Kremlin sent Sazhanev to Grenada, where potential air and sea operations could threaten Venezuelan and Mexican oil fields and Panama Canal traffic, and from where Cuba could aid Latin insurgencies. The former commander of U.S. forces in Panama, General Wallace H. Nutting, estimates Soviet Mig flying-time from Grenada to Venezuela or Mexico to be under 20 minutes.

Ambassador Sazhanev, by the way, is a four-star general and military intelligence official specializing in covert operations. He was given full control of Cuban military and intelligence activities affecting the Grenada-Central America relationship.

True, President Reagan thought the safety of American medical students a good reason for sending troops to Grenada. He most certainly thought of signalling Moscow and Havana that their toying with air and sea lanes vital to America's well-being, and continued use of Grenada as a support base for Marxist-Leninist violence, would not be tolerated.

It is several months since the invasion of Grenada and is finally clear its purpose was strategic and vital to hemispheric security.●

GEORGE WILL ON MOVING THE U.S. EMBASSY TO JERUSALEM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, with a number of my colleagues in the House I have introduced a bill which will move the American Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. That bill now has 207 Members of the House as cosponsors.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement made by the distinguished columnist George Will on this issue in a discussion on "This Week With David Brinkley." The issue was raised by Mr. Brinkley at the conclusion of the show. He noted the bill that has been introduced in the Congress, noted that there is a "good deal of controversy about it," and asked, "George, are you in favor of that?" George Will made the following response:

Absolutely. It's not a question of recognizing it. If you went out of Connecticut and K Street and asked passersby the capital of Delaware—which is Dover, by the way—and Vermont—which is, what? Montpelier—and Israel, a lot more people would know Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, regardless of what the U.S. Congress or State Department says about it than would know Delaware or Vermont. Clearly, if Costa Rica, which is I think about the only nation that still has the gumption to stand up to Arab pressure, can have its Embassy in Jerusalem, the United States, in its standing-tall phase, can afford to put its Embassy in Jerusalem, thereby signaling that Jerusalem is the united capital of Israel and so shall remain.

Mr. Will's forthright and principled stance on this issue deserves the attention of all of us considering this issue.●

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I share with my colleagues in the House the winning essay in the 1984 New Hampshire Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest. This year's New Hampshire winner is Elizabeth Dressler, a 17-year-old senior at Hollis Area High School in Hollis, N.H. Her prize winning essay is entitled "My Role in Upholding Our Constitution."

In her thoughtful essay Ms. Dressler explores the meaning of our Consitution and the Bill of Rights in today's society. She reminds us that our freedoms, while great, did not come easily and require each of us to make a commitment to our Nation to preserve them. She eloquently spells out the responsibilities which accompany our freedoms.

Ms. Dressler lives with her parents Donald and Nancy Dressler, her sister Amy, and her brother Frederick, at 171 Dow Road in Hollis. She enjoys running, piano, crafts, horseback riding and reading, is the treasurer of her senior class and a Spanish Club representative and hopes to attend Harvard University in the fall.

The essay follows:

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

(By Elizabeth Dressler)

The first Amendment of the Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution forms the basis of the freedoms we enjoy as United States citizens. It states that "the Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridge that freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." The main concept in a democratic republic such as ours is that of personal freedom. In

Amendments I-X, or the Bill of Rights, we, as American citizens, are guaranteed certain inalienable rights. Aside from the freedoms of religion, speech, and the press, we are also guaranteed the right to a speedy trial, to reasonable fines and bails, and to know the reasons for our arrest. We are also guaranteed certain powers in making decisions concerning the laws we live by. Most importantly, our constitutional rights are never to be denied us; our freedom is protected.

To define my role in upholding the Constitution, is to state what actions I must take in order to protect it should its integrity be threatened. Knowing that the Constitution forms the basis of our democratic form of government, I must defend it against all who would violate its laws, try to destroy its tenets, or amend it improperly. And if, at any time, my right to think or judge issues as an individual is threatened, I must take a stand and fight to preserve this most fundamental freedom, to think for myself.

One of the basic tools at my disposal which I share with all U.S. citizens, and enables me to uphold the Constitution, is my right to vote. Using this tool properly suggests to me the right to assemble with enlightened citizens to discuss important issues to be voted upon. It is up to me to read all I can, listen to all sides, and be well informed on the issues of government so that I may vote intelligently and in the best interests of America. By exercising my right to vote, I am insuring the continuance of our democratic society, thereby achieving the goal of our forefathers, which was, "that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from this earth."

The principals of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity are defined in the Constitution. The idea of guaranteed freedom is a unique characteristic of this country. Americans must not take their freedom for granted; they must strive to keep an awareness of this freedom alive in America in order to ward off continual threats from within and without. It should be enjoyed, but, at the same time, every citizen should be taught how precious this privilege is. The joy of being able to vote, sing, eat, sleep, and choose as we see fit, is the reward for upholding our Constitution.●

FRESNO METROPOLITAN MUSEUM DEDICATION

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1984, the Fresno Metropolitan Museum of Art, History and Science will be open to the public. This is an event of achievement, commitment, and generosity by citizens of the San Joaquin Valley. It will hearld the opening of the only regional museum between the two major metropolitan areas of California, and also marks the realization of many dedicated and hard-working San Joaquin Valley residents.

While initially conceived almost 8 years ago, the museum was officially incorporated just 5 years ago in 1979. Since then, the museum has found itself a home, raised $3.5 million and has become the recipient of several art and history collections which will reflect the unique culture and history of the valley.

Museums offer a unique and special learning experience for young and old alike. No other institution can match the opportunities provided by a museum to enjoy and relive the scientific, historical, and cultural accomplishments of this society.

The spirit of cooperation and enthusiasm which has been the foundation of the project during this entire time, reflects the character, sense of tradition, history, and cultural values of the residents of the entire San Joaquin Valley.

On behalf of the 98th Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations and best wishes to the many individuals who were a part of this entire effort and whose foresight and dedication made this cultural and historical dream a reality. Special recognition should go to Mr. Lewis Eaton, president of the board of trustees and founder of the Fresno Metropolitan Museum and the McClatchy Newspaper Corp., for making available to the museum the old Fresno Bee Building in downtown Fresno. In addition, recognition should be given to the museum board of directors: Anthony Abbata, Elizabeth Aller, Keith Baxter, Brenton Bradford, Jack Cardwell, Delbert Crummey, Robert Duncan, T. Jefferson Ennis, A. B. Ben Ewell, Eleanor MacMichael, Dan Martin, Alice Peters, Elmer Bud Richter, Bruce Wild, and Jack Woolf.

As the policy of the museum states:

The Museum is a public benefit educational institution serving the peoples of Central California. The Museum will be a collecting institution preserving and interpreting the cultural heritage of the Central California region. Its content will include visual arts, written and visual history of the Central California region and the natural sciences of the Central California region in its collection as well as temporary exhibitions of similar content.

The museum will include and develop facilities and organizations supporting these purposes including spacious galleries, collection storage and work areas, shops, a library, and other facilities.

Among the exhibits and making its first U.S. display will be a collection of rare jade objects belonging to the Republic of China's National Museum of History. In addition there will be a collection of photographs from noted naturalist-photographer Ansel Adams and the prototype airplane for Charles Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis*, aptly renamed the *Spirit of Fresno*, as well as displays and exhibitions reflecting the regional culture.●

GORDON CAVANAUGH: HOUSING ADVOCATE FOR THE POOR

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see a recent Washington Post article concerning a truly outstanding advocate for the residents of public housing, Gordon Cavanaugh. As the article points out, Mr Cavanaugh's major concern is making public housing work for the people for whom it is home. Being an advocate for the poorest people in our socieity is usually a thankless task, and I am very happy that Mr. Cavanaugh's efforts are being recognized.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Cavanaugh on a number of occasions and can attest to his professionalism, dedication and knowledge of housing programs. He understands the difficult tasks which face public housing authorities and has been very helpful to Members of Congress in addressing these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a copy of the Post article in the RECORD. I commend this article to my colleagues' attention.

