

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSIONAL TAX BREAK

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I joined with other Members of this body in voting to instruct the conferees to the bill H.R. 5922 to accept an amendment repealing the automatic \$75-a-day tax deduction allowed Members for Washington-related living expenses and reinstating the 1952 law allowing Members to deduct up to \$3,000 for such expenses.

Prior to that vote, I voted in favor of a procedural motion. It failed. Had it passed, it would have put Members of Congress on an equal footing with other taxpayers. It would have allowed Members of Congress to deduct for tax purposes only those away-from-home living expenses that are reasonable, necessary, and substantiated—the same requirements imposed on all business men and women. I see no reason that Members should be treated as a separate class, distinct from other taxpayers, on this matter. Members of this body are neither first-class nor second-class citizens; we are merely citizens and should be treated accordingly.

In all matters such as these, it is important that Members of Congress deal openly and fairly with the issues. The public resents—and justifiably so—backdoor attempts to adjust the taxation or pay of Members. And the manner in which the Congress last December approved the automatic tax deduction for Members of Congress was just such a backdoor approach. There was no floor discussion of the provision in this body. Nor was there a separate vote. Because of the backdoor means by which this measure was approved, I voluntarily abided by the former limitation and did not take advantage of the automatic \$75 a day deduction in filing my 1981 tax return.

There is another, related, issue that concerns me. Congressional pay. For years now, we have allowed the issue of congressional pay to become a political football, setting off a yearly political scramble at authorization and appropriation time. It is time to blow the whistle on this game. Let us set congressional salaries at appropriate levels of purchasing power and freeze them at those levels by automatic cost-of-living adjustments, the same as we do for Federal judges or social security recipients. Since March of 1969, the purchasing power of congressional

salaries has decreased by nearly 50 percent. It is neither appropriate nor fair that the purchasing power of congressional salaries should fluctuate so widely over time. Nor should the setting of congressional salaries become an annual game of political hide and seek. Let us restore integrity to the process and respect for the institution by making whatever reforms are necessary.

Maybe if we can depoliticize some of the congressional pay and benefits issues, we can attend more readily to the really critical national issues that confront this Nation, the issues that really impact upon the jobs and incomes of average Americans.●

AMERICAN NIGHTMARE

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the relocation and internment of Japanese-Americans by our Government during World War II stands as a dark period in our national history. An old friend from Chicago, John Yoshino, has written a most thoughtful article about that tragic time for the current issue of Loyola magazine. I cannot remember a more compelling presentation of the effects of the internment action on Japanese American families. The need for our Government to provide redress for the wrongs done to these families is made very clear and I ask that the article be included in the RECORD.

AMERICAN NIGHTMARE

(By John Y. Yoshino)

SAN FRANCISCO, December 7, 1941—I was listening to the radio with friends when the news of Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor was broadcast. As quickly as I could I headed for home—across the bay, in Alameda—to await developments.

The Japanese attack, which devastated Pearl Harbor in a crushing military defeat, sparked fear of the Japanese military forces. The sense of alarm escalated, and in the early months of 1942, as the war hysteria gripped the nation, Japanese-Americans became the victims of hate campaigns whipped up by the media.

Military necessity was frequently used as the reason behind a proposition that would soon take concrete form: the wholesale removal of Japanese-Americans—citizens and aliens alike—from the west coast. Possible dangers of espionage and sabotage were also cited, although not a single instance of espionage or sabotage was uncovered. (Documentation that the Japanese-Americans posed no threat was presented by the FBI and US Naval Intelligence after the war.)

Finally, in mid-February of 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, under pressure from the Pacific coast states, signed Executive Order 9066, which put into motion the machinery that put us in concentration camps.

In the next few weeks and months events took place in rapid succession to deprive Japanese-Americans of social, civic, political and economic rights as 110,000 men, women and children were displaced from their homes and taken to temporary assembly centers and then on to the relocation centers inland.

Japanese-Americans were too immature, politically, to do anything to prevent their evacuation and incarceration. Religious and social organizations came to their aid, but these groups were not large or powerful, and their members' voices were drowned out by the anti-Japanese campaign.

As Japanese-Americans had to leave their homes on extremely short notice—a matter of weeks—property has to be sold and disposed of in a hurry, and crops were left unharvested. Many people lost titles to their homes. Several figures have been cited as to the approximate economic losses to Japanese-Americans, but all the figures have been underestimated. It would, indeed, be extremely difficult to place dollar figures on the property losses sustained by Japanese-Americans. Federal Reserve Bank figures estimated conservatively that the Japanese-Americans, in 1941 dollar rates, lost about \$400 million. Accumulations of a lifetime were swept away by the government act. Lands, homes, household appliances, garden tools, furniture, automobiles and many other items used in the domestic household were sold at bargain rates, given away or, at the last minute, abandoned. Because of California's anti-alien land laws, which prohibited noncitizens from owning land, many Japanese built houses on rented land. When the evacuation came, the owners of the land in many instances sold these houses, resulting in complete loss to the evacuee.

My family operated a dry cleaning business in Alameda. My father started it in the horse and buggy era; it was a small, family enterprise that we maintained until evacuation. And it was on rental property. When we left for the camp, we just closed the shop and, for all intents and purposes, abandoned the business.

We lived in an old, 2-story frame house on the corner of Lincoln Avenue and Walnut Street. My father had purchased it in the late '30s. The house had many rooms, for the family was large—parents and 10 children. When we left for the camp, I just locked the front door and left the key with the real estate owner in town. He managed the house for us for the duration of the war.

I have said that Japanese-Americans were politically immature. They were also politically naive. Many of us believed, until we got into the buses to be driven to the assembly center, that the U.S. government would not, could not deprive us of our freedom and throw us into concentration camps. I recall a Japanese-American woman, the head nurse of a surgery ward, telling me that she had abiding faith in the United States, and that all of this was some terrible mistake that would not happen. It happened to her.

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

to me and to thousands of other loyal Americans. What a shock it was and what a rude awakening. We were betrayed by our country.

Japanese-Americans living in the San Francisco Bay area were rounded up and herded into temporary camps—assembly centers. My family and I went to the Tanforan Assembly Center in San Bruno, a few miles south of San Francisco. Tanforan was a race track, and we lived in the stables. I was 32 years old. I was the oldest of 10 children and, as my father had retired from active work several years ago, I was looked upon as the family leader.

After several months at Tanforan, I was assigned to Topaz, a camp in Millard County, central Utah. This place had a gross acreage of 19,900 acres and was declared suitable for agriculture. It was located some 4,700 feet above sea level and about 140 miles south of Salt Lake City. Central Utah Relocation area included land formerly in private ownership as well as state-owned land and public domain. Temperature ranged from about 106 degrees Fahrenheit in the summer to about 30 degrees below zero in the winter months. The first killing frost usually came in late September; the last ones occurred during the latter part of May. Evacuee capacity: 10,000. Evacuee population of Topaz: 8,130.

No one who was put into one of the many assembly centers and, later, the relocation camps, would deny that they were concentration camps. Topaz had this in common with all the rest: it was surrounded by barbed-wire enclosures; armed guards with loaded machine guns stood watch from guard towers over the camp day and night; at night, powerful searchlights were used.

Topaz was an army-style, barrack community built in the desert. As the barracks were constructed in haste, they provided only the barest of accommodations, with little or no protection from the cold wintry blast of the wind or from the intense heat of the summer sun.

Our family of five—mother, father, sister May, brother Paul and I—was assigned a bare room 20 feet by 24 feet. A barrack was made up of four to six such family units. It would be hard to say whether the camp internees suffered most from lack of privacy or from the poor food served in the mess halls. Three of my sisters—Frances, Sue and Aiko—were married and lived in the camp with their families. My brother Joe was also married and lived in Topaz with his wife.

Since we were permitted to take to camp only what we could carry, we lacked the bare essentials for housekeeping. Residents were kept busy going to the dumps to find pieces of scrap lumber to make chairs, tables, other pieces of furniture and partitions. It was amazing to see the skilled handiwork of the residents as they tried to make the bare rooms look like home. Mom made handsewn curtains and drapes from cloth or material mailed into camp by friends and relatives from the outside. My father was a carpenter, as was his father in Kumamoto, Japan. He did very little fancy work, but whatever he made stayed together.

Recreation programs were quickly planned and organized to keep the thousands of able-bodied residents actively engaged in sports, social dancing and even sedentary games of chess and go.

But despite the best efforts of resident camp leaders to promote a productive and satisfying program of activities, many residents were overcome by frustration and

loneliness and, in their despair, committed suicide. Many of the old and the infirm, unable to adjust to the harsh environment, suffered greatly and died prematurely.

This was also a period in the lives of camp residents when social disorganization of the family became evident. With the government providing shelter, clothing, medical care and food, fathers were no longer looked upon as the head of the family and children rebelled against their parents. The strict discipline of the Japanese family went out the window. Families rarely ate their meals together. Delinquency problems increased and social workers were hard pressed to deal with the problems.

For as long as I shall live I will not forget the lines of men, women and children standing outside the community mess hall for their thrice daily meals, prepared by the kitchen crew of evacuees. Many times the desert sandstorms swirled down on the people and covered the utensils with fine dust.

Sweeping out sand and scrubbing the floor was an almost daily ritual. A rash of diarrhea would break out and long lines of people would be at the community toilets. Some said it was the alkaline water; others blamed spoiled food. Lack of partitions in the toilet areas caused many people to develop constipation. For obvious reasons, some people found the best time to go to the toilet was 2 or 3 am.

At Topaz I served on the administrator's staff in urging the Japanese-Americans to volunteer for combat duty. Since many camp residents were unalterably opposed to the young men serving in the army because of the way we had been treated by the government, I was in danger of being attacked by some of the camp evacuees. At night when I left our apartment to go to the latrine, my mother stood in our doorway to watch for anyone who might try to surprise me. Feelings ran high among the residents for and against joining the military. We organized block meetings to put on pro-American rallies. Speakers in support of volunteering for the army were frequently threatened with bodily harm.

Many internees stayed in camp for close to four years, until the camps were closed. I left in 1943, when I volunteered for military service, shortly after the U.S. War Department opened recruitment of Japanese-Americans for combat duty. In January, I was trained as a Japanese language specialist at Fort Snelling, Minnesota, and I was selected as a speaker for our graduation exercises. In my speech, I stated that my parents were being held in camp as hostages of the U.S. government. I was heartened by the strong round of applause from my fellow Japanese classmates, indicating their approval to my speech as they, too, had left their loved ones at one of the 10 concentration camps. But I was severely chastised by a high-ranking army general who followed me as a speaker.

In all, more than 150 young and old Japanese-American men from Topaz volunteered to serve in the U.S. Army. The older men—many of whom had served in World War I—felt they had to encourage the young to take a stand rather than vegetate in the camp. In defiance of the anti-American feeling at the relocation center, they volunteered. Many former Topaz residents served in the European campaign with distinction. I went to the Philippines, Okinawa and Japan with U.S. Military Intelligence before returning to the United States in 1945. Two of my brothers, Joe and Paul, volunteered

with me in Topaz; my fourth brother, Henry, had previously enlisted at the time the government drafted young men to enlist and train for the army and navy. My mother was a 4-star service mother, with all four of her sons in the U.S. military.

Many years have passed since the closing of the relocation centers. Thousands of the internees have already died. The second generation of Japanese-Americans who shouldered the brunt of the burden in these camps and later in reestablishing themselves back into the communities—whether it was back to the west coast, or to the mid-west or the east—are themselves in their seventies and eighties. Rebuilding their lives was not easy for Japanese-Americans after their return from camp. The four years had taken their toll, physically and mentally. Savings were depleted and almost all faced hard times. The 1970 census reported 20 percent of the returnees were below the poverty level.

As we look back, we see that the evacuation and incarceration of Japanese-Americans took place because the citizens of this country allowed the Congress, the Supreme Court and, most importantly, the President of the United States to take this unprecedented action. The evacuation was an act of racial discrimination. German- and Italian-Americans were not similarly rounded up and put away as a group.

The government in the 1950s passed the Evacuation Claims Act to indemnify the losses of Japanese-Americans in the evacuation. It paid what were referred to as "pots and pans" claims at about 10 cents of the dollar. By the time attorney fees were paid to a lawyer who handled the claims, very little was left to the claimants.

After more than 10 years of sobering discussion about redress and reparations, the Congress of the United States, at the urging of Japanese-Americans, in 1981 established a commission to conduct hearings in several cities to evaluate the wartime experiences suffered by the Japanese-Americans in American concentration camps. The final report of the findings of these hearings and recommendations by the commission will be made available to the President and the American people.

Most of us today find it impossible to understand how a democracy could evacuate and imprison its citizens. Yet it happened—a sorry chapter in American history. We who went through it hope and pray it will never happen again. ●

GAO CRITICIZES OMB ACTIONS ON FERC BUDGET

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has written me in response to my request that they review the Office of Management and Budget's request for appropriations for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I have been critical of OMB's attempt to portray the FERC budget request as \$32.5 million when the actual request is \$92.5 million. (See Extensions of Remarks, May 20, 1982, E2382.) OMB has chosen to

show the budget as a net budget, offsetting the actual request by assumed fee collections. FERC Chairman Butler has been equally critical of this approach in a letter to me dated May 17, 1982. When asked if he agreed with OMB's interpretation of FERC's appropriations request, he responded, "No."

Now, in a June 9, 1982, letter, the GAO joins Chairman Butler and myself in condemning the OMB practice. Calling the appropriations language requested by OMB ambiguous and suffering from vagueness, GAO states flatly, as Chairman Butler did, that it does not agree with OMB's interpretation of the FERC request, and that GAO does "not endorse the approach suggested by OMB."

The debate is not merely academic. The OMB budget gimmickry was adopted as part of the Latta budget which passed the House. The Senate resolution did not adopt the OMB approach. Should the Appropriations Committees follow OMB's approach, the FERC could literally have to cease its regulatory activities.

Until the OMB ceases its constant efforts to hide true expenses associated with the FERC, the FERC budget will be in jeopardy. More importantly, the OMB actions make a mockery of congressional efforts to establish credible budgets. In fiscal year 1982, OMB gimmickry has resulted in a deficit triple that estimated by OMB a year ago, despite enactment of the President's budget. A budget resolution which relies on smoke and mirrors, or "voodoo economics", such as in this case, is not worth the paper it is written on.

The GAO opinion can be obtained through the Energy Conservation and Power Subcommittee.●

THE 26TH ANNIVERSARY OF POZNAN WORKERS REVOLT

HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to my colleagues' attention that June 28 is the 26th anniversary of the Poznan workers revolt. It was on that day in 1956 that a group of Polish industrial workers rebelled against tyranny and oppression under the Soviet-backed, Polish Communist leadership in the city of Poznan, Poland, and it is on this day in 1982 that Poles and freedom-loving people all over the world pause and remember those who fought and died in the struggle for freedom.

One person whose name will long be remembered is Wladyslaw Gomulka, who had been a popular party chief until his arrest by authorities in 1951.

Gomulka's release in 1956 encouraged the industrial workers of Poznan to stage a general strike. More than 5,000 demonstrators marched through the city, demanding bread and freedom. After scattering rioting in which 53 persons were killed and over 200 wounded, the revolt was suppressed. Partly as a result of these uprisings, Gomulka became first party secretary and instituted a number of reforms.

I stand here now to salute the Polish people who have resisted totalitarian rule in the past and those who continue to fight for freedom and a better way of life today. By recognizing this holiday, we honor both, and we remind not only those currently in power in Poland of our fortitude and determination to resist, but we also send the same message to totalitarian regimes everywhere.●

U.S.S. "NAUTILUS" DESIGNATED NATIONAL HISTORIC LAND- MARK AT GROTON, CONN.

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, interested in national parks and historic preservation, I am pleased to learn that the submarine U.S.S. *Nautilus* has been designated by the Interior Secretary Jim Watt, as a national historic landmark in the historic shipbuilding town of Groton, Conn.

And, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, whose Guam district formerly contained a Polaris base, I am proud that this first nuclear-powered vessel will be so honored in such a hallowed place.

Again, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am happy that my old friend, Adm. Hyman Rickover, who fathered the nuclear Navy, is being honored after a long and illustrious career in the service of our country.