LOBBYIST IS DEDICATED TO HOUSING THE POOR

(By Howard Kurtz)

Week after week, Gordon Cavanaugh plies the corridors of Congress on behalf of his clients.

The tall, bearded attorney in the three-piece suit doesn't represent investment bankers or real estate agents or the oil companies. His clients don't have a political action committee; in fact, most of them have never even heard of him. But he is a tireless advocate for the nation's low-income tenants.

"It's not your classic Tommy Boggs lobbying," said Cavanaugh, 55, who represents the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities, a coalition of 35 urban housing agencies.

"I don't go to fund-raisers. I spend a lot of time with congressional staff. . . . There aren't a lot of votes in this for anyone. You're trying to appeal to the decency in congressmen."

Cavanaugh, who headed the Farmers Home Administration under President Carter, was well positioned to become a corporate lawyer after Carter lost in 1980, instead of representing primarily nonprofit groups. But, he said, "I just had no interest in going to a law firm that was just a money-making operation."

Cavanaugh said he enjoyed his stint in government, but he still chafes at the memory of having to deal with "technocrats and pettifoggers, this whole unseen ring of people. All the eternal analysis, asking for demonstrations of almost everything you want to do."

Cavanaugh's pitch for public housing is simple and direct: "This is a program that has never wandered away from serving very poor people."

He was troubled by recent federal audits that blamed some local public housing authorities for mismanagment and neglecting repairs on thousands of vacant units. While conceding that some agencies have been run poorly or gone bankrupt, Cavanaugh argues that public housing in New York and many other cities is remarkably well managed.

"Almost by definition, the program is going to be controversial," he said. "There's a great 'put-it-in-someone-else's-neighborhood' attitude.

"Private real estate can pick its spots, but public housing has been driven into sites that makes its management difficult. A number of projects have turned out badly. There are a lot of factors: bad design, like the 1950s high-rises, late rent payments and neighborhoods where people do not want to live. The units remain vacant, then vandalism sets in. Thieves come and tear out the plumbing and you have to fix it up again."

Public housing, which now gets more than $4 billion a year in federal subsidies, largely paid its own way until 1970. But Congress imposed limits on tenant rents, utility costs soared, and buildings deteriorated to the point that Cavanaugh says it would take $8 billion to $10 billion to repair them.

A graduate of New York's Fordham College and the University of Pennsylvania Law School, Cavanaugh was Philadelphia's housing director and chairman of the Philadephia Housing Authority in the 1960s. When Frank Rizzo was elected mayor, he resigned and moved here to form an advocacy group for rural low-income housing.

After President Reagan took office, some old friends from public housing asked Cavanaugh to do some brief lobbying on a supplemental appropriation. The assignment slowly evolved into a coalition that now represents public housing agencies in 27 cities.

In fighting Reagan administration efforts to cut back on public housing, Cavanaugh has found some unexpected Republican allies. He said that Sen. Jake Garn (R-Utah) and others recognize that "you've got a major investment already, 1.3 million units, and you've got to take care of them no matter what your philosophy is."

What keeps Cavanaugh going? "I got a hangover from the social mood of the '60s," he said. "It sticks with you."●

GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, March 25 commemorates the 163d anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence from the Ottoman Turks. After 400 years of foreign domination, and after 11 years of struggle against the despotic rule of the Ottoman Empire, Greece's independence was a cataclysmic event in European affairs; 163 years ago, Europe was composed mainly of autocratic empires and states whose borders had little relation to their composite nationalities. Outside of Britain and France, the ideals of self-determination and national independence were weak.

The astounding accomplishment of the Greek people acted as a catalyst in transforming the aspirations of Europeans. Greece's independence from the Turks was in many ways a greater feat than the other great struggle for national independence 45 years earlier: the American Revolutionary War. Although the Greek people received support from many other countries, particularly the United States, they enjoyed no advantage similar to a protective ocean or the active assistance of an ally such as the French.

During the last 163 years, the ideals of national independence and democracy, which were first expounded by the ancient Greeks, have spread widely throughout Western Europe and much of the world. Greece's achievement of independence helped to spread not only the belief in the inherent right of national independence, but the belief that it is possible for a nation to assert its rights, despite seemingly impossible odds. In Eastern Europe, and elsewhere in the world, there are people still yearning to be free. It is appropriate that we commemorate March 25. This date remains a powerful symbol of the ideals that we hold dear, and upon which this Nation was formed.

I am pleased to support House Joint Resolution 502 to designate March 25 as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." The finest traditions of our two countries are embodied in this resolution, and symbolized by this day.●

AIRPORT INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned of a unique and innovative new internship program for high school students, and I would like to share it with you.

San Francisco International Airport, in conjunction with the San Mateo County Industry Education Council, the San Mateo Union High School District—specifically Capuchino High School—and the San Francisco Unified High School District, are sponsoring a unique 1-year pilot program to encourage interaction between students of California's 11th Congressional District and the airport.

Participating students will have the opportunity to work with management staff at the airport on a one-to-one basis, enabling them to experience actual hands-on training with the departments of engineering, operations, community relations, and business and finance.

The results of this program could be significant for both the students and the airport. The interaction of student and employees of these departments will develop and refine skills necessary for students' future job opportunities, but may also be advantageous to the airport by giving it a firsthand look at potential future employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to see the business community and the educational community in my district working together to find ways in which to improve opportunities for our youth. I commend all involved in this worthwhile project, and hope they inspire others to come up with creative solutions to education and unemployment problems.●

FAMILY REUNIFICATION

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my colleagues' attention to the following letter sent by the American Jewish Committee to the Speaker. It outlines that group's deep concerns over H.R. 1510, the immigration legislation, and urges that the Roybal bill, H.R. 4909, be given a committee hearing.

I fully agree with the American Jewish Committee's view that only the Roybal alternative addresses the problem of illegal immigration in a way that takes into account the concerns of minority communities, particularly Hispanics, about job discrimination resulting from sanctions. The legislation recognizes the need for stricter enforcement of labor laws as the more appropriate and reasonable course for discouraging the hiring of undocumented workers. The Roybal bill also maintains our policy of emphasizing family reunification, another area in which ethnic communities have a strong interest.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 4909, I too believe that it should be given a fair hearing before any rule is granted for the consideration of immigration reform legislation. It deserves no less.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,
New York., N.Y., February 23, 1984.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As the House of Representatives takes up the issue of immigration reform this session, the American Jewish Committee considers it imperative that as many groups as possible who will be affected by this legislation have the opportunity to present their views and participate in shaping the final package of proposals that will emerge from Congress.

Because of this need for full and broad participation in the shaping of a new immigration bill, we urge the House to consider seriously the alternative legislation recently

submitted by Congressman Edward Roybal. This new proposal addresses systematically and responsibly the key issues in immigration reform, including continued legal inflow into the U.S., enforcement of the borders and a comprehensive and humane program for legalizing undocumented aliens currently in the country. It also reflects the legitimate concerns of the Hispanic community which must be taken into account in any new immigration legislation. Moreover, in its support for maintaining current procedures for family unification, including brothers and sisters, in the immigration law, the Roybal Bill is sensitive to the needs of the Jewish and other ethnic communities in the U.S. and would preserve policies that have served our nation well.

As we have noted in previous communications to you, the American Jewish Committee believes that immigration reform is necessary and that legislation in this area should be passed by Congress this year. It still seems possible to us for the House to hold the Simpson-Mazzoli Bill in the Rules Committee until the Roybal proposal can be heard and debated at the committee level. If this is done promptly, we believe that a consensus can be reached among the bills under consideration that will attract wide support in the House and result in the passage of a fair and effective immigration reform package in this session of Congress. For this reason, we urge you to assure that the Roybal Bill receives the full hearing it deserves.

We look forward to continuing to work with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

HOWARD I. FRIEDMAN,
President.●

ANOTHER VIEW OF CYPRUS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1984, the House Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East held hearings on international security assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus. Among the witnesses attending was Prof. Pierre Oberling, Ph. D., department of history of Hunter College in New York.

Professor Oberling is a native of Strasbourg, France, and came to the United States in 1942 to escape Nazi occupation of France. He received his Ph. D. from Columbia University and taught for many years at Hunter College. He also traveled and lived in Greece, Turkey, and Iran and visited Cyprus in 1977. His book, "The Road to Bellepais," on the Cypriot Turks is apparently considered to be a classic on the situation in Cyprus between 1963-74.

This Member would not claim to be an expert in Cypriot history nor on the years of animosity between Greece and Turkey, two of our NATO allies. But, this Member has no reason to distrust the professor's analysis.

Professor Oberling provides us with a different view on the situation in Cyprus; and herein lies my reason for placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is no question that atrocities occurred on both sides and a peaceful resolution of the Cyprus problem on the basis of a bizonal federated state is absolutely necessary. However, most of us know little of the sufferings of the Cypriot Turks between 1963-74, reported by Dr. Oberling, which underlie the present situation in Cyprus. Therefore, I insert excerpts of Professor Oberling's testimony into the RECORD:

* * * (I)t might be worth our while to look briefly at the major events which have occurred in Cyprus since 1960. When the Cypriot Republic was founded, the Turkish Cypriots hoped that they would live in a kind of Mediterranean Switzerland—a fully independent, bi-communal state in which their rights would be protected, in keeping with the provisions of the new national constitution. But the Greek Cypriots, under the leadership of Archbishop Makarios, who had become the first president of Cyprus, regarded independence as but a stepping stone towards union with Greece (or *Enosis*) and openly sought the complete Hellenization of the island. As Archbishop Makarios put it, "Unless this small Turkish community forming a part of the Turkish race * * * is expelled, the duty of the heroes of EOKA can never be considered as terminated". EOKA was the Greek Cypriot guerrilla organization which had fought against British rule. It was now rearmed to bring about the destruction of the Cypriot Republic and the absorption of the island by Greece.

For the purpose of establishing the legal framework for *Enosis* and neutralizing all opposition to his scheme, Archbishop Makarios first forced the resignation of the distinguished German jurist who was the president of his Supreme Constitutional Court. Then, he prepared a list of amendments to the 1960 Constitution which would have deprived the Turkish Cypriots of both their veto power over legislation and their own municipalities.

When the Turkish Cypriots refused to accept these amendments, Archbishop Markarios illegally fired all of the Turkish Cypriot officials and members of the Cypriot House of Representatives. He also put into effect a plan—the so-called Akritas Plan—to brutalize the Turkish Cypriots into submission. The Turkish Cypriot quarters of the towns and isolated Turkish Cypriot villages were attacked, 364 Turkish Cypriots were killed, 25,000 Turkish Cypriots were forced to flee from their homes, and 103 Turkish Cypriot villages were looted and burned. But the Turkish Cypriots refused to accept defeat.

In 1967, General George Grivas, the old EOKA firebrand, who had returned to Cyprus, launched a new wave of attacks on Turkish Cypriot villages. The Turkish Cypriots were gradually forced to move into small enclaves which were then surrounded by coils of barbed wire and fortifications to prevent supplies from reaching them. The Turkish Cypriots were also forced to form their own administration. Thus, several years before the Turkish intervention, the Greek Cypriots had already divided their own nation into two separate, ethnically distinct zones, each with its own government.

By 1974, the Greek military junta, under the leadership of the ultra-nationalist Colonel Dimitrios Ioannides, had lost patience with Archbiship Makarios, whose attempts to bring the Turkish Cypriots to their knees had consistently failed. Needing an immediate triumph to offset its declining popularity, it organized a coup, the aims of which were the murder of Archbishop Makarios and his replacement by an EOKA thug by the name of Nikos Sampson. Although the Greeks failed in their attempt to assassinate Archbishop Makarios, they succeeded in overthrowing him and in installing Sampson in the Presidential Mansion in Nicosia.

Sampson at once embarked upon a massacre of Archbishop Makarios's followers. At least 700 Greek Cypriots were killed in less than a week. Because Sampson had a long history of violence against the Turkish Cypriot community and had been elected a member of the Greek Cypriot House of Representatives with the slogan "Death to the Turks", his rise to power was looked upon with alarm and dismay by both the Turkish Cypriots and the Turks.[1] It is at this point that the Turkish intervention took place. As Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the former British Foreign Secretary, commented: "Turkey has been provoked beyond endurance". In any case, the Turkish intervention was perfectly legal according to the Treaty of Guarantee, which Archbishop Makarios himself had signed. Its legality has even been acknowledged by a court of law in Athens.

It must be added that the Turkish intervention was by no means the first military intervention in Cyprus since 1960. As early as 1964, the Greek Army had made itself at home on the island. During that year, 9,000 Greek soldiers and 950 Greek officers were secretly landed in Cyprus to help Archbishop Makarios subdue the Turkish Cypriot villagers. Petros Garoufalias, the Greek Defense Minister, later boasted of his skill in carrying out this operation. By 1967, as many as 20,000 Greek troops had been smuggled into the island. Then it must be remembered that George Grivas was a general in the Greek Army. Finally, the Greek Cypriot National Guard, which was commanded by Greek officers and received its orders from the junta in Athens, was, to all intents and purposes, a Greek force.

The Turkish intervention not only saved the Turkish Cypriot population from certain massacre, but it also caused the downfall of the savage dictatorship of Nikos Sampson and put an end to his slaughter of Greek Cypriots. Moreover, it led to the resignation of the much-hated Greek colonels and the reestablishment of democracy in Greece.

Since the Turkish intervention, the Turkish Cypriots have made new lives for themselves in the North. For the first time in their existence they feel safe and free. Therefore, they have strenuously opposed any solution to the Cyprus problem which would lead once more to their dispersal in Greek Cypriot-controlled territory and to the formation of a strong, Greek Cypriot-dominated government. For them there can be only two possible solutions to the Cyprus problem:

(1) The creation of a loose, bi-zonal federation with the Greek Cypriots, and

[1] Later it was revealed by Archbishop Makarios that in 1964 Ioannides, who was then stationed in Cyprus, and Sampson had approached him with a plan to slaughter the entire Turkish Cypriot population. (See Oriana Fallaci, *Interview With History*, Boston, 1976, p. 318.)

(2) The creation of an independent Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

The Turkish Cypriots would have preferred the first of these two alternatives. But the Greek Cypriot Government has consistently refused to negotiate on a realistic basis and, since April 1983, it has refused to negotiate at all. Both Archbishop Makarios and his successor, President Kyprianou, have acted as though the Cyprus problem began with the Turkish intervention of 1974. They have totally overlooked the savage and unprovoked attacks against the Turkish Cypriot community which were launched in 1963-64 and 1967, and they have taken no account of the deep concern which the Turkish Cypriots have acquired for their own safety as a result of these attacks.[2]

In fact, they have displayed such intransigence that they have even drawn fire from officials in their own administration. In April 1976, Glafkos Klerides, the Greek Cypriot Government's chief negotiator at the inter-communal talks, was forced to resign because he could not accept President Makarios's rigid stance in the negotiations. In July 1978, Klerides's successor as chief negotiator, Tassos Papadopoulos, was, in turn, dismissed after he had criticized President Kyprianou for refusing to abide by the Makarios-Denktas Agreement of February 12, 1977, which recognized the principle of bi-zonality as a basis for further negotiation. More recently, in September 1983, Nikos Rolandis, the Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister, resigned when President Kyprianou rejected UN Secretary-General Pérez de Cuéllar's invitation to resume negotiations. A few days later, Rolandis went so far as to accuse President Kyprianou of being "the enemy of Cyprus".