I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the statement of Interior Secretary Watt upon this proud historic designation:

U.S.S. *Nautilus* to be docked at Groton, Connecticut. U.S.S. *Nautilus* was the world's first nuclear propelled submarine. Her historical significance is fivefold. First, because she could operate submerged for unlimited periods of time, she was independent of the surface and thus was the world's first true submarine. Second, *Nautilus'* nuclear propulsion system is a landmark in the history of engineering, in general, and naval engineering in particular. Third, *Nautilus* demonstrated that nuclear propulsion increased the capabilities of submarines and surface naval vessels. Fourth, *Nautilus* is associated with the career of Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, the "father of the nuclear Navy" and one of the more famous naval

figure of this century. Lastly, the nuclear technology developed to propel *Nautilus* was also applied to the construction of the world's first nuclear electric power station at Shippingport, Pennsylvania.●

FROM ONE HILL TO ANOTHER

HON. WENDELL BAILEY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BAILEY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced that Missouri has become the national bellwether, the barometer of how things are and how they are going to be.

As I cross my district weekend after weekend, I find a growing antipathy to Government as it was, Government as it is. I find a growing do-it-yourself attitude, a pioneer spirit that provided the spark that made America great, a spirit saying once again, we can tie our own shoes, we can pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps, and if everything is up-to-date it is because we have made it so.

I have never found that feeling so well expressed, as in an editorial column, "View From the Hill," published in the near-legendary Pleasant Hill Times, Pleasant Hill, in Cass County, Mo., a fine newspaper founded in 1901 by Roy T. Cloud, but owned and published today by William S. Hale.

I wish we in the Congress of the United States could follow that same bit of advice expressed in the article, captioned "Public Works."

I ask that the Pleasant Hill Times editorial be included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

VIEW FROM THE HILL

PUBLIC WORKS

A story appeared in the Kansas City paper recently about the mammoth public works projects underway in Harrisonville and the amount of progress it brings to that city.

It should also be said that as many public projects are underway in Pleasant Hill this summer, perhaps more than has ever been done at that time.

The sewer improvement project has begun, the drainage project for the gap and downtown area will soon begin, our annual street improvement is scheduled for next month, and the school will certainly start the recently-voted storm shelter at the middle school.

These projects add up to not only a great deal of money that will be spent in Pleasant Hill this summer but also they represent progress in the community on many fronts.

The old song says that, "Everything's up-to-date in Kansas City," and while that may be true, our own community is also making efforts to itself be up-to-date.●

URGENT NEED FOR EXTENDED
UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, the Ways and Means Committee reported H.R. 6369, the Federal Supplemental Unemployment Compensation Act of 1982. This bill, if enacted, will provide for an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation in States with high unemployment for jobless workers who have exhausted their benefits. Now, more than ever before, the Congress must take quick and immediate action to reduce the suffering induced by the recession.

Since August 1981, the number of unemployed has risen from 7.8 million to 10.3 million in just 10 months. The current unemployment rate is the highest since World War II. Furthermore, the number of individuals unemployed for 15 weeks or longer has increased in the same period from 2.2 million to over 3 million. For these individuals, the need for decisive congressional action is particularly urgent. Without any extension on unemployment compensation, they will be forced to deplete their savings and live in poverty. If the recession continues, many more will suffer from extended unemployment.

What has made the current recession particularly harsh has been its effect on our Nation's basic industries. Many face conditions unexperienced since the 1930's. David Healy, an analyst for the brokerage firm of Drexel Burnham Lambert, Inc., commented recently, "The U.S. economy is in a recession, and the auto industry is in a depression." Hundreds of thousands of auto, steel, and construction workers have been laid off.

Correspondingly, the industrial Northeast-Midwest holds the dubious honor of leading all regions in unemployment. Since President Reagan's inauguration, the unemployment rate has increased from 7.1 percent to 9.4 percent. In Pittsburgh, unemployment is over 11 percent.

It seems clear that the only "trickle-down" effect of Reaganomics has been unemployment and suffering. And it is equally clear that the American public demands immediate action. While the administration and Congress have failed to extend unemployment benefits, cities such as my hometown of Pittsburgh have been forced to raise money through special benefits to provide food for unemployed workers. While I am extremely proud of these efforts, we should all realize that they cannot take the place of Government assistance.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

15009

Although H.R. 6369 does not create jobs, it does provide some comfort to these who have experienced prolonged unemployment. It will not allow anyone to receive more than the additional 13 weeks and it includes incentives for recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children benefits to find jobs and continue to work.

Mr. Speaker, the pain of unemployment affects the jobless in innumerable ways. Stress, disease, malnutrition, and crime are just a few of the effects of job loss. Though we cannot expect the Federal Government to find jobs for these citizens, we can demand that the Government compensate those who honestly want to work and who suffer from economic conditions over which they have no control. ●

TAX EQUITY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as I was looking through the newspaper the other morning, I noticed that the Treasury Department has released a new and very revealing report. According to a study conducted by the Department, almost all households with incomes under \$40,000 a year will pay more in taxes in 1982 despite the highly touted 10-percent cut scheduled to go into effect this July. The study states

Bracket creep due to inflation and social security tax increases * * * wipes out most or all of the personal income tax reductions in the Economic Recovery Tax Act across a wide range of middle income families * * *

This study, conducted by the administration itself, proves what many of us have been saying all along—the chief beneficiaries of President Reagan's tax cut policies are those in the upper-income brackets. Once more, the trickle-down theory rears its head.

Let us take a closer look at these tax policies that were sold as across-the-board relief for all Americans, as well as a sure-fire investment stimulus. The policies fall on both counts, as a simple examination of the figures will show.

Rather than sparking new investment, the Reagan economic program has caused a serious recession, characterized by a decrease of 7 percent in industrial production, sharply reduced new investment, post-World War II record unemployment rates, and a 45-percent rise in business failures.

Rather than providing an "even-handed" tax break to all Americans, the President's policies clearly leave the wealthy sitting pretty at the expense of lower and middle-income families. Taxpayers earning under \$10,000 a year will see their tax burden increased by 28 percent over their 1980

levels. In contrast, the tax bill provides the wealthiest citizens with huge tax reductions. For those making over \$200,000, the Reagan rate cuts will provide tax reductions of more than \$58,000 each over the next 3 years, after fully offsetting tax increases due to bracket creep and social security increases.

And this is just one part of the entire tax package. Other provisions that benefit the rich at the expense of everyone else include:

One. Reducing the maximum tax rate on capital gains to 20 percent—less than the marginal tax rate paid by a wage earner with a family of four making only \$15,000.

Two. Eliminating the estate tax on all but three-tenths of 1 percent of all estates, and reducing the top tax rate on the few estates still subject to the tax by almost 30 percent.

Three. Introducing new savings incentives, expanded retirement accounts and tax-free dividend plans for utilities, all of which provide the greater benefits to those with large disposable incomes, while eliminating the incentive that truly benefited all savers—the interest incomes exclusion. Previously, all savers were allowed to exclude their first \$200 of interest income from payment of Federal taxes.

Four. Providing massive new depreciation writeoffs benefiting wealthy individual taxpayers as well as corporations.

Obviously, this tax plan does not take into account what has happened to family incomes since the early 1970's. Median family incomes and average hourly earnings have lost ground to inflation on a pretax basis, while the forms of income that translate into wealth for the affluent—the compensation of America's top corporate executives, after-tax corporate profits, and personal income from dividends and interest—all have increased at rates substantially in excess of the rate of inflation.

Even more favored by the President than wealthy individuals are wealthy corporations. The benefits of the tax changes, like the reductions in personal income taxes, are not spread evenly across the business community. About 80 percent of the ACRS cut in corporate taxes will go to the largest 1,700 firms—the top one-tenth of 1 percent of America's businesses.

The Reagan tax act clearly shifts the Federal tax burden from large corporations to individual taxpayers, and among individual taxpayers it shifts the burden from the affluent onto middle and moderate income wage earners. As a result of the tax bill, 85 percent of all Federal tax receipts will come from the personal income tax and the social security payroll tax by 1987.

As Congress begins consideration of various ways to raise the \$21 billion in new revenue mandated by the recent budget resolution, we would do well to remember the fate of moderate- to middle-income wage earners under last year's tax bill. Already, these individuals bear a hugely disproportionate share of the American tax burden. Let us not add to that weight. Furthermore, let us not be trapped into seeing the economic picture only as painted in our President's simplistic manner. The goal of a prosperous economy is certainly desirable, but Mr. Reagan's method of achieving prosperity is unquestionably inequitable, and will leave most Americans out in the cold. The Republican Party may pay for its economic miscalculations in November, but if we continue to follow these same tax and spending policies, we will all surely pay in the long run. ●

USER FEES

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I am today at the request of the U.S. Department of Agriculture introducing legislation which clarifies and extends the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to collect fees covering the U.S. Government costs for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates for plants and plant products intended for exportation and for the testing, certification, inspection, and quarantine of import and export animals and certain products and materials.

This bill would grant the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to prescribe charges to cover, as nearly as practicable, costs incurred by the Federal Government in connection with the inspection, testing, certification, and quarantine of any animals, animal products, or materials imported or intended for export, and in connection with the inspection and certification of plants and plant products intended for export. Such charges will be credited to the current appropriation account from which the expenses are incurred.

Currently, the costs of such procedures are financed by appropriated funds except for the cost of care (including attendants) and feed for imported animals while quarantined in Government-owned or operated import centers. Such fees should be applied consistently throughout the importing and exporting communities.

Although it is recognized that inspections, tests, quarantines, and certifications are mandated by law, and the general public is an ultimate beneficiary because such services help to insure an inexpensive and healthy

food supply, it must also be recognized that the importer or exporter is the primary beneficiary of such services. The importation or exportation of these products and materials is not required by law. Rather, the services are performed as a safeguard against the introduction or dissemination of plant and animal pests and diseases. Such services insure a healthy domestic market and a safe, marketable product. They also preserve the integrity of American products abroad. The animals, animal products, plants, and plant products are used for personal pleasure, consumption, or in business enterprises, and such costs can be considered a cost of doing business.

It is expected that this bill could reduce 1983 outlays by approximately \$3.6 million. In a time of fiscal restraint, this is a reasonable proposal.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., March 16, 1982.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill "To clarify and extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to collect fees to cover United States Government costs incident to the issuance of phytosanitary certificates with regard to plants and plant products intended for exportation; and for the testing, certification, inspection and quarantine of import and export animals and certain products and materials."

The Department of Agriculture recommends that the draft bill be enacted.

The purpose of this draft bill is to allow the Department to prescribe charges for services provided to: (1) exporters requesting phytosanitary certificates for plants and plant products; (2) importers and exporters of animals (including poultry and birds), animal products or materials; and, (3) for cleaning and disinfecting means of conveyances. The draft bill provides that the money collected shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States and credited to the current appropriations account from which costs are incurred to pay the expense of the Secretary incident to providing such services.

Under present procedures, costs are financed from appropriated funds except for the cost of care (including attendants) and feed for imported animals while quarantined in Government owned or operated import centers. These latter costs are paid from charges collected from the importers and/or exporters and deposited into a trust fund. We believe costs associated with these activities should be borne by the persons who directly benefit from the services provided, and not by the general public.

An identical letter has been sent to the President of the Senate.

Enactment of this bill is consistent with the President's Fiscal Year 1983 budget, and would reduce 1983 outlays by some \$3.6 million. The proposal is also consistent with recent General Accounting Office recommendations (see GAO report CED-81-49).

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the

presentation of this legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.
Sincerely,

JOHN R. BLOCK,
Secretary. ●

UKRAINIAN HUMAN RIGHTS AWARENESS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in recognizing Ukrainian Human Rights Awareness Week. The first point that I would like to make is that the Ukraine is the largest of the non-Russian Captive Nations in Eastern Europe, not only in territory but also in the number of the non-Russian peoples within the U.S.S.R.

As a result of the consistent persecution and suppression of human rights in the Ukraine, the Ukrainian Public Group To Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords was established in 1976, in Kiev by 10 human rights activists. The purpose of this group is to monitor the Soviet Government's compliance with the human rights provisions of the 1975 Helsinki accords and to inform the citizens of the Ukraine and the world community of any violations. Of the 37 members that joined the group during the past 5 years, the majority have been imprisoned for this activity, while the others are either exiled, expatriated, or under police surveillance.

Ukrainian, as much as any people in the world, cherish freedom and understand the meaning of its loss. This is possibly so because freedom has been denied to them through so much of their history. In this century, the Ukraine has suffered under both Communist and Nazi tyranny. They continue to yearn for freedom as they bear the burden of totalitarianism under the rule of the Kremlin.

Yet the Ukrainian national spirit and the love of freedom remains so strong that the Soviet rulers of this captive nation are unable to completely conquer them; the Ukrainian people are determined to retain their cultural and national identity. Their quest for freedom is still alive although it suffers untold hardship.

It is imperative that the democratic countries of the world assert their opposition to this form of political tyranny and reinforce the work of the Ukrainian Public Group in monitoring the violations of the provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Unfortunately, the Soviet Government has repeatedly violated the terms of the act, and further, has obstructed the Ukrainian group's efforts to monitor

violations. It is necessary to remember that the Soviet Union continues to suppress the nationalistic spirit of the non-Russian Republics within the U.S.S.R.

Moreover, the Ukrainian people have a distinct language and literature and deep religious convictions. The Kremlin's policies in the Ukraine include both civil and religious persecution. Among other crimes it has inflicted on the Ukraine, the Soviets have attempted to physically destroy the Ukrainian Christian churches. The Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic churches have been repressed and almost totally crushed. The Kremlin continues to persecute and suppress the national churches in the Ukraine, and as we are painfully aware, the Soviets have historically denied religious freedom as a means to eradicate nationalism of the Ukrainians and other captive peoples. I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 123, which seeks the resurrection of the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic churches in the Ukraine to express U.S. support of the people of the Ukraine who are victimized by the repressive internal policies of the Soviet Government that adversely affects their cultural, political and religious freedoms.

The Ukrainian Public Group sacrificed their own freedoms for the principles of human rights. This special order gives the Ukrainian Helsinki Group added strength to continue resolutely in the human rights struggle. The Soviet repression in a nation of more than 45 million people clearly violates the most basic human freedoms. We must do whatever we can to focus U.S. and world opinion on this fact and provide some small uplift to the spirit of the valiant Ukrainian people and their hope for the future.

I join in expressing my hope that the aspirations of the captive peoples for national independence will once more be restored. We must not let the determined spirit of the captive peoples as represented by the Ukrainian Helsinki Group be broken.●

IN SUPPORT OF PUBLIC LAW 94-142

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1982, the General Assembly of the State of New York enacted Assembly Resolution 930, urging the President and the Congress to maintain current statutory and regulatory provisions regarding the educational rights of handicapped children.

I join strongly with legislators, educators, parents, citizens' groups, and many others, in and out of public life,

who share the views stated in this resolution.

On February 4, a large majority of the Members of this body, as well as from the Senate, signed a letter to the President urging him to support the goals stated in Resolution 930.

On June 10, this body gave a clear signal as to how strongly it feels about continuing high-quality Federal involvement in the education of America's handicapped children. In the House-approved Latta substitute, moneys for handicapped education were authorized at \$1.1 billion in authority and outlays, which is \$100 million over the 1982 level of spending as well as the 1983 Senate proposals.

I am pleased to say that I voted for this increased funding level and will urge my colleagues who are members of the reconciliation conference to ardently press for adoption of the House-passed figures.

The larger issue of future legislative changes concerning Public Law 94-142 will arise later in this Congress, and I wish to add my support to the sentiments expressed by New York's legislators, as stated in Assembly Resolution 930. I commend the text of the resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

STATE OF NEW YORK LEGISLATIVE
RESOLUTION ASSEMBLY NO. 930

Whereas, Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Children Handicapped Act, made the provision of a free appropriate public education for children with handicapping conditions a matter of national interest; and

Whereas, Significant strides forward have been made since its passage in nineteen hundred seventy-five toward meeting the educational needs of this Nation's handicapped children; and

Whereas, P.L. 94-142 and its implementing regulations have established a vital planning mechanism to ensure that the unique educational needs of handicapped children are met through placement in the least restrictive setting along with the provision of essential related services; and

Whereas, P.L. 94-142 and its implementing regulations have established procedures to protect the rights of handicapped children to a free appropriate public education by providing for parental consent to non-discriminatory testing, evaluation, and placement, and for procedural safeguards to resolve parental concerns; and

Whereas, It is the sense of this Legislative Body that promoting and securing the free appropriate public education of children with handicapping conditions must remain not only as a matter of national interest, but be recognized as an obligation of the highest priority so as to enable these citizens to enjoy as independent and productive a life as possible; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Legislative Body pause in its deliberations to memorialize the Honorable Ronald W. Reagan, President of the United States, and the Congress of the United States to maintain current statutory and regulatory provisions regarding the educational rights of children with handicapping conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the

Honorable Ronald W. Reagan, President of the United States, to the President Pro Tem of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of Congress from the State of New York, and to the United States Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Adopted in Assembly on May 17, 1982.●

LONG RANGE ECONOMIC
PLANNING

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that our economy is in trouble. We can blame part of our problem on OPEC and part on our military budget and past military adventures. But setting that aside, the fact remains that a major piece of our problem is avoidable but self-created.