While assuming a tough and unyielding stand in the negotiations, President Kyprianou has tried to force the Turkish Cypriots to bow to his will by means of a policy of economic strangulation. He has imposed a trade boycott upon Northern Cyprus and, arguing that his government is the only legitimate authority in Cyprus, he has spared no effort to discourage or prevent foreign countries from trading with the Turkish Cypriots. Foreign skippers who have used the Turkish Cypriot port of Famagousta have even been imprisoned and fined when later they used the Greek Cypriot ports of Larnaka or Limassol. Because of this boycott, the Turkish Cypriots have had difficulty selling their products abroad and the Turkish Cypriot economy has suffered accordingly. It is this attempt of the Greek Cypriot Government to strangulate the Turkish Cypriot economy which finally convinced President Denktas and his government to seek complete independence, for only by acquiring a formal status can the Turkish Cypriot state trade freely with the rest of the world.

Thus, it is the policies of the Greek Cypriot Government which have led to the creation of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and not the alleged machinations of the Turkish Government.●

[2] For the psychological wounds inflicted upon the Turkish Cypriots by these attacks, see Vamik D. Volkan, *Cyprus—War and Adaptation:* Charlottesville, 1979.

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, "My Role in Upholding our Constitution" was this year's theme in the Voice of Democracy contest, which is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. I am very proud to present the outstanding speech of David Eich, the winning contestant of the State of Wisconsin. David is an active senior at the Appleton East Senior High School and plans to pursue a career in law. I congratulate David, whose eloquent words I gladly share with my colleagues.

MY ROLE IN UPHOLDING OUR CONSTITUTION

(By David Eich)

My Mom makes good pie. The best actually, after Grandma, of course.

I wonder if the stars will be out tonight. And the moon. I wonder if I might blow clouds of breath from my mouth, up in the air, cold all around, but warm inside. High up over the most glamorous city in the nation, I cannot help but ponder on the skyline so lit that like a theater flat hides the most primal link to every piece of pie, every baseball game, and every kiss from Grandma that I ever had. The floodlights glare off the marble, as if all of Washington were a display in a shopping window. The rest of the world saunters by, perhaps window shopping, browsing over the freedoms that no marble can do justice to. Everything patriotic resides among these monuments; After dark the shadows of liberty weaken and fade into the night, but I am always secure in knowing that lights or no lights, marble or no marble, my mind is without constraint. Freedom, I laugh at the word so carefully inscribed in the rock that is the building stone of Washington, amused not by what it means, but rather by the way it is defined for most Americans. Those caught up in taking their security and their livelihood for granted equate freedom with democracy, democracy with the Constitution, and the Constitution with some yellowing piece of paper in some musty but crowded hall in the middle of the nation's capitol. Ha! Let eternity come before that piece of paper saves one man's life, or keeps one man's mind from bondage. And those hallowed Fathers, those heroic creators of our homeland, the legacy they leave is but sand on a beach * * * unless it lives in me. No, I proclaim to my friends, Washington is not the Capitol, the Constitution is not of paper, and freedom is not marble. Just as my heart gives me life, I tell them, it certainly is not the seat of my soul. To uphold a mere piece of paper, one requires but the strength of his arm. Yet to uphold the greatest work in the history of man requires more. If only Americans could come to look beyond the glass, beyond the ink, and into the farmer's kitchen, the milkman's truck; if I could convince them that we are all astronauts, orbiting humanity from the vantage of knowledge. For truly, the price in the shopping window, after sales tax, is only to know.

To know freedom.

To know your Nation.

To know yourself.

Ignorance twists the Constitution. The words lose their meaning amidst illiteracy. I wonder then, can the man who does not understand ever be free? No, for he wears his unawareness like a ball and chain. Oh, he might well see the glitter and the limousines, the black ties and the black stone, but he will be blind to his own claim to glory, freedom. A government is of the people that know, for the people that don't. One who tries to uphold the Constitution without reading it first quickly finds the arm of his rhetoric too feeble, and the yellow sheets come crashing to the floor as if they were leaden. Teach them that the Flat is not cloth, that instead it is the sweat and blood of men. Tell them that no one dies for yellowing paper, but that many have died for the Constitution. Explain to them that the freedom of speech and assumes the ability to speak.

Pick an apple and know that my produce is my own and not that of a state farm, and I have upheld the Constitution. Picket my employer and know that I have the right to assemble, and I have upheld the Constitution. Pray to my own God, and know that I have freedom of religion, and I upheld the Constitution. Strengthen my arms with the muscle of knowledge, and there is not yellow paper heavy enough in all the universe to weigh me down. Of course, no bicep becomes strong without exercise. I must seek to keep my freedoms in shape by using them. I must vote for my candidate, criticize my government, and participate. Only then, after I have upheld my Constitution, can my Constitution uphold me.

The stars are out tonight, and Mom, I'll have another piece of pie.●

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

HON. MARVIN LEATH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. LEATH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, introduced House Joint Resolution 521 which proposes that June 6, 1984, be designated as the 40th anniversary of the Allied landings at Normandy, France, during World War II.

I am pleased to join the chairman as a cosponsor of this proclamation to commemorate a date which was not only a stunning military victory, but a reminder to us all that the freedom we enjoy costs and there are many who have made the sacrifice.

During World War II, over 16 million Americans served in the Armed Forces of the United States. During that war there were many battles fought all over the world in defense of freedom. The most crucial battle occurred in June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, when American and Allied forces joined together to regain a foothold in Europe. The vivid remembrances of this date, I am sure, are

shared by the Members of this body who participated in this and other battles of World War II.

It may well have been the largest battle ever fought in the sense that it included every branch of our Armed Forces, together with international forces. Involved were over 153,000 troops, 5,000 naval vessels, and 11,000 sorties of Allied aircraft. There were many innovations both in weapons and tactics. For example, three divisions of airborne troops, the 82d and 101st of the United States, and the 6th of Britain were dropped inland and seized key points and blocked roads which German reinforcement were prevented from using. The skies were literally dotted with planes, and the sea filled with ships which were transporting well-trained troops to land against a strongly garrisoned and fortified coast.

The beaches were fiercely guarded by the German defenders with the approaches guarded by underwater obstacles. The beaches were heavily mined and strewn with barbed wire, and the high ground above them were commanded by artillery in strategic locations.

Notwithstanding, a quick foothold was gained with cover being provided by a close-in naval force which battered the German defenders. In a short period, the Allies had driven from the air, the once-vaunted Luftwaffe and, the German navy from the sea; and had taken its army by surprise. As the Allied troops moved inland after that first day, the flame of hope was rekindled for freedom-loving people all over the world.

We must never forget the sacrifice made by those who gave their lives or were wounded; 1,465 Americans were killed that day; 3,184 were wounded; 1,928 were listed as missing in action; and 26 were captured.

The successful assault on Normandy provided the basis for the ultimate breakthrough across Europe and paved the way for bringing the war in Europe to a successful conclusion. June 6, 1944, was not only a decisive battle in World War II, but a date that will live in the annals of history as one of the great battles in defense of freedom and the defeat of tyranny.

I urge consideration and approval of the resolution as expeditiously as possible.●

REMI MUYLLAERT—PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD WINNER FOR SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I announced the formation of a new public service awards program for the 11th Congressional District of California. The purpose of the program is to recognize all volunteers by singling out one special individual in each of the communities in my district whose public service has been outstanding. The recipients are chosen by a select advisory committee of respected residents and leaders from each community.

I am proud to announce today that the advisory committee for the city of South San Francisco has chosen Mr. Remi Muyllaert as its 1984 public service award recipient. A resident of South San Francisco since 1954, Mr. Muyllaert has donated countless hours to numerous civic activities in his community. He has actively participated in the Police Athletic League, the South San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the Elk's Club, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Advisory Committee for Colma Creek, the PTA, the South San Francisco Young Men's Institute, and he served on the adult education committee for South San Francisco High School. He has become particularly well-known in the community for his devotion to youth-related programs.