Once we were the most economically progressive nation in the world. Now our economic planning is creaky and inadequate, unable to look beyond the next quarter's profits. We are being overtaken by more far-seeing competitors in Japan and Western Europe.

We need to change. A brilliant overview of the problem and the solutions was presented by Mr. Louis H. Pugh as he received the Dowling College Distinguished Citizen Award on June 12, 1982 at Hauppauge, N.Y. So that we may all profit from Mr. Pugh's wisdom, I am inserting his address into the RECORD at this point.

DOWLING COLLEGE DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN
AWARD

Thank you Dr. Rudiger.

I am grateful to Dowling College, its trustees, Dr. Meskill, its faculty and the student body for honoring me with the Distinguished Citizen Award. I deem it a privilege to join company with the prior recipients. I would be remiss not to share this award with so many others who have sustained me throughout my life. Heading the list is my wife, Anne, who has been at my side for some 30 years; my son and daughter, Ron and Karen, who have always been in the grand stand rooting for and encouraging me; my many friends and associates, many of whom are here tonight—some from out of state—who have always been supportive. To all of you, friends of Dowling and invited guests, my sincerest appreciation for your support of Dowling College.

In today's world, it is critical that our universities and colleges continue to be a viable source of education and leadership. Over the years, industry and our schools of higher learning have been interacting to some extent. However, driven by mutual concerns and problems, we are currently entering a period of even greater interdependency and expanding participation.

Education and industry—partners in Long Island's future—must meet the challenge of the changing technologies as they impact on factory and office environments. Tonight, I will address this particular aspect where I feel there will be a major need for

innovative and strong cooperation. Why is there such a need? The answer is not simple. If we reflect upon recent years, we will realize that we have seen our country's position of economic and technical leadership erode in many areas where for decades we had been the envy of the world. Where at one time we might have had an over-confident air, today that has been replaced by doubts and fears. We are very self-critical, and as a consequence, hesitant, afraid to take action. As a result, we delay progress. We provide answers that in themselves create problems that at times are more onerous than the ones we started out to solve. The results of such shortsighted policies by government, industry, labor, and society are clearly evident today in the automotive, steel, housing, trucking and airline industries, to name a few. Unemployment on a national basis is approximately 10 percent, and in some geographic regions, as high as 15 percent—that is, 1 out of every 6 workers.

Fortunately, there has been a gradual realization in our nation that we must change the way we do business and focus on improving productivity and the quality of products and services. There is an awareness that if we fail to make the necessary investments in skills, technology, and facilities; sensibly control our expenditures; and pragmatically introduce the necessary changes; then, the high expectations of Americans will be stymied in a stumbling economy. I believe the productive potential of our nation can be realized if we focus America's vision toward a long-term anticipatory framework, rather than a short-term reactive one. It is imperative that we take a longer view and plan accordingly, rather than simply counterpunch at each new thrust at our economy.

One aspect of this long-term framework where I believe that industry and academia must and can participate to mutual benefit will result from the technological changes in our factory and office environments. The impact of low-cost computers, distributed computing and microprocessors will be very significant in terms of the way Americans work and live. Robots, with the aid of computers, are already being utilized in many industries. They are performing a variety of tasks. The need to increase productivity in order to remain a viable economic force in the world marketplace is the catalyst that will drive their development and introduction. Another area of change where computer technology, coupled with communications via laser light, teleconferencing, and electronic mail, will have a significant effect on the office of the future. By the end of this decade, the increased dependency on white collar workers—who will constitute approximately 50 percent of the work force—will further complicate matters.

The technological advances in this century, and particularly since the end of World War II, have made all of us aware of the direct and indirect effects associated with technological changes. All too often these impacts do not manifest themselves until they have reached a high level of acceptance within society. This arises because technical problems are addressed from so narrow a perspective that little, if any, attention is given to its social impacts. Underlying our problem is the nature of the kind of phenomena with which we are dealing. It is about change, and most people usually perceive change as threatening. Unfortunately, most futurists do not take this problem into account. They are so eager to implement that they rush headlong into it. By

the time diffusion of technology is completed, the control or guidance of its use is extremely difficult. In an effort to have society more readily accept the implementation of these advances, it is important to assess the potential consequences of a technology before it has reached wide-spread development.

The social impact of these technological changes is expected to be dramatic. One should expect a radical restructuring of work, including a devaluation of current work skills and the creation of new ones at an ever increasing rate. This will result in a fundamental change in most workplaces and a painful adjustment for the workers involved. These changes will require employees to retrain large numbers of workers. The nation's education system will have to prepare future workers for functioning in an electronic society. Some recent estimates indicate that some 20 to 40 million people could be affected by factory and office automation. The push to automate is already upgrading many jobs, giving the dirty, dangerous and monotonous tasks to machines. Some workers have been displaced, while others have been required to take jobs as baby sitters for the new machines. The ability of these new systems to measure and monitor human performance is already causing worker/management conflicts.

Clearly, we are entering a transitional period. We must study policy alternatives. In the short term, we need to address the mechanisms for dealing with people who are likely to be burdened by technological changes. We need to examine the options for assisting the employed workers and the new job entrants to adjust to the impending changes in an orderly manner. We need to anticipate the obsolescence of skills and to work out plans now, early in the game, before there is an unmanageable situation.

Educational institutions which now face dwindling enrollments have a fresh challenge. Programs should be geared to meet the needs of a changing society. As technology alters the workplace, education can be one means of staying abreast of new discoveries and developments. Continuing education can prepare adults for career changes or for maintaining and improving present career status. College education programs should be structured so that they will prepare students for entry into the labor market and for multiple careers during a lifetime. We should expand intern programs not only in the technical fields, but also in administration, industrial relations, and behavioral sciences so that students will be better prepared to enter the business world. Our society is complex, and it will become increasingly complicated. Clearly, there is a need for new approaches.

Recognition of the changes should enable government, business, labor and academia to anticipate the problems with greater clarity and to devise effective solutions. American industry has available to it a vast potential resource in the form of a well educated work force. It is a work force that appears in large part to be committed to work and is capable of improved performance, if properly motivated. The new wave of factory and office automation in the United States will raise the productivity of American workers, improve the quality of the product they make and increase the ability of domestic industries to compete with the imports that have eaten away at America's industrial strength. These gains will be realized only if workers and society are convinced that these technological changes will improve

their working and personal lives, rather than provide an extremely efficient means of controlling the work level and environment.

How to bring out the best in the American worker will be an increasing challenge not only to American industry but to the nation at large. The challenge that we face is to make the transition a smooth one without sacrificing the vigor and discipline so necessary to the workplace so that, once again, we can become the leading industrial nation in the world.

Thank you. ●

SUPPORT RECREATIONAL SPORT FISHING

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the growth in popularity of sport fishing over the past 25 years has been rather dramatic. Since 1955 the number of licensed anglers has risen from 16.9 million to approximately 28 million today. In all, it is estimated that there are 60 million Americans who fish if we include those who are not required to obtain licenses, that is, adolescent, retired, and saltwater fishermen.

No other single law passed by Congress has been as important to the management and improvement of the Nation's recreational fisheries resources as the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act. This law, more commonly referred to as the Dingell-Johnson Act or D-J, provides for a 10-percent manufacturers' excise tax on certain sports fishing equipment. These funds are then allocated on a 3-to-1 matching basis to the States for sport fish restoration and management projects.

Since 1950, American sports fishermen have contributed more than \$338 million for fisheries research and enhancement through the D-J program. More than 328 new lakes have been built and 3,672 boating access areas have been constructed, providing access to over 800,000 acres of lakes and over 2,200 miles of rivers and streams. These D-J funds have also been used to improve aquatic habitat, to protect fish from pollution caused by highway construction, water diversion projects and poor logging and farming practices. Through research, State and Federal agencies have developed new management techniques and improved upon old ones.

Although D-J funds unquestionably have been important to State fishery management efforts, revenues are insufficient. Receipts have not kept pace with inflation and budgetary constraints have hindered fishery programs. The latest survey of the States shows a funding shortfall of approximately \$127.5 million per year. As an

example of the problem consider that last year D-J collections were only \$30.5 million compared to the \$122 million collected under Federal aid to wildlife legislation. The problem is highlighted when we remember that three times as many Americans fish as hunt.

Also, the growth in number, skill, and mobility of fishermen has created a great demand on the resource. Fish habitat, like many other types of natural areas, is succumbing more and more rapidly to the pressures of pollution, development, and overuse.

In order to eliminate the funding deficiency I have introduced H.R. 6660 the Fish Restoration Act of 1982. This legislation would place a 10-percent tax on certain fishing equipment currently exempt from tax such as fishing line, hooks, and sinkers and establish a 3-percent tax to be imposed at the manufacturer's level on recreational boats 25 feet and less as well as certain boating equipment including boat trailers, depth finders, and trolling and outboard motors. The tax would not apply to commercial boats, hydroplanes, kayaks, or sailboats.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I propose will go a long way toward enhancing sport fishing in that expansion of the Dingell-Johnson program would generate two to three times the current receipts. The States as well as a coalition of sporting, conservation, environmental, and manufacturing groups are in favor of D-J expansion.

Natural and manmade fishing waters are limited and it is only through restoration of existing habitat, creation of additional impoundments, and provision of additional adequate access that greater levels of sport fishing can be achieved. I urge my colleagues to support the bill. ●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. MORRIE
WAX

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call attention to one of San Diego's outstanding citizens, Morrie Wax, who recently completed his fourth term as president of the San Diego USO Council, and his 18th year as a board member of that group.

Mr. Wax is, indeed, "Mr. USO" in my home city. Morrie was out front and very instrumental in raising the money and working with the city of San Diego in the construction of a new USO center for the large military population and due to his efforts that facility was opened on September 22, 1970. However, 10 years later, when the city was forced to relocate the

USO, once again it was Morrie who took the lead in finding a site, raising the money and supervising the construction of a new USO center. Because of his efforts the new center was dedicated to Mr. Wax upon its opening in 1980.

His terms as president of the USO have been in the years 1970-72 and 1980-82, and for the past 11 years he has initiated the fund drive to finance special holiday dinners and snacks for servicemen and women on Thanksgiving, Hanukkah, and Christmas and throughout those holiday periods. For the past 6 years he has led USO board members in ticket sales for the annual fund-raising party. Lest it be inferred that Morrie had the time and energy for only one civic enterprise, I want to add that he has been actively contributing to other causes through his years of citizenship in San Diego.

Mr. Wax is a native of Utah and joined the Army as an enlisted man in February 1941. He was commissioned a second lieutenant upon graduation from Officers' Candidate School in 1942 and served in Europe in 1944 and 1945, advancing to the rank of captain in the 25th Tank Battalion of the 14th Armored Division. He came to San Diego in 1946 but was recalled to active duty in 1952 and served as a major in Post Command in Camp Cooke, Calif., before returning to San Diego, where founded the San Diego Janitor Supply Co., which he now serves as president.

His wife, Jeannette, and two sons, Charles and David, may take deserved pride in Morrie's accomplishments, which include these activities:

National director of the U.S. Navy League; member of the board of the San Diego Coalition; chairman of the Southern California Committee for Employers Support of the National Guard and Reserves; president, San Diego Council of Navy League, 1977-78; member of the Navy League since 1966; member of Uplifter Club; member, Lodge No. 85 San Diego Masonic Order; member chamber of commerce; past president of Beth Jacob Mens' Club; member of the board, Temple Beth Israel; member, Selective Service Board, 1970-75; chairman, Armed Forces Committee of Jewish Community Center; past member of the board, Jewish Community Center; member 14th Armored Association.

I appreciate this opportunity to commend to you an outstanding citizen, Mr. Morrie Wax. ●

BRING BACK BRETTON WOODS
FOR LOWER INTEREST RATES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this is a turning point in the debate over monetary policy. During the 1970's the Keynesian scheme of targeting interest rates resulted in progressively worsening inflation and progressively more severe recessions. Yet failure of the current monetarist experiment in targeting the money supply has become so apparent that the Treasury has undertaken a reexamination of the whole monetary policy.

The lead editorial in today's Wall Street Journal gives some good advice:

What the Treasury ought to study is our last successful monetary order, the Bretton Woods system. We tend to forget that, as largely designed by John Maynard Keynes, this was a price-rule system.

Under a price rule, the editorial explains:

The Fed would skip all intermediate measures and target the price level directly, slowing its injections of money if prices rise and speeding them if prices fall.

This would avoid the dangers of both the Keynesian and monetarist prescriptions for monetary policy, which are so apparent in our economy.

I agree that the 1944-71 Bretton Woods system was not perfect, and I believe we can improve upon it. But it was vastly superior to the past 11 years of monetary and financial chaos. I believe the Wall Street Journal's advice is excellent. I commend this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 22, 1982]

BRING BACK BRETTON WOODS

So the Treasury is studying whether to abolish the independence of the Federal Reserve board, with Under-Secretary Beryl Sprinkel charging infidelity to monetarism. What needs to be understood—most especially by the congressmen who would decide on any Treasury recommendation—is that the implication of Mr. Sprinkel's crusade is not easier money but tighter money.

This point is difficult to comprehend, because it's hard to conceive that anyone would want further tightening just now. Measured by the broad price indexes, price stability has more or less been achieved. Though the indexes may show an upward blip or two, the underlying rate of inflation has clearly subsided. The dollar is setting record high after record high in the foreign exchange markets. Commodity prices are plunging, with gold piercing the \$300 level yesterday. And of course, interest rates and unemployment are at postwar highs.

Yet because of some numbers spewing out of a computer somewhere, the monetarist catechism holds that Mr. Volcker is too easy. M1, as currently redefined, is above its target areas. Mr. Sprinkel's pet, the mone-

tary base, has also been growing vigorously. So when he says he wants a "more stable" policy, he can only mean he wants a currently tighter one.

Monetarists will try to obscure this point by talk of "erratic" policy and of leads and lags. The monetary aggregates have indeed been erratic. But the monetarist claim that the current recession was caused or deepened by flatness in M1 last spring and summer would be more plausible if M2 were not above its targets in the same period. As the monetarist St. Louis Fed observed in reviewing the last year, "The most significant question for monetary policymakers in 1981 was which monetary aggregate to control." The problem was not Mr. Volcker, but the aggregates.

These problems are brilliantly outlined in the accompanying speech by Frank E. Morris, president of the Boston Fed. Technological and financial innovation have undermined the traditional distinctions on which monetarism has been based. We are well on our way toward a financial environment so fluid no computer number means much for very long. The issue is how to guide monetary policy in such an uncharted environment.

One answer—Mr. Volcker's answer—is seat-of-the-pants reckoning. This is the theme he returned to in describing his difficulties with aggregates before the Joint Economic Committee last week. "The hard truth is that there inevitably is a critical need for judgment in the conduct of monetary policy." This attitude doesn't disturb us much when the Fed Chairman is Paul Volcker, but we didn't much care for it when the Fed Chairman was G. William Miller. Over the long pull, we're not going to find an unbroken string of philosopher-kings; we need some standard to which the Fed can be held accountable.

If the monetarist standard of M1 has become unworkable just as it gained ascendancy, the Keynesian alternative is to target interest rates. We are sorry to see some of our supply-side friends playing with this fire, for if we have learned anything over the past decade it is that interest-rate targets are a recipe for inflation.

The remaining alternative is a price rule. The Fed would skip all intermediate measures and target the price level directly, slowing its injections of money if prices rise and speeding them if prices fall. As a practical matter the broad price indexes are not reported promptly enough to guide short-run policy, so some especially sensitive price or index of prices would have to be used as a proxy for the general price level.

This is, of course, the classical answer, with the proxy for the price level being the price of gold, or in certain historical periods the price of silver. Some modern economists suggest a basket of commodities as the price proxy, or producer prices. Even if gold were chosen, for simplicity, there are serious questions of how to set the price. In other words, a price rule cannot be instituted overnight, but would require serious study.