Despite recent health problems, Mr. Muyllaert continues to give of his time and expertise. I wish to commend the SSF advisory committee for its unanimous selection of Mr. Muyllaert as the 1984 Congressional Public Service Award winner. He is truly an inspiration and an outstanding example of dedication to his fellow human being.●

H.R. 2133—AMENDMENTS TO THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

HON. FOFO I. F. SUNIA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. SUNIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2133, the amendments to the Small Business Act. This bill has received wide public approval. It advocates that Federal departments pay competitive, lower prices.

H.R. 2133 clarifies programs which the Small Business Act now contains. Its cosponsors and I intend that it will increase competition. The Federal procurement process should involve small businesses. This legislation will open up opportunities for businesses which in the past have been unable to bid on contracts for the Department of Defense.

The Small Business Act authorizes the Small Business Administration, the SBA to certify if a business can capably and competently perform a specific Government procurement. The SBA contacts those companies whose low bids contracting officers have rejected because they questioned the companies' ability to perform the contracts. The SBA then offers the companies the opportunity to apply for a certificate of competency. If the SBA grants the certificate, the contracting officers must award the contracts to those companies.

In 1982 the SBA issued a rule which left the referral of a case at the discretion of a contracting officer if the contract had a value under $10,000. I feel that the Small Business Act is clear that no exception should exist to the right of a small business to a referral for a certificate of competency, regardless of the dollar value.

Congress must legislate its intent that access to the certificate of competency should not depend on the anticipated dollar value of the contract. The SBA's program of certificates of competency has proved successful, saves the taxpayers money and provides great benefits to small businesses.●

HONORING DR. HECTOR P. GARCIA, RECIPIENT OF PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL OF FREEDOM

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, when Dr. Hector Garcia was notified of his selection to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, his characteristically modest response was, "I'm not worthy of this honor to be considered with such people that I have respect for, both living and dead."

Despite Dr. Garcia's sincere humility, his efforts in fighting for the tradition of freedom so cherished by the country's founders are not simply a footnote in America's history. Recognizing the work of Dr. Garcia illustrates the racial inequities that have been institutionalized in our Nation, the dramatic progress made in correcting these inequities, and the great challenge ahead in maintaining and building upon past achievements.

Dr. Garcia initially became known through his work in safeguarding the rights of Hispanics. On June 16, 1945, Pvt. Felix Longoria was killed in action while serving with the 27th Infantry Division in the Philippines. After a local cemetery in Three Rivers, Tex., refused to accept Private Longoria's remains because of his Mexican descent, Dr. Garcia intervened and arranged to have Private Longoria laid to rest with full military honors in Arlington National Cemetery.

Shortly thereafter, Dr. Garcia founded the American GI Forum of the United States, a national veterans family organization composed primarily of Hispanics who are veterans or active duty service members. Dr.

Garcia founded the forum with the objective of working with Government authorities to eliminate discriminatory practices towards Hispanics as well as enhancing their overall quality of life.

Since then, Dr. Garcia has molded the American GI Forum into a dynamic force in the movement for social and economic equality for Hispanic American citizens. It fact, the forum is often consulted by Federal, State and local governmental officials when considering issues which affect Hispanic Americans and veterans. Under the leadership of Dr. Garcia, the forum established the following aims and objectives:

To develop leadership in the Spanish-speaking population by creating interest in community, civic, and political affairs;

To advance understanding among citizens of various national origins in orders to develop a more enlightened citizenry and a greater nation;

To preserve and advance the basic principles of democracy, the religious and political freedom of the individual, and equal social and economic opportunities for all Americans;

To secure and protect for all veterans and their families the privileges guaranteed to them by the Constitution and laws of the United States; and

To preserve and defend the United States from all enemies through loyalty and service to our country.

The American GI Forum has not been Dr. Garcia's only contribution to this country. Prior to founding the forum, he served in the Army from 1942-46, where he was awarded a Bronze Star Medal and six battle stars. After gaining recognition in his work through the forum, Dr. Garcia was appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson to the United Nations as a delegate in 1967 and then as a member of the Civil Rights Commission in 1968.

Dr. Garcia has been a friend to me for many years; I am particularly proud to count him as one of my constituents. Not only is he a tremendous help to me in my work as a U.S. Representative, but I can personally attest to the profound influence he has upon the State of Texas and the community of Corpus Christi in the arena of social justice.

In studying his accomplishments, we can all be assured that our system of Government is not static, but can adapt to the dynamics of a changing society. When Dr. Garcia founded the American GI Forum in 1948, few in this country were aware of discrimination against Hispanics and few were committed to improvements. Dr. Garcia brought national attention to the plight of Hispanics, awakening many Americans to the need for comprehensive social reform.

The awarding of the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Dr. Garcia indicates to all Americans the importance of his contribution to the social progress of our Nation. Several years ago, such recognition would not been possible. I join the thousands of people who have learned and benefited from Dr. Garcia's efforts in congratulating him for being selected for this prestigious award. We must all follow his example and work tirelessly in molding a better America for all people, regardless of race, culture or creed.●

HUNGER IN AMERICA

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I wrote to Presidential Counselor Edwin Meese III, inviting him to visit a soup kitchen near his office in the White House so that he could see for himself evidence of hunger in America. Unfortunately, Mr. Meese did not respond to this invitation, as he did not respond to an earlier one.

If Mr. Meese cannot take the time to leave the White House, perhaps he will have a few minutes to peruse the New York State Hunger Watch report, "Profile of 'At Risk' Populations and Service Agencies," which has just been released by the State of New York. He need only read the summary.

There he will find preliminary results from interviews and case studies of 446 individuals in senior citizens centers, emergency feeding programs, and community health centers across New York State. He will find that there has been a steady increase in the demand for emergency food assistance in the past year. He will find that there is, in the words of the report, a "close association between the perception of hunger and low reported caloric intake." In other words, people who claim to be hungry have been found, on investigation of their diet, to have calorically inadequate diets. People, in fact, know when they are hungry. He will also find that the overwhelming majority of pregnant women involved in the study were nutritionally deficient.

Other findings that might prove to be of special interest to Mr. Meese are that Government assistance is not adequate; apparently 52 percent of the people involved in the study who were eligible for food stamps were not getting them. The study also found that Government offices reported no change—some even reported a decline—in caseload at a time when the lines at emergency feeding sites were growing longer.

This is more proof—if more proof be needed—of the increasing hunger problem in America. I wish to commend the New York State Department of Health, the Department of Social Medicine at the Montefiore Medical Center, and all those involved in the Hunger Watch project for their excellent work. Hunger Watch—New York State is a fine example of public and private sector cooperation in the area of human services. It is unfortunate that this effort needs to be expended simply to keep track of the disastrous results of the present administration's assault on social programs.●

H.R. 4718

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, if our economy is going to prosper and return to full employment, we must insure that sufficient capital is available for new businesses with a potential to grow rapidly. These young entrepreneurial businesses produce most of the new private sector jobs in our economy and generate most of the technological innnovations and new products that we need to compete effectivly in international markets. Unfortunately, these businesses have problems raising the capital they need to develop new innovations and bring them to market.

To launch a new business, most entrepreneurs must fend for themselves, frequently relying solely on personal savings and loans from friends and relatives. Only a select few can meet the stringent criteria needed to tap the venture capital market. Their projects do not hold out the prospect of extraordinarily high profits. Nor do they have a good probability of going public or merging with another corporation. Venture capitalists, in other words, are constantly on the look out for another Apple Computer or Genentech; they are generally not funding the thousands of potential entrepreneurs who have profitable, but not spectacular, job-producing, productivity-enhancing ideas. As a result of this capital market gap, many promising businesses never see the light of day, not because they cannot pass muster in the marketplace, but because financial markets and existing financial institutions are not equipped to provide the vast majority of entrepreneurs with adequate financing at affordable prices and on reasonable repayment terms.