The current Treasury study is being surfaced in a mood of desperation—the administration having sold a budget compromise as a cure for high interest rates only to see rates escalate after its victory. As we have been saying throughout the budget fight, a congressional budget resolution is an exercise in cosmetics, and anyone in the financial community who doesn't understand that deserves to lose his shirt. Spending discipline, when and if it actually arrives, will of course help interest rates. But since the

high and volatile rates date from the Federal Reserve's procedural reforms in 1979, it certainly would appear that we also have a problem with monetary policy—though the problem may be not too little monetarism but too much.

We certainly do need a study of monetary policy. We do not need an assault by either the Treasury or the supply-siders on Mr. Volcker, who is potentially instrumental in forging a new monetary regime and in any event crucial to managing the transition. We do not need a study plumbing contemporaneous reserve accounting or otherwise scraping the barnacles off monetarism while the whole deck is afire. Nor do we need another recitation of the gold bug argument about paper money being merely a warehouse receipt for gold; the government doesn't need to hold a single ounce of gold to use it as a price-level proxy.

What the Treasury ought to study is our last successful monetary order, the Bretton Woods system. We tend to forget that, as largely designed by John Maynard Keynes, this was a price-rule system. Other nations had the responsibility of fixing their currencies to the dollar. And the U.S. had the responsibility of conducting a monetary policy that would keep the dollar worth 1/35th of an ounce of gold. Price stability, prosperity and reasonable interest rates reigned until the U.S. forsook or forgot its part of the bargain.

Obviously we cannot go back in a day. We may not want to go back exactly. A new international agreement would be at best premature. But given the success of Bretton Woods and the failure of what followed, it can certainly serve as a model for the direction we ought to head. And the first step is a serious look at putting the Fed back on some form of price rule. ●

**CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
HIS HOLINESS PIMEN, PATRIARCH
OF MOSCOW AND ALL
RUSSIA, ECCLESIASTIC LEADER
OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX
CHURCH**

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 26, the people of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join with Vicar-Bishop Ireney and the Bishop's Council of the Patriarchal Parishes in the United States, the Right Reverend Dennis Havrilak, pastor, and members of the congregation of SS. Peter-Paul's Russian Orthodox Cathedral of Passaic, N.J., in welcoming and honoring His Holiness Pimen, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, esteemed head of the Russian Orthodox Church, the largest and most important religious body in the Soviet Union, on his long-heralded visit to the United States. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending warmest greetings and felicitations to His Holiness Pimen, the 14th Patriarch of the Russian Ortho-

dox Church, spiritual leader of 250 million Russian Orthodox faithful.

Mr. Speaker, the faith and devotion of people in a full communion of understanding, ever caring and respecting the individual religious beliefs of his fellow man has been the lifeline of our democracy—ever inspiring our people with hope and urging the individual on to great achievements and purpose in pursuing the fulfillment of his dreams and ambitions. The exemplary leadership and outstanding efforts of our citizens so important to our quality of life are in the vanguard of the American dream and today we join the Russian Orthodox community of our Nation in tribute to His Holiness Pimen whose leadership endeavors in promulgating spiritual guidance, good will, fellowship, and brotherhood in service to God are applauded by all of us in the United States and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we recognize the most historic occasion of this visit to our country of a highly learned and knowledgeable Patriarch who rose through the hierarchy of ecclesiastical rule and authority in the Soviet Union. His personal commitment, noble deeds, and quality leadership on behalf of the needs of people have truly enriched the lives and destinies of a multitude of people here in America and throughout the world.

His Holiness Pimen was born Serge M. Izvekoy on July 23, 1910, in the small textile town of Bogorodsk east of Moscow, the son of an office worker. At the age of 17 he entered a monastery and in 1932 was ordained a priest.

Following his stay at the monastery, he worked in the Moscow area, and for many years was in charge of the church choirs in the capital.

After World War II he was sent on a number of assignments around the country, ranging from the town of Murom in central Russia to the port city of Odessa on the Black Sea. In 1949 he was named head of the famous Pskov-Perchory Monastery and in 1954 was placed in charge of the Trinity-Sergeyev Monastery.

In 1957, he was named Bishop of Odessa and in 1960, Archbishop. The high title of Metropolitan of Leningrad was conferred upon him in 1961 and he was elevated to Metropolitan of Krutitsky and Kolomna in 1963. On June 3, 1971, with centuries-old pomp and majesty, he was enthroned as the new Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church—Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia—first among the other bishops who make up the Holy Synod, the church's ruling body.

International Who's Who also notes the following distinguished titles of respect for His Holiness Pimen: Grand Cordon, Order of the Cedar of Leba-

non 1972, Order of St. Sergius of Radonezh (U.S.S.R.) 1979, and Order of Friendship of the Peoples of 1980.

His Holiness Pimen is the fourth Patriarch of the Soviet era. The first was Patriarch Tikhon, who was elected in 1917. In 1943, Patriarch Sergius was elected. He died in 1944 and a year later Patriarch Alexis was chosen. Patriarch Alexis died on April 17, 1970, at the age of 92 and His Holiness Pimen was named temporary Patriarch in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, in his dedication and devotion to the needs of people, His Holiness Pimen has truly enriched the cultural, educational, and religious endeavors of the Soviet Union, the international community, and the quality of life for many, many people here in America.

As the chants of "Axios, Axios," Greek for "He is worthy, he is worthy," resounded through Moscow's Yelokhovskiy Cathedral when he was elected Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia so will we join with the congregation of SS. Peter-Paul's Russian Orthodox Cathedral this coming weekend in echoing our deepest respect and esteem for the paternal leader of the Russian Orthodox Church. We do indeed welcome and salute him for his exemplary dedication and sincerity of purpose in his continuing leadership efforts to help strengthen the resolve of a nation of people in service to God and mankind—His Holiness Pimen, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. ●

THE ABUSE OF THE INSANITY DEFENSE DID NOT START WITH THE HINCKLEY VERDICT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, many in this Nation are seething with outrage over the verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity rendered in the case involving John Hinckley. This decision represents an abuse of the so-called insanity defense and could result in a man who almost killed the President of the United States and gravely wounded three other persons being free in less than three months.

In the sense that we give the protection of the President's life an important priority in this Nation—so, too, must we extend this protection to include insuring that those who would seek to kill or maim the President be guaranteed swift and certain punishment. Today I have introduced a bill which would bar the insanity defense in any case involving the assassination, attempted assassination, kidnapping, and assault on the President of the United States and his immediate successor. I chose this limited route be-

cause I believe such a bill could be passed by Congress this year. I do not share the same optimism with respect to a broader revision in the insanity defense statute.

I would also like to include as part of my statement a most interesting article entitled "The Insanity of the Insanity Defense," by Peter J. Grimes, chairman of the department of criminal justice, Nassau Community College. This article was originally published in November of 1981 but it continues to have great relevance today. I urge my colleagues to review the article carefully to see yet another example of how the abuse of the insanity defense continues to make a mockery of our criminal justice system.

The article follows:

[From the Law Enforcement News, Nov. 9, 1981]

THE INSANITY OF THE INSANITY DEFENSE

(By Peter J. Grimes)

The last time I saw my son alive was July 9, 1980. As I said good night to him, I little knew that 14 hours later he would be dead, the victim of a violent crime, and that within 24 hours my wife and I would be making the funeral arrangements for Michael, who, at 10 years of age, had been intentionally struck down by the driver of an automobile. Dead also would be his best friend, with whom he was playing at the time, and a high school teacher who was enjoying a day of recreation at the county park.

Within days the offender, Robert Kabolowsky, was charged with nine counts of murder and innumerable other charges which accrued during his rampage through Wantagh (N.Y.) County Park. He was remanded to the Nassau County Correctional Center, where he was held without bail to await future court proceedings and the results of psychiatric investigations. Blood tests which had been conducted at a local hospital revealed that at the time of the murders the offender "had a high percentage of THC in his blood . . . THC is the active ingredient in marijuana."

Much to the surprise, shock and horror of my wife, myself and other family members and friends, not to mention the relatives and friends of the other murder victims of this tragedy, the County Court, citing the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Law for the law for the State of New York, held that the offender was "not responsible by reason of mental disease or defect." This plea had been recommended by the Nassau County District Attorney, according to New York State Criminal Procedure Law § 220.15, prior to the County Court's acceptance of the plea. At the pretrial hearing held to determine his responsibility to stand trial, Judge Raymond Cornelius informed Kabolowsky that if he were not prosecuted criminally he would be turned over to the State Department of Mental Health for treatment. The judge then asked the accused if he fully understood these consequences, to which the defendant replied, "Yes, I talked it over with my attorney and parents and feel it is my best defense."

The offender was transferred to a New York psychiatric hospital where he is being treated and from which he will be returned to the court for periodic review. The offender's parents, upon hearing of the outcome of their son's prosecution, were quoted in a

local newspaper as saying, "We felt from the very beginning that if there was any justice, it would turn out this way." From the point of view of the victim I can assure the reader that justice has not been served.

In a research report which appeared in the American Journal of Psychiatry in March 1980, Dr. Henry J. Steadman, studying "Insanity Acquittals in New York State, 1965-1978," concluded that "there has been a dramatic increase in the number of insanity acquittals since 1971." In a study of acquittals in the 1970's, A. Siner indicated that in New Jersey those patients acquitted for murder averaged 24.2 months of hospitalization. Based on this data it appears evident that eventual release from a psychiatric hospital will probably take place within a few years.

For years it has been my experience, first as a professor of criminal justice and now as a parent who has experienced the brutal murder of his only son, to witness time and again the abuses of the insanity defense by lawyers and forensic psychiatrists. The underlying problem with the insanity plea, according to New York State Senator Frank Padavan, "is that its successful use always ends in acquittal. The accused is then free of all sanctions except the same requirement for treatment imposed on other mentally ill individuals. Nothing stops the shrewd defendant from wielding the insanity defense, and then once hospitalized, undergoing a 'miracle cure' that leads to freedom."

The argument to amend the insanity defense is not new. In 1964 our present Chief Justice of the United States, Warren E. Burger, indicated that "perhaps we should consider abolishing what is called the 'insanity defense'; the jury would decide within the traditional framework of drawing inferences as to intent from the accused's conduct only whether he committed the overt acts charged. I suggest this not as a new idea but to stimulate a serious debate on the subject."

In an article which appeared in *Psychiatric Annals* in August 1977, Dr. Abraham L. Halpern elaborated on some of the problems of the insanity defense. Discussing "The Insanity Defense: A Juridical Anachronism," Dr. Halpern stated:

"I have for many years contended that the insanity defense should be abolished. It has degenerated to nothing more than a legalistic ploy in many cases, especially when the defense of justification is not possible. It does nothing to promote justice, damages respect for the law, sustains the sham of the 'battle of the experts' in our courtroom, and needlessly increases the cost of trying and defending allegedly mentally disordered criminals."

According to C. R. Jeffery, "Most lawyers stated they used psychiatric pools that consist of defense-minded psychiatrists. 'If a man doesn't testify the right way he is not hired,' one attorney said. Although lawyers complain about government-biased psychiatrists, they readily admit to making use of defense-biased psychiatrists."

Commenting further on the misuse of the insanity defense German and Singer note, "Frequently, the insanity defense is the result of a plea bargain. Where prosecutors and judges know that an offender will be incarcerated even if not convicted, they are more likely to tolerate, or even encourage, an insanity acquittal, thereby saving themselves both the time involved in full trial, and the risk of the defendant's release if he is not convicted."

Later in his article, Dr. Halpern cites a quotation from Rachlin which points to the insanity defense as a glaring misuse not only of the law, but of psychiatry. It is further noted by Rachlin that "because of the sensationalism generally surrounding a number of uses in which the insanity defense is raised, the public corruption of the mentally ill as being dangerous is fostered. Abolition of the insanity defense would therefore, in part, serve to separate in the public's mind antisocial behavior from psychotic behavior. I would think that this might go a long way toward decreasing community resistance toward discharge of hospitalized patients based on the misconception that mental illness and dangerousness are closely related."

Fortunately there is movement for a viable alternative to the "not-guilty-by-reason-of-insanity" defense. The report of the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime, published in August 1981, has taken a bold step toward revising the insanity defense with its recommendation that "the Attorney General should support or propose legislation that would create an additional verdict in Federal criminal cases of 'guilty, but mentally ill . . . and establish a Federal commitment procedure for defendants found incompetent to stand trial or not guilty by reason of insanity.'"

The report goes on to comment that the line between sanity and insanity is not often clear. "Consequently, there are defendants who appear to be suffering from mental illness that may not significantly affect their ability to obey the law. Such a person presents juries with the difficult choice of either making a finding of guilty, even though the jury might feel compassion because of the defendant's mental problems, or not guilty by reason of insanity, even though the person appears able to appreciate the criminal nature of his conduct and conform his conduct to the requirements of the law, notwithstanding the mental illness."

There are presently at least three states—Illinois, Michigan and Indiana—that have developed the alternative verdict of "guilty but mentally ill" to enable juries to respond better to this situation. This alternative has been sponsored in several state legislatures. It has been proposed in the New York State Legislature for the past four years by Senator Padavan, chairman of the Senate Committee on Mental Hygiene and Addiction Control.

The adoption of the "guilty but mentally ill" proposal would enable the jury to "elect a verdict that in essence would not only find the defendant to be in need of treatment, but also guilty of a crime and therefore subject to a prison sentence. The convicted would then be placed in the custody of the corrections system and would receive care from a satellite psychiatric facility. If his illness abates, he still must remain in prison for the rest of his term."

For a little more than one year my wife and I have been without our son, a boy who will always remain ten, whose life was unmercifully snuffed out by an offender who had a depraved disregard for the rights of others, even the right to life. While we must do all we can to prevent crime, we must bring to justice those who commit it. It is clear that the country owes this as a duty to the victims of crime. Legislation such as that proposed in this article will provide innovative inroads so that our criminal justice system will provide justice for all.

Naturally I am personally involved due to my great loss, yet I feel it is my duty as a

criminologist to urge all who will listen to help to right this wrong in our criminal justice system. It has been committed against innocent victims in the past and will continue in the future, if we sit on our hands and do nothing.●

UKRAINIAN HUMAN RIGHTS AWARENESS WEEK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1982

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues during Ukrainian Human Rights Awareness Week in recognizing the undying love of freedom in the hearts of enslaved Ukrainians.

The history of the Ukraine is as glorious as it is tragic. Its long-suffering people have achieved greatness despite the malevolent influence of powerful neighbors. Perhaps more invading armies have marched over the rich black earth of the Ukraine than over any other land. In fact, today marks the 41st anniversary of the most brutal invasion of all—Hitler's. World War II left the Ukraine in ruins, with millions of its people dead.

Nazi domination of the Ukraine lasted 3 years, but brutal Soviet domination of this country has lasted over 60 years. In 1918 the Ukrainian people made a brave attempt to establish their independence, but the infant Ukrainian Republic was overwhelmed by the Red army a year later. Since then, the Ukrainian people have suffered terrible repression under Soviet rule. But the Soviets have not succeeded in stifling their culture and love of freedom. In recent years Ukrainian national feeling has surfaced again despite KGB brutality.

The Ukrainian Helsinki Group was formed on November 9, 1976, to monitor Soviet compliance in the Ukraine with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki accords. Of the 10 brave Ukrainians who founded this group, and the 37 who eventually were members of it, none are now active. All are in prison or in internal or foreign exile. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize with deep appreciation the courage of these Ukrainians who fought so hard at such risk for their nation and for the freedoms we so often take for granted.

They may have been silenced, but they drew the world's attention to the flame of freedom burning so brightly in the Ukraine. We must not let that flame be extinguished. Fifty million Ukrainians, and all the fine Ukrainian Americans who have made such a large contribution to this country, have not forgotten that we are the symbol of freedom to the entire world. Let us not forget them. I would like to conclude with the words of Mykola

Rudenko, a founder of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group now in prison:

From under the thick ice of fettered spirituality another child of Freedom timidly raises its head. Whether it is barbarously destroyed or survives, this depends on you, people of good will.●

CITIZENS ON THE MARCH TO RECLAIM AMERICA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the issues that we as a Congress and a country are confronting today are issues that will affect, for generations, the vitality of our American ideal. They are social, economic, and political ideals that give sway only to the Constitution of this land. It is within this Constitution that we find the framework for the emerging Reclaim America movement taking place among the towns and cities of this country. It is a campaign steeped in citizen involvement, grassroots patriotism, and a willingness—a demand—to accept responsibility for the decisions that affect the well-being of our constituents and our country.

Sponsored by National People's Action, Reclaim America is a rallying cry for millions of people who have been economically discriminated against. Millions of people are unemployed, unable to buy homes, unable to afford rent, cannot buy heating fuel, cannot borrow to build neighborhood businesses, cannot keep their family farms, cannot manage health care costs, cannot bring improvements to their communities, and most of all, cannot compete with large banks and large corporations who are making record-breaking profits and are also now getting the benefits of even larger tax breaks.

This crisis has been brought about by antipeople policies coming out of Washington, including artificially high interest rates, artificially high energy costs, and Federal cutbacks in all social service and community development moneys. At the same time we are witnessing an acceleration in defense spending, the threat of nuclear war, tax breaks for big business, and deregulation that benefits corporate America—and an overall shift in priorities to make the rich even richer!

I support National People's Action in their belief that it is going to take a concerted effort by community organizations, unions, churches, peace groups, and all people's organizations to reorder the priorities of corporations and the current administration. National People's Action has begun to work toward such a joint effort by

sponsoring Reclaim America, September 6-14 of this year.

NPA's Reclaim America has begun to schedule rallies, meetings, and other activities in cities across the country for Monday through Thursday, September 6-9. They have set September 10 in Chicago as the first joint Reclaim America action as people from the West, South, and North join with local groups to demonstrate to corporate Chicago the demands of Reclaim America. They will grow in numbers as they head toward Ohio to take their demands to corporate Cleveland. On Sunday, September 12, NPA will hold its 11th national conference in Philadelphia. On Monday, September 13, the movement will take its Reclaim America agenda to the Capitol, where the ranks will swell with people from throughout the Washington, D.C., area, Philadelphia, and the Middle-Atlantic States. On Tuesday, the 14th, joined by New Yorkers and people from New England, NPA will top off Reclaim America Week with a show of strength to corporate America on Wall Street, New York City.

It is within that framework that I am once again reminded of the unique blend of America embodied in Reclaim America and National People's Action. Reclaim America is a coming together of all people who hold this country and its democratic principles to be the responsibility of us all and are more than willing to do their part as Americans to keep it so regardless of race, ethnic heritage, religion, age, or political affiliation.

I want to commend this action, for it embodies the idea of our democracy and the foundation of our Republic. I look forward to participating in NPA's Reclaim America in September and urge you to join me. ●

ELIMINATING WASTE IN GOVERNMENT: THE PRIVATE SECTOR JOINS THE FIGHT

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who consistently support reductions in the ever-escalating growth of Federal spending do so largely out of a revulsion for wasteful and out-of-control spending by the Federal Government.

As any businessman knows, elimination of unproductive use of money, unnecessary acquisitions, and useless spending commitments is essential to creating a functional, delivering entity. Government's service delivery role is hampered by obscene waste and an endemic unwillingness to even study the problem, let alone do something to stop it.

Out of the knowledge of the dangers of waste, President Reagan has convened the President's Sector Survey on Cost Control. Under the experienced chairmanship of J. Peter Grace, this commission will survey waste in Government from a broad perspective, and concentrate on reforms for operations and spending in 35 areas of the Federal establishment. The \$20 million that will be spent for this massive study will not be taxpayer dollars; the private sector is donating the cost of this enterprise's operations. Nothing, it is said, succeeds like success.

James Nance, staff director for the Survey, gave a few poignant examples of just how much money government consumes, and how many superfluous goods are purchased with it. For instance:

The United States government spends \$19,100 each time the average heart beats!

Interest on the national debt costs \$190,000 each minute!

The government owns 436,000 automobiles and employs 2.6 million civilians. This means that virtually every civilian employee of the federal government can be riding in a government car at one time!

Gathering horrendous and popular statistics such as the ones above is not the major purpose of the Survey; suggesting ways to stop the inexorable growth of these numbers is.

I salute the efforts of the responsible corporate leaders in applying their experience at operating effective entities for use by a deeply mishandled Federal Government. Their enlightenment and fresh, uninhibited approach to cost-cutting will slay many sacred cows, and restore this Nation to fiscal health.

"Our Federal Government," Donald Lambro wrote in the mid-1970's, "has become a bloated, extravagant, paternalistic, remote, cluttered, disorganized, inefficient, frivolous, duplicative wasteland." The President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control certainly has a tall order ahead of them in their quest to rid all of these abuses from the Federal Government—the people's government. ●

IN MEMORIAL—DOUG HARVEY

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, last week the Science Committee learned of the death of an exceptional public servant, and a close friend, Doug Harvey. Doug created the industrial energy conservation program at the Department of Energy and managed it for 5 years until 1981. The program was widely recognized as one of the best run, most intelligently organized activities at DOE. It was strongly supported in Congress, by both Houses, both par-

ties, and both authorizing and appropriations committees.

Doug Harvey was, however, more than a competent bureaucrat. He was an innovator who searched for new ways to do things and made them work. He was a scholar whose knowledge of American industry was encyclopedic. He was a dedicated advocate for energy efficiency who extended, maybe overextended himself, to assist Congress in its deliberations on industrial productivity. He testified at hearings, spoke at seminars, wrote position papers, and spent hours in direct conversation explaining the intricacies of industrial processes, management, and financing.

He was, finally, a warm, friendly, humorous man who was admired and loved by those who knew him well.

Doug died last Monday at the age of 53 of a massive and unexpected heart attack. As a tribute to his memory and to the special affection in which he is held by the Energy Development and Applications Subcommittee, I would like to place in the RECORD the following article from the June 23, 1980 Industry Week. It is entitled: "DOE's Different Kind of Bureaucrat," and, although somewhat out of date, captures in a special way the uniqueness of this truly exceptional public servant.

DOE'S DIFFERENT KIND OF BUREAUCRAT

When Dr. Gene Frankel, science consultant to the House Energy Development & Applications Subcommittee, came to the nation's capital last January, he faced a classic exercise in Washington homework: reading the reports by the Dept. of Energy (DOE) on the various energy conservation programs it funds.

Predictably, even an educated man such as Dr. Frankel had trouble making sense of the bureaucratic mumbo jumbo.

But as he labored through the voluminous documents, "one program stood out clearly above all the others," he recalls. "It seemed well thought out, intelligent. I could actually understand from the documentation what was going on. It was most unusual—and I could hardly wait to meet the man responsible for it."

The subject of Dr. Frankel's surprise was DOE's industrial energy conservation program. And the man behind it (whom he's since had ample chance to meet) is Douglas G. Harvey, director of the Office of Industrial Programs.

Dr. Frankel's surprise isn't surprising, for Doug Harvey has long been recognized as a distinctly non-typical Washington bureaucrat.

For one thing, the 51-year-old, Rutherford, N.J., native doesn't live in Washington. He and his wife, Delores, maintain their home 45 miles away in Baltimore, a blue-collar, shot-and-a-beer town away from the glitter of Silver Spring cocktail parties and Georgetown boutiques. He travels by car pool to the Baltimore train station and commutes by Amtrak to his job.

For another, he's one federal manager in charge of an industry-related program who had logged extensive time in industry—23 years, in fact. He came to the government from Hittman Associates Inc., a Columbia,

Md., consulting firm, where he headed energy and environmental programs. Before that he was a vice president at Sanders Nuclear Corp., Nashua, N.H., for four years; earlier still he served a lengthy stint at Martin Marietta Corp., including 12 years as manager of its Space Power Systems Div.

He's also a prolific inventor, with 33 patents to his name. They represent a remarkable variety of technologies, ranging from new methods of loading electrons in a thermoelectric generator to a new solvent for tertiary oil recovery to an artificial heart.

He's even an author of two books: "Radioisotope Power Generation" and "Automobile Energy and the Environment."

"Doug's program is relatively free from Congressional sniping," observes Mark O. Decker, director of energy and natural resources at the National Assn. of Manufacturers (NAM). "And that's because he has the support of industry."

This industry support, too, makes the program unusual. Although corporate executives normally recoil at the idea of federal involvement in their businesses, in this case they generally go along with it. Explains Mr. Decker: "They see what Doug is trying to do—setting up an R&D program aimed at the private sector taking over the technology after the government has proved it. This is the type of government involvement perceived by industry as being meaningful and productive."

To be sure, Mr. Harvey's program has its share of critics. Some of them—and they can be found in such diverse quarters as industry itself, Congress the White House Office of Management & Budget, and even within the policy office of DOE—insist that the government has no business giving money to industry to save energy. Industry will conserve anyway, they reason, as a market response to higher prices.

But for every critic who advocates a lesser federal role in industrial energy conservation, there are others who believe the role should be larger.

A firm believer in the market system, Mr. Harvey sees DOE's R&D role as limited. "The role of the federal government with the private sector, especially the industrial end of it, has never been carefully defined or understood," he declares. "Thus, we bend over backwards to prove that the projects we fund will save significant energy, that they will not be pursued expeditiously without federal involvement, and that with federal involvement we can speed their introduction into the marketplace by five or ten years."

To accomplish this, Mr. Harvey has set up explicit criteria to govern which projects his office will fund.

"First," he explains, "we must be able to reasonably predict that if successful, a project will bring a 15 percent return on investment after taxes. Second, to ensure the effectiveness of our investment, we try to determine a project's market penetration in five years and what its costs and benefits will be; we require that a project must save \$10 for each \$1 invested. Finally, we eliminate any projects that duplicate what the private sector already is doing, or might do."

This last consideration—whether a project will duplicate a technology that the private sector might develop on its own—is the hardest to evaluate. Mr. Harvey's staff must weigh three categories of risk and assess the degree to which each might hold back technology.

First, the staff must examine the technical risks, determining the odds on a

project's being technically successful. Second, it must look at the economic risks, asking whether a project's cost is likely to adhere to projections. Finally, it must study the institutional risks, to see whether a project will be blocked by traditional but inefficient practices within an industry. In addition, Mr. Harvey's office must consider whether state and local laws will interfere with a project.

ARRAY OF PROJECTS

A technically trained manager (he holds B.S. and M.S. degrees in chemistry, respectively, from Trinity College and Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Doug Harvey is usually knowledgeable about the projects his office funds. Talking softly and chain-smoking in his cluttered office at DOE's headquarters overlooking Washington's L'Enfant Plaza, he obviously enjoys describing the project's technologies.

About half the projects, he says, relate to generic technologies that will benefit a wide spectrum of industrial processes. One such innovation he's enthusiastic about is a family of advanced, high-temperature waste heat recuperators that will capture about 70% of the waste heat from direct-heat processes.

The other half of the R&D program is geared to process specific technologies aimed at saving energy within specific energy-consuming industries.

In the aluminum industry, for example, Mr. Harvey's office is working with companies to develop a smelter using a wettable cathode, ways of substituting coal for natural gas in remelt operations, and a small-diameter shaft furnace for direct reduction of aluminum.

In textiles, a DOE-developed process for using foam instead of water in textile finishing operations—at an 86% energy saving—already has been adopted by 17 companies.

Overall, the office has received more than 2,000 proposals for projects. Final selections—of both generic and specific-process technologies—traditionally were made in twice-monthly evaluation sessions among Mr. Harvey and his three top aides: W. B. Williams, his deputy; Alan Streb, director of the R&D division; and Thomas Gross, head of deployment and monitoring.

This informal selection process, however, drew fire for being "too in-house and too incestuous." Mr. Harvey admits, acknowledging that "it's hard to get into a program without some bias." As a result, his office recently set up an advisory committee from the National Academy of Sciences, primarily comprised of industry representatives, to assist on project selection and to review projects at major decision points. Additional evaluation help is provided by the Idaho National Energy Laboratory and other federal laboratories.

Establishment of the advisory committee is hailed by NAM's Mr. Decker: "It reflects the healthy trend we've seen of DOE being more careful in starting projects and then standing behind them. Until now, DOE has tended to focus on the first stage of a project. Now it is getting more deeply into the operational and scale-up stages, which enables business to get a better idea of the potential of projects."

EXPECTING FAILURES

But, Mr. Harvey, who puts heavy emphasis on project evaluation, says his office isn't afraid to scrub projects that aren't proving worthwhile. In one memorable "failure," it killed the funding of a microwave vacuum grain-drying process to replace the conven-

tional process using propane. Although the project worked, he recalls, "it turned out to have a better potential for seed drying—a relatively small energy consumer in the total agricultural energy picture. It clearly wasn't a role for us, so we got out as judiciously as possible." DOE spent some \$700,000 on the project.

Such failures are expected. In fact, Mr. Harvey asserts, "We project that 40% of our projects will fail. But we should have failures. . . . We wouldn't be doing our job if we had no failures, for that would mean we weren't funding risky projects."

Mr. Harvey consistently pounds that message home to members of Congress. Apparently he's been successful. As he observes: "Bureaucrats usually get a lot of criticism for spending money on failures, but we have gotten very little flak." In fact, he says, cooperation from Capitol Hill "has been excellent" in the last two years. "We really haven't had many fights lately."

Much of this Congressional cooperation is due to Mr. Harvey, says Dr. Frankel of the Energy Development and Applications Subcommittee. "Congress generally feels Doug is running a good program and that he ought to be funding an even bigger one. The reception is favorable because of him. He's very articulate in explaining the rationale behind what he's trying to do."

Adds Melvin H. Chiogioji, deputy DOE assistant secretary for local assistance programs and one of Mr. Harvey's longtime colleagues: "The industrial energy conservation program could well have flopped without Doug. He's made it go. He's successfully pointed out to the Hill and to the Administration the advantages of government-industry partnership, and he's been wise in selecting the projects in which the government can best play a role."

NO PAPER PUSHER

Mr. Harvey also has been masterful in obtaining cooperation from industry. "Businessmen like him because he's different from most federal Bureaucrats," remarks Dr. Beno Sternlicht, chairman and technical director of MTI Corp., Latham, N.Y., a firm working with DOE on developing improved industrial heat pumps. "Where other bureaucrats tend to push paper, he wants to see results. He's a firm believer in government and industry being partners rather than adversaries."

Mr. Harvey estimates that his office's R&D activities to date have saved a cumulative 5 trillion Btu of energy. But he admits that the 1985 goal of 1.5 quadrillion Btu (1.5 quads) annually will be difficult to reach. "We'll have to get on a steep ramp to meet that figure, although we have a shot at it," he comments. But he says he's much more "comfortable" about reaching the goal of 5.5 quads annually by the year 2000.

Obviously, Mr. Harvey takes satisfaction in the energy savings his programs are achieving. And despite nearly five years in government, he's still excited about his job. "I find this job perhaps the most interesting I've ever had," he enthuses, "at least in terms of the innovative ideas I deal with."

Yet, he also calls the job "one of the most frustrating" he's ever had. "The ponderous nature of the bureaucracy makes it difficult to get anything done," he laments. "The procurement process takes forever. And in industry I was able to hire people on the spot; here it takes six months or a year for the paperwork to go through, and then a freeze comes on. It's terribly frustrating."

There's one other big difference from industry, he reflects. "There," he says. "I could cut a contract on a handshake."

BUFFER PERIOD

Mr. Harvey has been putting up with the frustrations of government since August 1975 when he left Hittman Associates to develop the industrial conservation programs for the Energy Research & Development Administration, a forerunner of DOE. A year later the responsibility was made a separate operating entity, and he became its director. With DOE's formation in 1977, the function was included with the Industrial Energy Efficiency Program under the Office of Industrial Programs. Mr. Harvey was named to head the office in January 1979.

He credits his long years in industry as being of "invaluable help" in his job. He's also taken pains to hire industry-trained people exclusively for his staff. That policy, he says, "has enabled us to develop rapport and believability over the years" with companies.

Although he can't completely escape the frustrations of his job, Mr. Harvey finds that it helps to play tennis at least one night a week. He also tries to find time for his favorite hobby: fly fishing. Living in Baltimore, too, serves to insulate him somewhat from the Washington rat race. The train ride to and from the capital offers him "a buffer period—a chance to read without the telephones ringing," he says.

Without doubt, though, the frustrations and the long hours will someday cause him to return to private life—to work for another company, to work on more inventions, or to write books.

Observes MTT's Dr. Sternlicht, a longtime friend; "If and when Doug leaves, it will not only be DOE's loss, but also industry's. He is a bright light in the bureaucratic jungle." ●

IN RECOGNITION OF UKRAINIAN HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of honor that I rise today to salute the brave Ukrainian people on the occasion of Ukrainian Human Rights Awareness Week.