These capital market gaps take many forms. For example, insurance companies and pension funds control billions of dollars which they are usually willing to invest in long-term

projects. However, they generally are not willing to make the large number of relatively small loans needed by entrepreneurs. Banks, on the other hand, have the specialized expertise to evaluate loan applications and the marketing network to service small borrowers. But for a variety of reasons, banks prefer to make short-term loans. Since entrepreneurs require long-term financing, an entrepreneurially oriented industrial policy should try to eliminate this gap by devising ways to combine the banks' ability to originate loans with the willingness of insurance companies and pension funds to provide long-term financing.

Capital availability is only one type of capital gap. Entrepreneurs also need patient capital. New businesses often have a poor cash flow during their startup phase. Only later, when the business is safely down the road to financial solvency, will its cash flow be sufficient to meet its debt service obligations. In view of these financial facts of life, a capital availability program should be structured so that repayment terms better suit the unique financial characteristics of startup companies.

Investment decisions, of course, are best left to individual lenders and stock purchasers. But with some targeted changes in both our financial laws and regulations, I believe we can greatly improve the ability of individual investors and existing financial institutions to service the unique financial requirements of entrepreneurs.

With this in mind, I have introduced H.R. 4718, the National Entrepreneurship Act on February 1, 1984. This legislation should help to insure that existing financial institutions are better equipped to provide adequate financing on affordable terms for new entrepreneurial ventures.

The National Entrepreneurship Act relies exclusively on the market oriented decisions of entrepreneurs and financiers, with a minimum of Government supervision, interference, and redtape, to insure that sufficient long-term, patient capital is available to help young businesses grow more rapidly and create more jobs. In addition, the National Entrepreneurship Act has several other desirable features:

It does not redistribute jobs from one region to another.

Government planners are not forced to pick winners or losers or to distinguish between sunrise and sunset industries.

It does not compete with private capital by offering subsidized interest rates for projects that are already receiving sufficient funding from private sources.

It serves a public purpose but the financing mechanisms are shielded from undue political interference and special interest pleading.

It allows investors to earn high rates of return on successful ventures to compensate for the extra risk of funding entrepreneurial activities.

It will help each State capitalize on its unique talents, skills, industrial structure, and comparative advantage.

The National Entrepreneurship Act has the following titles:

1. SECONDARY MARKET FOR INDUSTRIAL MORTGAGES

Commercial banks specialize in short-term business lending and have the facilities and specialized expertise to evaluate loan applications and to originate and service the large number of relatively small loans required by rapidly growing small businesses. Pension funds and insurance companies are a major source of long-term capital for the U.S. economy but they are not well equipped to originate and service the large number of relatively small loans needed by rapidly growing new businesses. A Government-sponsored secondary mortgage market will purchase industrial mortgages from banks and resell them to pension funds, insurance companies, and other institutional investors who are looking for long-term investment opportunities. It will combine the unique talents and lending activities of commercial lenders with those of pension funds and insurance companies, thereby increasing the efficiency of U.S. capital markets and the amount of long-term capital that is available to finance purchases of plant and equipment. A similar Government-sponsored secondary market for residential mortgages helped increase home ownership and employment opportunities in the construction industry.

2. MATCHING GRANTS FOR STATE VENTURE CAPITAL ROYALTY FINANCE CORPORATIONS

Royalty finance is a form of long-term patient capital whereby an investor's return is based on a percentage of the sales revenues generated by each new product. With royalty financing, a new business can undertake longer term projects because it will not have to start repaying investors until the product or innovation is a commercial success. Massachusetts and Connecticut have had great success with State-sponsored royalty finance corporations which provide grants to new entrepreneurial corporations that cannot obtain funds from traditional sources. The State corporation is repaid from royalties on the new products and these royalties provide a revolving fund for continued and expanded operations. A matching grant program will encourage States to emulate these efforts and help other States expand their existing programs.

PENSION INVESTMENT UNITS

Public and private pension funds have more than $850 billion of assets. However, State and Federal laws often prevent pension fund managers from investing these assets in the securities of new businesses. In addition, many pension fund managers do not have the resources to analyze the investment potential of new businesses whose securities are not actively traded on major exchanges. The Federal Government should make available matching grants to encourage the establishment of State sponsored pension investment units that will recommend changes in State and Federal pension fund regulations and statutes and provide research about the investment opportunities of new entrepreneurial businesses in their States. This will allow pension funds to participate more actively in each State's economic development program. The higher returns from a more aggressive, but still prudent, investment strategy will also help to hold down pension costs for both private- and public-sector employers.

4. LOAN LOSS RESERVE FUND

Banks often view loans to new entrepreneurial businesses as extremely risky. Because these businesses do not have adequate collateral to compensate a bank in the event of a default, they cannot obtain loans to purchase plant and equipment. A loan loss reserve fund, however, will insure banks against losses and defaults on loans to these businesses. The fund will be financed by small payments from banks, borrowers, and the Federal Government. It will be sufficient to compensate banks for losses on any particular loan, although not their entire portfolio. This self-financed insurance fund will encourage banks to lend more aggressively, but it will also require them to act prudently since they will still bear part of the risk of default.

No single piece of legislation can hope to solve all the problems faced by entrepreneurs. But focusing on some of the most pressing financial issues will go a long way toward insuring the success of existing ventures and, more importantly, guaranteeing that potential entrepreneurs who, until now have been shut out of the capital markets, will have an equal opportunity to launch their projects.●

JAMES T. SCHAEFER CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, James T. Schaefer of Union, N.J., is being honored as Citizen of the Year, and I wish to join in a tribute to this fine gentleman and outstanding business leader. The old maxim, "give a job to a busy man if you want to get it done" applies to Jim Schaefer.

In addition to his full time duties as the executive director of the Union Township Chamber of Commerce, Jim Schaefer manages to devote many hours to a myriad of worthy causes—the Ehrhart Gardens senior housing board, which he serves as secretary; the local Juvenile Conference Committee; the advisory board of the Ironbound Boys' Club and Salvation Army Corp. in Newark; the board of trustees of the New Jersey State Correction Department's Youth Corrections Institutions panel; the Three-Ring Federal Credit Union, of which he is vice president; the board planning Union's third senior housing complex, which he serves as president; and the Union Rotary Club.

There have been few local civic celebrations that have not benefited from Jim Schaefer's practiced hand at the helm. He was chairman of the Township's Bicentennial observance in 1976 and cochairman of the group that brought the All-America City banner back from Williamsburg that year. Last year he was secretary of the Township's 175th anniversary celebration committee.

A native of Newark's Ironbound section and the second of 12 children born to the late Charles and Nora Schaefer, Jim enjoyed a long and successful business career that prepared him to juggle all those civic balls without fumbling them. He went to work in 1942 as a teenager for P. Ballantine's brewery.

After a 3-year interruption for service with the Marines in the South Pacific during World War II, he began his climb through the sales and marketing apparatus of what was then one of America's premier breweries. By the time Ballantine had fallen victim to an industry trend toward consolidation that resulted in the disappearance of most regional breweries, Jim had become the firm's public relations and sales promotion director. In that position he played a key role in the company's relationships with the New York Yankees and the football Giants during those teams' halcyon years. He also was responsible for a variety of eye-catching promotions and special events that kept the Ballantine name before the public. The New York City "Street Games," which drew widespread media attention in the early seventies, was a Jim Schaefer brainstorm.

Throughout his years with Ballantine, Jim had been active in such local organizations as the VFW Teener League, the American Legion, the Knights of Columbus and Holy Spirit Church.