The Ukrainian people were once members of a free and proud nation. But 64 years ago, the Soviet Union, with complete disregard for the sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation, sent its massive forces across that land beginning a brutal repressive campaign against the Ukrainian people that continues today.

January 22, 1918, was a day of glory for Ukrainians when their free and Democratic Parliament, the Rada, declared the nation's independence. But freedom for the Ukrainian National Republic was seen as a serious threat by the Communist forces that had taken control of Russia during the Revolution of 1917. Finally, in 1922, the Communists forcibly took over and the freedom that had been joyously celebrated there came to a sad end.

Mr. Speaker, literally millions of Ukrainians have been systematically slaughtered by a succession of Russian Communist regimes. Ukrainians have been forced over the past 64 years, to leave their homeland and to serve their Russian slave masters in factories and on farms throughout the Soviet Union.

Despite all this turmoil and tragedy, the Ukrainians living in the Soviet Union have somehow managed to maintain both their dignity and their ethnic identity. But there is no question that while Russian control over the Ukraine is brutal and complete, the spirit of the Ukrainian people has never been diminished.

The Soviet ruling elite should take note that while it maintains political control over the Ukraine, it will never be able to obliterate the strong national traditions held by millions of Ukrainians.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet rape of Afghanistan sent a loud and clear message to freedom-loving people around the world that the Russians will never abandon the use of wanton force to achieve their political objectives.

The U.S. reaction to that invasion was quick and decisive. Among them were the cancellation of vital wheat sales to the Russians and the pulling out of our team from the Moscow Olympics. Another less publicized action was the closing of the U.S. consulate in Kiev, a section of the Ukraine. Unfortunately, that move has proved to be more detrimental to the people of the Ukraine than it has hurt the Russians. That consulate post served as a key communications link between the Ukraine and the West.

As a member of the congressional ad hoc Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, I have sponsored a resolution calling on President Reagan to reopen the U.S. consulate in Kiev.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, I salute the heroic Ukrainian people during Ukrainian Human Rights Awareness Week. May it serve as a hope for all Ukrainians to maintain in their hearts, that with God's help, their self-destiny as a nation may once again become a reality. ●

FREEZING THE ARMS RACE

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, JONATHAN BINGHAM, had an article in the May issue of WorldView entitled "Freezing the Arms Race." In addressing the increasing strength of the nuclear freeze movement in the

United States, JACK BINGHAM does an excellent job of analyzing the strengths and the weaknesses of present U.S. policy on arms control and the folly of this administration's approach to the Soviet Union and international disarmament negotiations.

As an adviser to the U.S. delegation to the U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, I am distressed about this administration's arms control agenda and believe that JACK BINGHAM has put forth a reasonable and worthy point of view in his article. This article also illustrates what a loss the Nation suffers with the announced retirement of JACK BINGHAM. He has been a force for rationality and compassion on the international scene. Unfortunately we have too few such voices. I urge my colleagues to read his article.

JONATHAN BINGHAM ON FREEZING THE ARMS RACE

"People in the long run are going to do more to promote peace than are governments. Indeed, I think that people want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of their way and let them have it."

Thus spoke President Eisenhower in 1959.

Today, almost a quarter-century later, the American people are on the "warpath" for peace. According to a mid-March Los Angeles Times/Cable News Network poll, although 55 per cent found the subject of nuclear war so depressing that they did not want to think about it, 57 per cent (vs. 37 per cent) have thought enough about it to want a nuclear weapons freeze. Newsweek found 60 per cent of those polled favoring a freeze, 29 per cent against.

The freeze campaign was organized last year around the simple proposition that the U.S. and USSR should adopt a mutual and verifiable freeze on testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons, plus the missiles and aircraft that carry them. This first step would be followed by a negotiated reduction in both powers' nuclear arsenals.

The freeze idea cuts through the miasma of arms control complexities that so easily befuddle experts as well as laypersons. Organizations and prominent individuals from around the nation began to endorse the freeze—labor unions, churches and synagogues, and highly knowledgeable people, such as former CIA Director William Colby, former arms control negotiator Gerald Smith, and that great expert on the Soviet Union, W. Averell Harriman.

In January of this year I was approached by leaders of five or six organizations in my Bronx congressional district asking me to support the freeze. I agreed enthusiastically. There are now twenty thousand individuals collecting petition signatures to force the proposal onto local ballots all over the country. In the capital I joined with Representatives Michael Lowry (D-Wash.), Ed Markey (D-Mass.), Silvio Conte (R-Mass.), Tom Tauke (R-Iowa), and Edwin Forsythe (R-N.J.) in drafting a resolution to put before the Congress. Shortly thereafter, Senators Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), Mark Hatfield (R-Ore.), Lowell Weicker (R-Conn.), Alan Cranston (D-Cal.), Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), and Paul Tsongas (D-Mass.) offered a not-too-different version. We all combined on the same resolution, which was

introduced in the Senate on March 10 and in the House the next day. There are now 22 supporters in the Senate and 151 in the House, with more to come.

How did an idea that has been around in different forms for twenty-odd years suddenly begin to move? Ironically, I think the Reagan administration helped get it started by frightening people. This fear is caused in part by loose talk about the need for plans to fight and "win" a nuclear war, together with demands for the largest nuclear buildup in history, and in part by the administration's insensitivity to the real meaning of nuclear holocaust. Edwin Meese, White House counselor, characterizes it as "something that may be undesirable."

To offset such complacency, Physicians for Social Responsibility, with ten thousand members and growing fast, has held seventeen symposia around the country to explain in factual detail why nuclear war would be the ultimate medical catastrophe: Not only would its survivors envy the dead, but the health-care system would be unable to count, much less comfort, those afflicted by injuries which would later claim their lives. And Jonathan Schell wrote a now-famous three-part series in the New Yorker showing that humankind, even all life, might be obliterated by a full-scale nuclear exchange and its subsequent effects.

"The targeters would run out of targets and victims long before they ran out of bombs." Yet the Pentagon war planners—who, after all, are paid to envision the worst of all possible contingencies—have focused on a possible Russian first strike that might cripple our ability to strike back. The Pentagon therefore proposes a staggering increase in spending on a new generation of some 17,000 nuclear warheads, together with the missiles and bombers to deliver them, which would threaten the Russians with the same first strike we fear.

As George Ball, former under secretary of state and erstwhile cold warrior, said in his March 22 testimony in favor of the freeze, it is time for Americans to reject "the contention that we dare negotiate only from what the nuclear pundits call 'strength'—which serves as an excuse for not negotiating at all."

Some critics of the freeze contend that there is no freeze campaign going on in the USSR, so a halt in the arms race will never mutually be agreed to. But Secretary Brezhnev's doctor has been permitted to report in detail on nationwide Soviet television how catastrophic a nuclear exchange would be, and Brezhnev himself has been asking for a variety of freezes.

If this is just rhetoric and bluff on his part, I think we should call him on it and regain the propaganda advantage, which would be useful to us, especially in regard to some of our NATO partners. If it is not a bluff, we should negotiate with him about it. It seems to me that the Reagan administration's knee-jerk and complete rejection of the freeze proposal is a serious mistake. In no way does the freeze undermine the administration's approach to the START talks—the successor, it is hoped, to the unratified SALT II treaty. The freeze proposal is not in the form of a bill to be enacted into law; it is merely an advisory, sense-of-Congress resolution. And it does not call for an immediate freeze. It calls for negotiations on the best way to arrive at a verifiable freeze.

In April there will be hearings in the Congress on the freeze proposal. Now is the time for the voice of the people to be heard.

It is one of the great things about a democracy that its leaders can be persuaded to change their minds when voters care deeply enough about an issue to do just what the people of the United States are doing now: working together to reduce the peril of nuclear war. ●

THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES/VENEZUELAN RELATIONS

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, of the many outstanding representatives of the United States that I have met since becoming chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, one of the finest is our Ambassador to Venezuela, William H. Luers. Bill Luers is leaving Venezuela after 4 years as Ambassador. He will be very difficult to replace.

Bill has shared with me his last speech as Ambassador, in which he reflects on the future of United States-Venezuelan relations. I believe this thoughtful address will be of interest to my colleagues, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES-VENEZUELAN RELATIONS—SPEECH TO THE VAAUW BY AMBASSADOR WILLIAM H. LUERS, CARACAS, JUNE 4, 1982

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a difficult speech to give, because it is my last one as Ambassador to Venezuela and because the topic is complicated by recent events. The future of United States-Venezuelan relations would have been much easier to discuss three months ago. I had imagined giving this farewell talk to the VAAUW on the same upbeat note that I have struck during my nearly four years as U.S. Ambassador to this important, dynamic nation. Today our relations are clouded by the conflict in the South Atlantic. I do not intend now to engage the debate over the rights and wrongs of that tragic struggle. The issues are too close to us, the passions are too high, and the justice of the causes is blurred by differing views of history, law, and power.

Today I want to try to look beyond the South Atlantic crisis and try to identify those interests that are likely to be important and binding in United States-Venezuelan relations in the years ahead despite the wounds that our friendship has suffered over the past two months. I plan to address three topics:

What are the principal Venezuelan foreign policy interests?

How does the United States relate to those Venezuelan interests?

And finally what are some new factors that may enter into our relations over the coming decade?

II. VENEZUELA'S INTERESTS

First, I will outline what I have come to understand as the principal interests of Venezuela in the world today. This is not a statement of what I think these interests ought to be, but what I have observed during nearly 15 years of dealing with Ven-

ezuelan governments. These are interests that have been articulated in almost identical terms by ad and copei leaders in Government. After participating directly in the visits of three Venezuelan presidents and dozens of ministers to Washington, D.C., and in the visits of one U.S. president, two vice presidents and numerous cabinet officers to Caracas, I have found that the two great Venezuelan political parties sound very much alike when they deal with the United States. No North American official has a closer, more intimate friendship nor more respectful admiration for Venezuelan democracy and its leaders than Bill Luers.

What have been the primary interests of Venezuela during its democratic experience?

First, the promotion of democracy in the hemisphere. The first line of Defense of Venezuela's 24 year old Democracy has been the active support of pluralism and democratic institutions in the region. Venezuela under Bolivar was the first nation in this hemisphere to wage war for the liberation of the continent. And it is the first nation of the hemisphere to place the struggle for democracy above all other means to defend its political system and its national security. Venezuela has waged this peaceful struggle for democracy with the weapons of diplomacy, political encouragement and economic assistance. This Venezuelan activism on behalf of democracy has helped keep alive and restore the democratic process in nations throughout this hemisphere.

Second, Venezuela has given high priority to regional economic integration through its energetic support for the Andean pact, its sponsorship in the founding of the Latin American Economic System (SELA) with headquarters in Caracas, and its efforts to give vitality to the Latin American Energy Development Organization (OLADE) whose new secretary general is a respected Venezuelan energy expert. These organizations have not yet fulfilled the hopes of Venezuela or other Latin American nations, but they offer the potential for greater integration and cooperation. They are examples of Latin American solidarity at work.

Third, Venezuela has taken a special interest in its relations with the nations of the Caribbean. Over the past 15 years particularly, successive Venezuelan Governments have dedicated increasing resources and attention to these island states and sought to welcome them into the hemispheric community. Venezuela's constructive role in engaging Mexico in their oil facility and joining with others in the Caribbean Basin Initiative is further proof of this growing Venezuelan commitment. Venezuela's deep interest in these nations is logical because Venezuela not only shares the Caribbean waters and seabeds with them, but also shares democratic values with most of them. It has a clear desire to promote stable economic and social development in these small often fragile nations that populate the Venezuelan neighborhood.

Fourth, Venezuela has long had an interest in Central America. The strong backing Venezuela gave to our decision to redefine our relations with Panama and the canal was helpful for U.S. relations with the entire region. Now the turmoil and changes in Central America of the past five years have resulted in Venezuelan Governments expanding significantly attention to the economic and institutional development of nations in rapid transition. Despite the gloom that dominated the media over the past year, the situations in Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador and even Guatemala are

hopeful—democracy and pluralism may be winning the day against tremendous odds. Venezuela has been a major force in this process and will continue to be.

Fifth, Venezuela has placed OPEC at the center of its foreign policy since it helped found that organization as a means of establishing just returns for Venezuela's principal export. Every Venezuelan Government has taken a leadership role in innovating OPEC policies. Most recently it was Venezuela which took the lead in urging OPEC production restraints to protect the price of petroleum which is vital to the Venezuelan economy. It now appears that these policies have been successful, that OPEC institutions have been strengthened, and that the price of petroleum has been stabilized.

Sixth, and finally, every Venezuelan Democratic Government has sought a good relationship with the United States. This has been logical because the United States is a democracy, because the United States has been Venezuela's major market for petroleum, and because we are the proximate industrialized nation which has long supplied goods, services and educational opportunities to Venezuelans. Venezuela has also sought to affect world affairs through influencing U.S. policies. Since Don Romulo Betancourt first opened Jack Kennedy's eyes to the promise of helping to build democracies and economic growth in this hemisphere, this special Venezuelan access in Washington has contributed immeasurably to the evolution of sound U.S. policies. It is my firm belief that Venezuelan governments have had a greater influence on U.S. policies over the years than we have had on Venezuela. I have absolutely no doubt that in the past year the Government of Venezuela has played a major role in shaping constructive U.S. policies toward Central America and the Caribbean.

These six interests are so deeply imbedded in Venezuela's political, geographic and economic position in the world that they will persist into the foreseeable future. Although other interests may enter the picture, I see nothing in recent events in the south Atlantic that will dramatically change these six principal Venezuelan interests.

III. THE UNITED STATES AND VENEZUELA'S INTERESTS

The United States' interests do not coincide completely with Venezuela's nor should they. We are the most powerful and most over committed Nation on earth. We were the first Nation to break with colonialism, and the first modern democracy. We have intimate ties with almost every corner of the globe because we are a Nation of immigrants, because we have fought in two world wars, and because we believe in the defense of liberty and the rule of law. This complex international network of alliances, friendships and responsibilities reflects multiple national interests that often conflict with one another. The management of U.S. foreign policy involves almost daily selection of tradeoffs—decisions as to which national interest will be damaged the least by a given policy decision. The overriding international commitment of my country is to restrain Soviet power while avoiding world conflagration.

In this setting, let me describe candidly how the United States relates to the six Venezuelan national interests I outlined above.

First, the United States has over the past 20 years become increasingly persuaded of the correctness of Venezuela's policy that the promotion of democracies in this hemi-

sphere is the best defense of our national security. The Latin American criticism that the United States prefers anti-Communist dictatorships may have had some validity in the past but it is not true today. Our closest friends are the democracies. The United States is anti-Communist and will remain so, but we are ever more convinced that the surest way that nations can inoculate themselves against totalitarianism is through strong democratic governments. U.S. policy over the past decade and one-half has been to support the democratic process and we have heard Venezuelan leaders argue this case aggressively in the United States for years—successfully. President Herrera's major message to President Reagan last November was precisely the need to keep faith in the promotion of democracy.

Second, how has the United States reacted to Venezuela's drive toward promoting regional economic integration? From the meeting of Latin American States in Vina Del Mar through the foundation of Olade and Sela, the U.S. has looked with detachment and understanding on these new regional organizations. In the beginning we believed that the Andean pact restrictions would limit the region's capacity to have a dynamic private sector and limit U.S. investment opportunities too severely. Over time the U.S. Government and private sector has adjusted to the Andean pact just as the Andean pact has sought closer relations with us. Three years ago the U.S. Government and private sector began a constructive dialogue with the pact. We have not been critical of either Sela or Alade and have been willing to cooperate with both. We favor regional integration and support those efforts that lead to economic growth in the area.

Third, Venezuela's interest in promoting development in the Caribbean has coincided with U.S. interests. The U.S. has placed greater emphasis on the need for growth in the private sector and in employment. The Venezuelan Government has been more concerned about infrastructure and balance of payments. Yet these differing approaches are complementary, not contradictory. Our fundamental commitment is similar to Venezuela's as is evident in the cooperation that has developed between the United States, Venezuela, and other regional powers of the Nassau group in developing the Caribbean basin initiative.

Fourth, in Central America our interests also coincide closely. Our agreement to support the electoral process in El Salvador and Honduras reflected our common interests. Venezuela and the United States have pursued similar policies in Central America because our analysis of the problems and our commitment to democratic solutions have been virtually identical. Our cooperation was natural and in each of our self interests—not the result of pressure from one side or the other. Although we have differed over how to deal with the Sandinistas, the United States and Venezuela share a common interest in keeping pluralism alive there and in seeing an end to Nicaragua's assistance to subversive activities elsewhere in Central America.

Fifth, it is no secret that OPEC is not one of the most popular international organizations in the United States. It is perceived by North Americans as an organization which has raised petroleum prices to artificially high levels that have strained severely the capacity of the world economies. The United States does not seek dramatic shifts

of prices either up or down. Therefore, to the extent that OPEC policies can lead, as Venezuela hopes, to stable and predictable pricing, the United States will be able to deal with OPEC constructively. Moreover, Venezuela's commitment to OPEC has not been an impediment to excellent United States-Venezuelan relations in the past and it will not be in the future.

Sixth, and finally, the United States and Venezuelan bilateral relations have never been seriously troubled. The relations have been based on common objectives and self-interest. Tens of thousands of Americans and Venezuelans share close friendships, and our two governments have worked closely together on a whole range of endeavors—often we agree and often we disagree. I am told that now Venezuela will have to be less idealistic, more pragmatic about the United States. In fifteen years I have not seen much idealism in Venezuelan official dealings with the United States. I have heard Presidents Betancourt, Leoni, Caldera, Perez and Herrera speak about the United States and to U.S. leaders—each one of them has been a hard thinking defender of Venezuelan interests. U.S. leaders have become accustomed to hearing Venezuelans tell them "I am going to speak frankly because we Venezuelans are friends of the United States." We have, as one Venezuelan leader told me recently, developed thick skins. But we have also developed admiration and respect for the forceful democratic leaders of this country. What is important to preserve in the period ahead is that mutual respect. Venezuela, which has the loudest and most dependable democratic voice in this hemisphere, surely does not want to lose the ear of Washington. The United States, for its part, would be less comprehending in our complex dealings with this hemisphere were we to lose the advice of the outspoken leaders of Venezuelan democracy.

IV. LOOKING INTO THE FUTURE

United States-Venezuelan interests will, I believe, continue to coincide. How then do I respond to the dire predictions heard at all levels of Venezuelan society—from serious people, who fear that United States-Venezuelan relations will be profoundly changed for decades by the events of the past two months? Is it believable that this Latin American Venezuelan sense of rejection, impotence, and pain resulting from the U.S. policy toward the South Atlantic conflict will fundamentally change the strong relationship that I have outlined here?

Is it possible that Venezuela will be able to forget the intimate ties of Miranda and Bolivar to the U.S. revolutionary heritage? Will Venezuelans forget the fact that it was the United States that invoked the Monroe Doctrine twice on behalf of Venezuela—to press for a settlement on its border claim against Great Britain and to lift the blockade of La Guaira? My answer is I doubt it, but I am not certain.

This maddening, tragic war between Argentina and Great Britain has raised to the surface many undercurrents and emotional aspects of U.S. relations with Latin America. To name a few.

The unbalanced nature of the Inter-American system that contains a superpower with global commitments. Is the Inter-American system designed to enable the smaller nations of the hemisphere to focus U.S. power and energies on Latin American issues? Or is it a democratic community of sovereign and equal nations determining the course of

events in the new world? Is the major role of the Inter-American system to keep the peace within the hemisphere or to protect it from external aggression. I believe the Inter-American system has and should have all these objectives. The United States is open to proposals on how best to modernize this system which has served so well and in so many ways in the past to maintain the peace in the new world.

The perceptions of history, law, discourse, and the use of language are different in the English and Spanish speaking nations of this hemisphere. While we share a common commitment to liberty, we see the institutions that govern that liberty through different eyes, and we speak of them in different ways. No event has more tragically revealed our misunderstandings of each other than the current conflict in the South Atlantic. We must do better in defining our different ways to each other. Incredibly we in the United States are still ignorant of Latin American realities—and Latin Americans still only vaguely perceive North American values.

The frustrations of the small nations dealing with the large, of new nations dealing with the old, of the weak dealing with the strong, have been poignantly and dramatically focused by this awful war. To understand so well, as I think I do, the anxieties of both sides in this conflict is to realize the terrible injustices of history. It is also to realize the volatility and profound changes that stem from arming national passions in this precarious world. Will the small nations of this hemisphere now devote even more of their resources to defend their interests? Will they seek new alliances or new friends? I think and hope not.

The role of the totalitarian alternative lurks behind all armed conflict. Does this South Atlantic conflict offer new alternatives for the Soviets and Cubans to become a meaningful force in this hemisphere? Does it suggest a strengthening of military rule in some nations that had been moving back to democracy? My belief is that the pain and solidarity that Latin American nations feel together will cause them to emerge from this period with an even stronger sense of independence and purpose. A strengthened Latin America will be a more difficult target for the communists. Latin Americans seek liberty and the democratic process not because of the United States, but because of their own traditions and aspirations.

It is impossible to predict with any certainty in what ways this hemisphere or this world has been changed by the conflict between two western nations. Many States in this hemisphere will re-examine ties of cooperation, trust and national security with other nations—alliances could shift. In the United States, it is still too soon to say whether North American understanding of Latin American realities will be improved or confused—whether attitudes will become more positive or negative about hemispheric relations.

What is clear to me is that there will be even greater need for the Venezuelan-United States dialogue in the future than in the past two and a half decades. I pledge to all Venezuelans that I will stay near to that important discourse between the two democracies that have been such a large part of my personal and professional life. My wife, Wendy, joins me in that pledge. ●

OPERATION YOUTH

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding program—Operation Youth—which took place recently in my district. Operation Youth is a week-long conference during which interested young men and women learn about our system of government.

This year's conference, the 32d edition, was held June 5-12 at Xavier University in Cincinnati, and over 82 selected Ohio high school students participated in the program. The agenda included speeches by leaders in government, education, and the media on topics such as "America's World Affairs," "Science, Energy and Society," and "Freedom and Economics." Forums were then set up so the students could discuss these topics and other current issues. In addition, the students formed political parties and elected officials to a mock municipal government. I am extremely proud to recognize those who were elected to office as well as those who participated in all other aspects of this valuable program.

They are as follows:

Mayor, Paul Darwish, LaSalle High School; vice mayor, Michael York, Colerain High School; city manager, Katy H. Lusheck, Mother of Mercy High School; clerk of council, Michelle Frost, Lima Central Catholic High School; and city council members: Amy Driehaus, Seton High School; Lisa Haney, Seton High School; Tim Haverland, Forest Park High School; Michelle Naegele, St. Ursula Academy; Edwin J. Rigaud III, St. Xavier High School; Andy Russ, Moeller High School; and Michael Vorbroker, Elder High School.

Also participating in the conference were:

Kuy Adamson, Taylor High School; David T. Altenau, Elder High School; Molly Anderson, Loveland High School; Ann E. Bailey, Washington High School; Richard P. Bensman, Minster High School.

Gerl Ann Boyle, Lockland High School; Elizabeth A. Brogen, Loveland High School; Christopher J. Buckner, Wyoming High School; John M. Burns, Eaton High School; Trisha D. Calver, Shelby Senior High School.

Brian Clark, Fenwick High School; Diane Conway, O.L.A. High School; Tony Curso, New Richmond High School; Michael T. Daleiden, Loveland High School; David F. Dearworth, Oak Hills High School.

Allison DeGraffenreid, Princeton High School; Thomas Fishburn, Elder High School; Mary C. Foppe, Mother

of Mercy High School; Elizabeth F. Forg, Madeira High School; Sandy Fox, Wm. Mason High School.

Andrea Funk, Reading High School; Christopher Gramke, Elder High School; Greg Hart, Greenville High School; Christopher Helmecki, St. John J.S.; Michael Hobbs, Norwood High School.

Dawn Jenkins, Shelby Senior High School; Anita Jones, Aiken Senior High School; Christopher Joos, Southeastern High School; Steve Kemen, Elder High School; Robert Kemper, Elder High School.

Lisa Kohls, St. Ursula Academy; Christopher Kissen, Moeller High School; Ann Kreinbrink, Van Buren High School; Amy Kuhlman, Liberty-Benton High School; Adelaide Lee, Notre Dame Academy.

Joyce Ann Lewis, Van Buren High School; Kimberly S. Marty, Wyoming High School; Sam McAdow, London High School; Othea G. McCoy, Hughes High School; Patty McLoughlin, Rosecrans High School.

Kelly McMahan, Loveland High School; Richard Mere, Moeller High School; Karen Monopole, Norwood High School; Louis R. Morris, Northwest High School; Laura M. Ney, St. Ursula Academy.

Claudia O'Grady, Notre Dame Academy; Joseph Ollier, St. Xavier High School; Beth Osborne, Anderson High School; Eric M. Painter, Madeira High School; Margaret Phelps, Aiken High School.

Gary Pugh, Lima Central Catholic High School; John T. Roelker, Moeller High School; Mark Ruse, Loveland High School; James Saunders, Wyoming High School; Bobbie Ann Saylor, Goshen High School.

Jeff Schoenling, LaSalle High School; Jane Anne Shawley, Defiance High School; Jeane Shupe, Fenwick High School; Thomas Swink, Minster High School; Marsha Telles, Seton High School.

Thomas Thompson, Elder High School; Stephen Tobin, McNicholas High School; John Wagner, Roger Bacon High School; Elizabeth Waldron, Turpin High School; Andrea Walston, Taylor High School.

Tony Walter, Lehman High School; Michael Welch, Elder High School; Matthew Wilhelm, Defiance High School; Glenn Wilson, St. Bernard High School; Melissa Woche, Western Hills High School; Steven J. Zehler, Talawanda High School.

I would especially like to honor William E. Smith, director of Operation Youth and professor of accounting and finance at Xavier University. His dedication in insuring the success of this program has been unsurpassed. His efforts, as well as those of his staff, enabled over 82 young citizens to gain new insight into the workings of democracy. The staff included: Tom

Gardner, program director; Kevin Bien, chief of staff; Pam Ehrman, Karen Fahlbusch, Bill Maly, and Glen Napolitano, senior staff; Colleen Cullers, Brenda Green, Mary Green, Melissa McDonald, Tom Pommering, and Greg Sertell, junior staff; and Joe Sabato, junior staff administrative assistant.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to pay tribute to this outstanding and worthwhile program. ●

REMARKABLE INEFFICIENCY WINS STAMP OF APPROVAL

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, when I saw the following editorial by Joe Grimm in the Oakland Press in Pontiac, Mich., I was both amazed and appalled by what it had to say about the Government Printing Office. It is obvious from his revelations that a good housecleaning is in order there, but I find it totally irresponsible and disgusting that Public Printer Danford Sawyer's efforts to save taxpayers millions of dollars by ending many questionable practices at GPO are being fought tooth and nail by the Joint Committee on Printing.

I think the members of the committee should explain to the public why they are failing to act in the public interest by reforming the GPO's operations.

Mr. Grimm's editorial recounts the horror stories only too well, so I will not repeat them, but I believe Danford Sawyer is to be commended for his actions in trying to restore fiscal order to the GPO. It is a shame to think his plans may never come to pass because of the obstructionism of a congressional committee.

I hope my colleagues on this committee will reconsider their position against Mr. Sawyer's planned reforms. I also hope the public will respond to this outrage by writing their Senators and Congressmen demanding that they support Mr. Sawyer's efforts to save us millions of tax dollars.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Oakland (Pontiac, Mich.) Press, May 20, 1982]

REMARKABLE INEFFICIENCY WINS STAMP OF APPROVAL

It is a textbook tale of government waste. In recent weeks, columnist Donald Lambro has reported on practices in the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) that defy belief.

For example:

The federal government pays nearly twice as much to do its own printing as it would pay if private businesses did the work.

The average GPO wage is \$11.74 an hour, compared to the \$8.39 an hour paid to people doing the same jobs for private business.

On average, GPO employees are paid 22 percent more than their counterparts in the federal government.

Nearly a third of the GPO's 6,200 employees are not even needed. While the rest of the publishing world uses photocomposition, the federal government trains new hires to operate antiquated linotype machines.

\$11 million worth of GPO publications were recently sold for scrap because none of the titles were selling even 50 copies a year.

This week, next week, every week, the equivalent of one tractor-trailer load of published material is hauled into warehouses because the federal government will not pay to mail it out but refuses to turn off the presses.

The story was to have a happy ending, though.

Danford Sawyer, a former advertising executive and now the man in charge of the GPO, planned to gut the waste and inefficiency from his department.

Beginning June 1 and continuing for seven months, he planned to give GPO employees six days off without pay.

To bring employees' salaries in line with the salaries of other federal employees, he planned a 22-percent wage cut.

Although he has not made any firm proposals, Sawyer has hinted he will do something about reducing his surplus of 2,000 employees.

Here was an opportunity to save millions of tax dollars without cutting a single food stamp or welfare payment. Here was a man who was in the position and the frame of mind to do it.

It may never come to be.

The House Joint Committee on Printing stands in the way with a five-paragraph resolution.

The first paragraph notes, "Whereas . . . it has always been the policy of the Joint Committee on Printing . . . to supervise and conduct government printing business on a cost-effective and efficient basis."

The last paragraph concludes, "... no furloughs, reductions in force or other adverse personnel actions shall be imposed on GPO employees. . . until a study of the long-range printing needs of the federal government has been conducted. . . ."

Who is on this Joint Committee on Printing that is so reckless with our wallets?

It has five Republican and five Democratic senators or representative who, for the most part, receive heavy contributions from the 22 unions that represent almost all GPO employees. For example Sen. Charles Mathias, R-Md., committee chairman, received \$46,000 from GPO unions for his 1980 campaign.

It is likely the committee's authority to tell Sawyer how to do his job will be decided in court—at our expense.

Urge your elected senators, your congressman and the president to pressure the committee to allow Sawyer to do the job we all want him to do. ●

CRIMINALS HAVE EASY ACCESS TO BULLETPROOF VESTS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I authored legislation aimed

at keeping bulletproof vests out of the hands of criminals.

Specifically, these two bills, H.R. 4978 and H.R. 5559, would place tighter controls on those persons selling and buying bulletproof vests, and would impose tough new penalties for any person caught wearing a bulletproof vest during the commission of a crime.

The need for this legislation is clear. In last year's Nyack, N.Y., Brink's robbery a criminal's vest stopped a police bullet, allowing the robber to return the fire and kill two law enforcement officers. In a morbid twist, the robber was later found to be carrying the defeated police bullet in his pocket, presumably as a souvenir of his "conquest."

In February of this year, one of the FBI's most wanted killers, Joseph "Mad Dog" Sullivan, was arrested wearing a bulletproof vest that had aided him during a murder spree that police think may have resulted in 20 persons dead.

The Justice Department has informed me that bulletproof vests have saved the lives of approximately 400 law enforcement officers during the past decade. Although we have no such statistic for the criminal lives that have been saved by these vests, the evidence we do have indicates that number would also be significant.

Simply stated, police need every possible advantage over the criminal element if they are to succeed in the fight against crime. The soft body armor, which police started using in the mid-1970's, has provided such an advantage. But now that edge is being negated by the fact that criminals have easy access to those very same vests.

To make matters worse, in many cases criminals are wearing vests that are superior to those worn by police. A recent New York Post article quoted two suspected drug dealers arrested in New York City as boasting to police, "Our vests are better than yours." At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the New York Post article containing that particular quote.

[From the New York Post, June 14, 1982]

COPS SHOOT TWO IN MACHINE-GUN DUEL

(By Chris Oliver, Charles Lachman and Sam Rosensohn)

Cops battled a machine-gun-toting gang in a bloody duel yesterday after a cocaine deal turned sour near Central Park.

Two suspected drug dealers, wearing bullet proof vests and carrying automatic weapons, were injured by police gunfire as cops converged on a building.

Later, while being booked in the 24th Pct., one of the suspects sneered at police and told them:

"Our vests are better than yours."

Cops at the 24th Pct. said the two suspects, who also carried several sets of handcuffs, had just emerged from the building after they ripped off more than \$7500 in cocaine from a dealer inside.

One of the suspects, Harold Morris, 21, from Mount Vernon, allegedly armed with a silencer-equipped Israeli Uzi submachine gun, tried to commandeer two cars to make a getaway.

Despite the threat of a gun barrel, drivers in both cars were able to speed away.

In the chaos, police arriving at the scene chased after one of the vehicles, a late model Datsun driven by 22-year-old Duane Davis.