Jim and his wife, the former Marion (Vicki) Sobe, are the parents of two grown children. Vicki is a travel agent; Bob, a dean of admissions at Princeton University's school of engineering; and Patti, an employee of the Franklin State Bank Corporate Branch.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with all my fellow citizens in Union Township in saluting this outstanding American and Citizen of the Year.●

TV NETWORKS HESITATE TO PROJECT ILLINOIS ELECTION WINNER

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1984

● Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, perhaps as significant as the actual results from yesterday's Illinois election was the hesitation by the three major television networks to project the winner through voter exit polling.

I hope this new responsibility demonstrated by the networks is not simply an isolated incident caused by the very large voter turnout. I would like to believe that the networks, thanks largely to the efforts of my colleague, Congressman AL SWIFT, now understand the potential damage which projected results can cause, and that this new found restraint will become standard policy through the remainder of election year 1984. As a further comment, I am inserting an article by Mike Royko which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on March 15, 1984.

MAKE MY DAY; TELL A LITTLE LIE

(By Mike Royko)

In 20 years, I've never once asked anything of the readers. I don't ask you to give money to worthy causes, help needy families, donate your vital organs for transplants, or take part in any other journalistic do-good endeavors.

But this one time, I'm asking all of you to join me in a noble cause. It's something that will make you feel wonderful, and—if enough of you do it—will win national respect and admiration for Chicago, Cook County and the State of Illinois.

I'm asking you to lie.

Not a big lie. Not a bad lie. Not something that will later cause you to run to your clergyman, psychiatrist or bartender to get your guilt eased.

This is a good lie, a worthwhile lie, a lie that will put bounce in your step and a giggle in your voice and make you feel wonderful. Let me explain:

Next Tuesday, many of you will be voting in the Illinois Democratic primary. The eyes of the nation will be upon us, as the anchormen love to say.

Some of you will come out of your polling places and be grabbed by exit-pollsters working for one of the networks.

They will ask you who you voted for and why.

Be polite. Talk to them. But lie. Don't give them one honest answer.

If you voted for Mondale, say you voted for Hart. If you voted for Hart, say you voted for Mondale. Or if Glenn is still in the race, say you voted for him.

When they ask you why you voted for Hart, say it is because he is so mature and serious that he reminds you of your grandfather.

Or say you voted for Mondale because he reminds you of Johnny Travolta.

What will this accomplish? You probably know the answer, but I'll tell you anyway.

The pollsters will take your answers and feed them to a computer, which will chew on them, digest them, and finally burp a sheet of paper. The networks' high priests of politics will stare at the numbers, then announce: "I project the winner as . . ."

Even before the polls close and one vote has been counted, the TV anchors will be on the air telling the world how Illinois voted.

And one minute after the polls close, before 1 percent of the vote has been counted, they will be on the air "declaring" the winner of the Illinois primary. Then they'll sit there, looking smug and waiting for the results to confirm their infallibility.

But if enough of you lie, the entire nation will be treated to one of the finest evenings of television viewing since the tube was unleashed.

As the evening wears on and the actual votes are counted, we will see Dan become more and more wild-eyed. We'll see Peter hyperventilating. And even David will look like he is fully awake. And they'll all be stammering about how "goodness, something seems to have gone wrong."

Or maybe they'll scream that the votes should be thrown out on the grounds that they disagree with the exit polls.

There will be chaos in the newsrooms, network executives will try to cut their wrists, and anchormen will have nervous breakdowns before our eyes.

Don't doubt that it can be done. I once saw it happen on a smaller scale.

A few years ago, I was asked to spend an election night at a Chicago TV station talking about the results.

One hour before the polls closed, a meeting was held and one of the polling gurus came in and announced the result of the state's attorney race.

He said: "Bernard Carey has won with 63 percent of the vote. But there is a margin of error, so we are calling it at 57 percent."

All the TV newsmen nodded their heads. I said: "You aren't going to say that on the air, are you?"

"Of course," they said.

"You're nuts," I said. "He not only won't get 63 percent or 57 percent, he might lose."

The polling guru looked at me as if I were something that had come out from under a rock. And a TV whizbang said: "They're never wrong."

So before any votes were counted, they went on the air and declared Carey the winner, as did another station.

And I went on the air and declared that they were all nuts.

By midnight, when the real votes had been counted, the polling guru looked suicidal, the TV whizbangs were sweating through their pancake makeup, and Carey lost with 49 percent of the vote.

"How did you know?" a whizbang asked me.

I explained that because of Chicago's unique political atmosphere, many Chicagoans would not dream of telling a stranger how they voted in an important local election. They have a deep sense of privacy. They also fear a brick through their windows:

Many Chicagoans had simply lied to a stranger that day.

Unfortunately, Chicago, like the rest of the nation, has now become accustomed to

exit polling. Some people probably believe that they are required by law to answer.

So it will take a conscious effort in and beyond Chicago to turn the networks' projections on their ears.

But it can be done. Illinois can be the toast of the nation's TV viewers.

All you have to do is tell a little fib. Then go home, sit back, relax, and watch the anchormen slowly swallow their tongues.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

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

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

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

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 27, 1984, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 28

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, including the Health Care Financing Administration, Social Security Administration, and refugee programs.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings with the National Ocean Policy Study on S. 2324, to insure that all Federal activities directly affecting a State's coastal zone will be fully consistent with that State's coastal management plan.

SR-253

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative priorities of AMVETS, Blinded Veterans Association, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and Veterans of WWI.

SD-106

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold open/closed hearings on military implications of Soviet SALT violations.

SD-192

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 2181 and S. 2134, bills to authorize and define the scope of powers for depository institutions and their holding companies and to revise certain Federal bank regulations.

SD-538

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider S. 1227, to improve the single-employer pension plan termination insurance program created in 1974 by title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), S. 2311, Health Maintenance Organizations, S. 2308, to authorize funds through fiscal year 1987 for the primary care block grant program, and other pending calendar business.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to mark up S. 2085, to extend authority through fiscal year 1988 for the Secretary of Agriculture to recover costs associated with cotton classing services to producers, H.R. 3960, to designate specified lands in North Carolina as wilderness and wilderness study areas as additions to the National Wilderness Preservation System, H.R. 4198, to designate certain lands in the State of Vermont for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, H.R. 3921 and S. 1851, bills to establish additional wilderness areas in the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire, and H.R. 3578 and S. 1610, bills to establish certain wilderness areas in Wisconsin.

SR-328A

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of State, and the U.S. Information Agency.

S-146, Capitol

Armed Services

Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee

To resume open and closed hearings on S. 2414, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Defense, focusing on force projection programs.

SR-222

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs, including S. 2346, S. 2416, S. 2321, and S. 2347.

SD-419

Joint Economic

Economic Goals and Intergovernmental Policy Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the current situation and future prospects of the international debt.

340 Cannon Building

10:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2115, to exempt participants in the executive exchange program from the Federal Criminal Code provision prohibiting employees and officers of the executive branch from receiving outside income, and S. 2262, to establish a Federal pay schedule for the police forces of the Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport.

SD-342

Rules and Administration

To resume hearings on S. 1675, to establish guidelines to assure that registration and polling place facilities used for Federal elections are readily accessible to handicapped and elderly individuals.

SR-301

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To continue hearings on military implications of Soviet SALT violations.

SD-116

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Postal Service.

SD-138

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs, including S. 2346, S. 2416, S. 2321, and S. 2347.

SD-419

MARCH 29

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee

To resume open and closed hearings on S. 2414, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Defense, focusing on strategic command control and communication programs.

SR-222

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee

To continue open and closed hearings on S. 2414, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy research and development programs.

SR-232A

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings in closed session on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to be followed by open hearings.

SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for programs of the Older Americans Act (Public Law 89-73).
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for shipbuilding programs of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD-124

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs, including S. 2346, S. 2416, S. 2321, and S. 2347.
SD-419

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-226

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2403 and H.R. 3259, bills to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Pueblo de Cochita in New Mexico.
SD-562

Joint Economic
Economic Goals and Intergovernmental Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine catastrophic health care insurance for the elderly.
SD-538

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Rural Electrification Administration.
SD-124

Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs, including S. 2346, S. 2416, S. 2321, and S. 2347.
SD-419

MARCH 30

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, including Human Development Services and Office of Community Services.
SD-116

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Federal Aviation Administration's scatter plan to disburse airplanes departing National Airport over a larger geographical area.
SD-106

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on U.S. participation in the International Energy Program.
SD-366

Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the implementation of section 2175, to increase the efficiency of the Medicaid program administration by allowing States to implement innovative approaches to providing care, and to enable States to receive waivers of certain programmatic requirements in order to implement these approaches, of Public Law 97-35.
SD-215

Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs, including S. 2346, S. 2416, S. 2321, and S. 2347.
SD-419

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs, including S. 2346, S. 2416, S. 2321, and S. 2347.
SD-419

APRIL 2

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on OMB circular A-122, to restrict the use of federal funds for lobbying by contractors and grantees.
SD-562

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

APRIL 3

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1985 and 1986 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.
SR-253

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 910 and H.R. 559, bills to permit the Securities and Exchange Commission to assess civil penalities for trading in securities while in possession of material nonpublic information.
SD-538

* Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on daytime broadcasting issues.
SR-232A

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2457, to designate certain lands in Idaho as wilderness, and to release other forest lands for multiple-use management.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for Air Force aircraft programs of the Department of Defense.
SD-124

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

APRIL 4

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Office of U.S. Trade Representative.
S-146, Capitol

Governmental Affairs
Information Management and Regulatory Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1985 through 1989 to carry out the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (Public Law 96-511), to reduce Federal paperwork requirements and duplications, and consolidate statistical policy activities with information management in the Office of Management and Budget.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for manpower programs for the Department of Defense.
SD-124

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Interstate Commerce Commission.
SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Science Foundation.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
SD-124

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

APRIL 5

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, including the Centers for Disease Control, and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration.
SD-116

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to review proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1985 for nuclear energy programs and nuclear waste activities of the Department of Energy.
SD-366

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the inertial confinement fusion program of the Department of Energy.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, National Credit Union Administration, and the Office of Revenue Sharing (New York City Loan Program), Department of the Treasury.
SD-124

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.
SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, focusing on title X (family planning).
SD-430

11:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume oversight hearings to review the report and recommendations of the Commission on Fair Market Value Policy for Federal Coal Leasing.
SD-366

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.
SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for energy and water development programs.
SD-192

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
Closed business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1985 for the intelligence community.
S-407, Capitol

APRIL 6

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on North American gas reserves and resources.
SD-366

9:30 a.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 50 and S. 1672, bills to streamline trade relief procedures and make trade relief more accessible to small businesses.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2125, proposed Arkansas Wilderness Act of 1983.
SD-628

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the use of the media in drug abuse education
SD-430

APRIL 9

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1278, to provide for a program of megnetohydrodynamic research, development, and demonstration with respect to the production of electricity, and S. 1925, to establish a national coal science, technology, and engineering program within the Department of Energy.
SD-366

*Finance
To hold hearings to review the Social Security Advisory Council's recommendations on medicare trust solvency.
SD-215

2:00 p.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2201, to convey certain lands in Arizona to the Zuni Indian Tribe.
SR-428A

APRIL 10

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, including the Office of Inspector General, Office for Civil Rights, Policy Research, and Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, and for the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission.
SD-116

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, on pending calendar business
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2362, to revise certain provisions of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, focusing on limitation on authority with respect to merger parties.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for space programs of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Coast Guard.
SD-138

Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal aid highway program of the Department of Transportation
SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for fossil energy research and development programs of the Department of Energy
SD-138

APRIL 11

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 521 and S. 1924, bills to establish a criminal background check of individuals whose employment may bring them into contact with institutionalized children.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD-138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold hearings on U.S. Coast Guard icebreaker operations.
SR-253

Environment and Public Works
Regional and Community Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on certain activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, focusing on the cost of TVA power purchased by the Department of Energy.
SD-406

Labor and Human Resources
To resume oversight hearings on certain activities of the Legal Services Corporation, focusing on past and present policies at the corporation, including political activity.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review veteran's health programs.
SR-418

10:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

2:00 p.m.
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. 2418, to provide for the construction of the Library of Congress Mass Book Deacidification Facility.
SR-301

APRIL 12

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1069, H.R. 555, and S. 817, bills to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to approve the inclusion in the rate base of a public utility of the costs of construction work in progress.
SD-366

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1407, to provide procedures for the registration and licensing of motor vehicles when ownership is transferred in interstate commerce.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for Army modernization of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
SD-124

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agency Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and the Naval Petroleum Reserves.
SD-138

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Library Services and Construction Act, and the Adult Education Act.
SD-430

APRIL 23

1:30 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of occupational disease.
SD-430

APRIL 24

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

Armed Services
Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings to discuss strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel.
SD-232A

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1985 and 1986 for programs of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act, and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act.
SD-253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for intelligence programs of the Department of Defense.
S-407, Capitol

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal aid highway program of the Department of Transportation.
SD-406

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, focusing on title XX (adolescent family life demonstration projects).
SD-430

APRIL 25

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1816, to require the labeling of textile fiber and wool products as to country of manufacture.
SR-253

Governmental Affairs
Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1858, making a technical correction to the legislative veto provisions of the Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973 (Home Rule Act).
SR-385

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume oversight hearings on the Federal food stamp program, and the Child Nutrition Act (Public Law 89-642).
SR-232A

Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on child sexual abuse.
SD-226

11:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1405, proposed Federal Neutrality Act of 1983.
SD-562

APRIL 26

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for National Guard and Reserve units of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-124

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Smithsonian Institution.
SD-138

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to review the proposed refinancing of the Kennedy Center bonded indebtedness to the Department of the Treasury.
SD-406

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, focusing on title XX (adolescent family life demonstration projects).
SD-430

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the impact of occupational disease.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Supreme Court, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
S-146, Capitol

MAY 1

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the joint weapons program of the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for programs of the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Marine Mammal Commission, and the Small Business Administration.
S-146, Capitol

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Justice, and the Legal Services Corporation.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-138

Veterans Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for veteran's health benefit programs.
SR-418

MAY 3

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2117, to establish the national vaccine-injury compensation program as an elective alternative remedy to judicial action for vaccine related injuries.
SD-562

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Defense.
SD-192

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for U.S. territories.
SD-138

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies.
SD-124

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Head Start program.
SD-430

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124

MAY 8

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.
SD-124

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, including title X (family planning), and title XX (Adolescent Family Life Act).
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.
SD-138

MAY 9

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on veterans compensation programs.
SR-418

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the impact of drugs on crime.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
*Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-124

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1985 for the U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2329, to improve retirement income security under private multiemployer pension plans and to remove unnecessary barriers to employer participation in those plans by modifying the rules relating to employer withdrawal liability, asset sales, and funding.
SD-430

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on alleged corruption by officials of the Boilermaker's Union.
SD-430

MAY 23

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review the sharing agreement between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and to discuss the Veterans' Administration's supply and procurement policy.
SR-418

11:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1405, proposed Federal Neutrality Act of 1983.
SD-226

JUNE 6

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Inspector General and Medical Inspector of the Veterans' Administration.
SR-418

JUNE 13

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the civil rights of victims in labor disputes, focusing on existing agencies ability to protect rank and file employees and the general public during labor disputes.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation relating to veterans' compensation, and a proposed construction resolution.
SR-418

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 28

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

MARCH 29

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

APRIL 3

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
SD-430

APRIL 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Taft-Hartley Act.
SD-430

MAY 1

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Public Health Service Act, focusing on title X (Family Planning).
SD-430