The innocent witness' car was hit at least five times before he stopped and told police who he was.

Meanwhile, Morris, running down Central Park West, turned and fired his machine gun in the direction of arriving cops, witnesses said.

COKE DEAL ENDS IN BATTLE

"I heard 'tatta, tatta, tatta,'" said Hank Erskine, 41, of 471 Central Park West.

"It was something out of a gangster movie."

None of the bullets hit the cops. Morris was hit in the chest by cops' fire.

The second suspect, Jack Taylor, 21, also of Mt. Vernon, raced across Central Park West and vaulted a stone wall bordering the park.

Cops found him hiding in a gulley near the wall. He was hit once in the thigh.

Nearby, cops found a plastic bag containing 70 grams of cocaine.

The chase for additional suspects then moved to a semi-vacant building at 67 West 107th St., where it was believed at least one of the men was holed up on the roof.

No one was found.

Davis said cops' bullets nearly killed him and a friend, Barbara, riding in the front seat.

"I told her to get down. Just then a bullet went through the windshield and landed exactly in the same spot where she was sitting," he said. ●

PRESERVE THE RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, known also as the Civil Rights Act for the Disabled, is the major Federal law prohibiting discrimination against handicapped persons. Section 504 guarantees that all disabled individuals have an equal opportunity to participate in programs receiving Federal financial assistance. It is a basic civil rights document for our country's nearly 36 million disabled persons, prohibiting discrimination, exclusion, or denial of benefits against otherwise qualified handicapped individuals. The guidelines and regulations developed under section 504 have been crucial in allowing handicapped citizens to become productive and active members of society.

I understand that the Reagan administration is conducting an intense review of the section 504 guidelines. Various drafts are floating around the bureaucracy that appear to weaken

the law under the guise of "streamlining" or "reducing Federal redtape." I am concerned that these proposals would seriously undermine the Federal Government's commitment to equal rights for disabled Americans.

Section 504 has had significant results. For many adults, this legislation has meant jobs, job training, and even transportation. In addition, section 504 has opened the doors to recreational, educational, medical, and dental programs for disabled children and adults.

It is within very recent history that health care programs, foster homes, libraries, museums, parks, and public transportation have been made accessible to the handicapped. In combination with the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, section 504 has opened schools throughout the Nation to handicapped children and youths, and insured that these schools provide appropriate instruction and programs.

For disabled adults, section 504 is particularly crucial because it is virtually the only law that insures protection of their rights. Section 504 mandates equal access to health and dental care, to vocational training, university programs, jobs and recreation supported by Federal funds.

The civil rights protections which have been hard won by the disabled community may be destroyed by the proposed changes. I will work to see that Congress preserves section 504 so that these important protections are not lost in the administration's crusade to "deregulate" and "streamline the bureaucracy." ●

BILINGUALISM MAY SERVE TO CHEAT ETHNIC MINORITIES

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the membership an article which appeared this spring in Time magazine. I have long believed that bilingualism is, in the long term, counterproductive for Hispanics and other language minorities in this country, and that distinctions based solely on race or cultural differences create both institutional and self-imposed segregation. The story of Richard Rodriguez is a compelling one, and his experiences with the security of the Hispanic community and with its apprehensions about assimilation into the American mainstream should be instructive to us all. The Time article which appeared in the issue of April 19, 1982, is attached:

TAKING BILINGUALISM TO TASK

In the melting-pot America of legend, plunging straight into the English language in school was a matter of pride and sheer

survival. The pain of learning, and of leaving one's immigrant parents behind, was justified as necessary for progress and assimilation. But by the 1970s, prevailing notions about education and ethnicity had changed. It was believed that the cultural heritage of each student should be preserved. Accordingly, new waves of immigrant children, the majority of them Hispanics, were provided with bilingual education, as the Federal Government prodded schools to give them instruction primarily in their own language until they acquired English skills. But many students stayed in such classes for years.

Critics now assail "bilingualism" as expensive, impractical and un-American. None are more eloquent—or surprising—than Richard Rodriguez. A Mexican American by birth who trained as a scholar of Renaissance literature, Rodriguez, 36, is a writer of rare precision and grace. His new book "Hunger for Memory" (Godine; \$13.95), is a perceptive and touching memoir about growing up in an immigrant family and about the emotional costs of studying his way to a secure place in the Anglo intellectual hierarchy. In the book, Rodriguez bears knowledgeable and compelling witness against America's recent methods of educating the underprivileged, and especially against bilingual education.

Rodriguez, in fact, is his own best case history. "I have been haunted by how my education has made me different," he says. As a "socially disadvantaged" son of Spanish-speaking parents, he entered a Roman Catholic grammar school in Sacramento, Calif., when he was six, speaking barely 50 words of English. By day, in class, he sat silent and unlearning. At night he luxuriated in the warmth and intimacy of his family's Spanish language and the separate, private world of his home. It was only when his teachers finally prevailed on Rodriguez's parents to try speaking English at home that his education began. And so did "the inevitable pain" of growing away from his parents culturally. That process of growth and separation, he insists, is part of all education.

Rodriguez has scant patience with middle-class ethnics, "filled with decadent self-pity," who resist entering the mainstream of American life. Today's bilingual classes, he maintains, keep children "poised at the edge of language too long." Using black English or Spanish in school is crippling because it reduces learning and delays assimilation; hence it reinforces a public form of separateness, a distinction that ultimately keeps minorities in their ghettos. "What I needed to learn in school was that I had the right—and the obligation—to speak the public language of los gringos," writes Rodriguez. "Only when I was able to think of myself as an American, no longer an alien in gringo society, could I seek the rights and opportunities necessary for full public individuality."

"Minority student" is a label that Rodriguez dislikes and regrets having accepted for himself, first at Stanford, then as a graduate student at Columbia. By the time he won a Fulbright scholarship, he was in no way "socially disadvantaged." Yet in 1976, when fellow graduate students were scrounging for teaching jobs, Rodriguez found himself overwhelmed with offers from top universities, not because he was a skillful scholar-teacher—which he was—but simply because he was a member of a racial minority. Disillusioned by what he regarded as the unfairness of academic affirmative-

action policies based solely on race, he turned down all the professorships offered and became a writer. Rodriguez realized that "the policy of affirmative action was never able to distinguish someone like me from a slightly educated Mexican American who lived in a barrio. Worse, affirmative action made me the beneficiary of his condition." Today, he believes, colleges do non-white students a disservice by recruiting them without due regard for their preparation or chances to succeed. "The revolutionary demand," Rodriguez writes, would be for "a reform of primary and secondary schools."

Eventually Rodriguez spoke out in favor of the Bakke decision, which upheld a white applicant's complaint against a minority admissions quota at the University of California medical school at Davis. At a time when the Reagan Administration is cutting back funds for bilingual education and backing away from affirmative action, his views take on political significance. He has been quoted and courted by an array of right-wing politicians "for whom," he says, "I would never vote," and called a "brown Uncle Tom" by minority groups. Commenting on "Hunger for Memory," Oral Historian Studs Terkel, a supporter of affirmative action, warns, "I don't want to see the book of an exceptional individual used by others to make a general case." Rodriguez, who now lives simply in a small San Francisco apartment, shares that concern. Says he: "I've always been in favor of affirmative action, but only if class was the criterion rather than race." ●

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. JUDD GREGG

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I submit the following speech as it was presented by Ronda Ellen Maxwell in this year's Voice of Democracy contest. Ronda Maxwell, age 16, is a resident of Amherst, N.H., and attends Milford Area Senior High School. She is the daughter of Ralph and Choral Maxwell. Ms. Maxwell was awarded the New Hampshire winner prize in this highly competitive contest that is conducted annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary. This eloquently written speech reminds us all that American citizens have both privileges and duties. It brings to light the importance of each individual's contribution to society—the fact that everyone can help strengthen America by working together "in unity with the common bond of patriotism and pride in who we are and what America means to us." Ms. Maxwell's speech certainly provides an inspiring response to the contest theme of "Building America Together," and I am proud to have it represent the State of New Hampshire.

As we are approaching our Nation's birthday, I find it especially appropriate to present these words of one of America's youth.

1981-82 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM, NEW HAMPSHIRE WINNER— RONDA E. MAXWELL

What is the first and most important element in the raising of a monument? It is the construction of a sound foundation. The sturdiness and longevity of any structure depends upon the strength of its foundation in much the same manner as the monument of America has been built upon the sturdy foundation of her heritage—our forefathers, working and toiling as a unified force.

They were great men who committed their lives to implement a new design, and each succeeding generation has contributed its share of designers. These were our Thomas Jeffersons, our Abraham Lincolns, our General Pershings, our Eisenhowers, our Trumans. Can our generation contribute no less?

The guidelines for America were developed through the use of a master blueprint which became the nucleus of the new design. Our blueprint is as essential and valid today as it was then. For of course it is the Constitution of the United States of America, which promises freedom and equality to all Americans. The Pledge of Allegiance incorporates the phrase—"Liberty and justice for all". These are just two of the rights granted to each of us. Liberty was secured when we gained independence from England in 1776, and justice is promised by the Supreme Court and the State and county courts across our land.

Who are the architects today who are responsible for making America a better country? The answer is not the few people who have the actual power, but each and every one of us. You and I—the citizens and inheritants of this living monument.

Each of us, as a citizen of a town or city, must assume responsibility for what happens in our town or city. We, the people of the United States, have the opportunity, unlike people of many other nations, to vote and to have an active hand in town meetings and on the school boards. But, the key words are involvement, commitment, and dedication for young and old alike.

As school students, we can become involved in youth governments, church groups and other similar programs. We can commit ourselves to obeying the laws in our town and by doing so, help establish a smooth and law abiding society. We can dedicate ourselves to seeking fields of education, that together, develop all areas of future American technology.

As adults, there are many areas to become involved in. The occupations of teacher, counselor, politician, lawyer, scientist, minister, law-enforcer, and doctor. The dedication and commitment of our adult community in hospitals, laboratories, schools, churches, and courts, are all active ways to participate in the further growth of our country. Man, woman, or child—black, yellow or white; all of us must press for justice and its achievement, in our own way, no matter what the personal discomfort or cost may be.

So, if the master blueprint is followed and involvement, commitment, and dedication are the way of life for each of us who are Americans, we will have the satisfaction of seeing America become a strong and long-lasting country. And this can only be attained if we work in unity with the common bond of patriotism and pride in who we are and what America means to us. ●

THE TONGUE-TIED AMERICAN

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, the *Alumnus* magazine of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville recently was kind enough to have an article based on my book, "The Tongue-Tied American," which discussed the severe problem we have in this Nation of a foreign language deficiency.

In response to that article, David P. Merrill, an alumnus of the school, wrote about his experiences both as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in Uruguay and some other experiences.

What he has to say makes good sense, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues.

ABOUT LANGUAGE

After one year of college I went to Uruguay for two years where I learned to speak Spanish as a matter of necessity. I lived mainly in small outlying towns and without a knowledge of Spanish it would have been impossible to survive. After I returned to the U.S. in 1971 I tried to keep up my proficiency in the language by taking college classes and seeking out Spanish-speaking friends.

Beginning in 1975, my Air Force job allowed me to travel several times each month to Europe, for three years. My favorite stop was always Madrid because I could wander almost at will throughout the city. If I needed help or directions it was a very easy matter to just ask someone. As a result, I saw more of Madrid than most of my traveling companions who had been going there twice as long as I.

Another frequent stop for me was Frankfurt, West Germany. Although I did not speak German, I did travel into that city and the surrounding towns quite often. However, unlike in Madrid, I always felt I was at the mercy of everyone else. One time that Spanish did prove helpful to me in Germany was when I sought out the local post office with a "German-speaking" American friend. I quickly learned that this friend's German was limited to about 10 words, and although we could both ask, "Where is the post office?" in German, neither of us could understand the directions. In our helpless situation I suddenly spotted a small bank with a sign in the window which said, "Se habla Espanol" (Spanish spoken here). I quickly went inside, asked for the Spanish-speaking teller, and suddenly all the directions to the post office became crystal clear.

Spanish has allowed me to speak to South American immigrants in New Jersey who spoke almost no English, and has made it easier to travel in certain sections of Miami and Los Angeles. I had so much fun on a recent trip to the Ciudad Juarez/El Paso area that I am constantly trying to think of a good excuse to return to Mexico. I have been able to expand a small mail order business in Spanish-speaking countries where all correspondence is in Spanish. Being able to speak Spanish has truly opened up the door to another world.

As far as Americans are concerned, I think the knowledge of another language would be very helpful to them just in being able to better understand English. For most of us, we will rarely, if ever, have occasion to use another language in our travels within the U.S. We have a unique situation in our country where we can travel thousands of miles and never hear anything other than English. Because of that, I can understand the reluctance of many people to belittle the idea of "needing" to learn another language.

On the other hand, as American business expands outside of the U.S., we have a more pressing need to be able to communicate in languages other than English just to keep up with other competitors.

Some friends of mine recently visited Poland and told of their trip to a restaurant one evening. Seated at a large table was a group of Japanese businessmen who spoke Polish among themselves the entire evening, even when the waiters were not within hearing distance. The question was posed as to which group made the more favorable impression that evening, the Japanese businessmen who spoke Polish even when they didn't need to, or the English-speaking Americans. It has been reported that even some of our foreign embassies have no one who can speak the local language. How reliable, then, is our communication with that government?

We would be amazed at how many of our daily products are foreign made. Even some of our red-blooded American cars are composed largely of foreign-made parts from overseas U.S. subsidiaries. We simply can't expect the world to keep catering to us in English.

After World War II, we were the dominant economic power in the world and it was possible to expect other nations to do things our way or not do business with us. That is no longer true. A German business would not prosper very long in the U.S. if it insisted upon doing everything in German. Yet, how often do we go to Germany wanting them to do things in English for our convenience?

The knowledge of foreign languages is an invaluable resource that, by and large, we are neglecting in this country. Not only would such a personal knowledge enrich the nation as a whole, it would also culturally improve our own lives.●

HOUSING SAVINGS ACCOUNT

HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced legislation to provide an opportunity for a first-time home buyer to establish a tax-deductible housing savings accounts.

The current plight of the American home buyer in 1981 is a story of capital shortage—not enough savings in the economy to meet the financial requirements of industry, government, and households. Consequently, all interest rates, mortgages in particular, have risen to unprecedented levels. Rising prices and historically high interest rates have slammed the door on millions of would-be first-time home

buyers and cast a cloud over the American dream of homeownership.

Since home mortgage lending is directly and primarily supported by personal savings, providing direct tax incentives for savings is an extremely important policy measure that Government can take to promote a higher flow of savings in the 1980's. That is why I have introduced H.R. 6607—creating a savings stimulant for the first-time home buyer.

The three main provisions of this bill include: First, tax-deductible contributions; second, tax-free accumulation of interest; and third, a payback provision.

First, tax deductible contributions may be made to the account for 10 years from the date the account is established. The maximum deduction to an account by any and all individuals per year cannot exceed \$1,500—\$3,000 in the case of a married couple—or 15 percent of the individuals adjusted gross income.

Second, the interest accrued on the housing account accumulates tax-free during this 10-year period.

Third, 1 year after the funds are taken out of the account and used for a downpayment on the purchase of a home, the funds are subject to taxation. The total amount taken out of the account will be divided by 10 and added to an individual's gross income in equal increments over a 10-year period. The payback provision was included in the bill to allow the U.S. Treasury to recapture the revenue loss incurred over the past 11 years.

I believe this bill establishes the necessary savings incentives for individuals to save for a downpayment on their first home. I encourage my colleagues to assist first-time homebuyers by cosponsoring H.R. 6607. Remember, a family's home is much more than shelter. A home signifies the family's accomplishments in life, expresses its personality, establishes its place in the community, and defines the perimeter of its private and personal stake in society.●

THE BUDGET AND THE CONSTITUTION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report of June 23, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The report follows:

THE BUDGET AND THE CONSTITUTION

The desire for a balanced federal budget is a powerful force in our country today. As the budget debate rages on in Washington, this desire has emerged as one of the few points of consensus among members of Congress.

Our budget-balancing record in recent years has not been good. The federal budget has been balanced in only nine of the 51 years since 1930, and our budget process now contains a strong bias toward excessive spending. Partly because of deficits, our national economy is in one of its most sensitive stages since World War II. Record-high interest rates and some 10.3 million workers unemployed nation-wide underscore the severity of the current recession. There is wide agreement in Washington that if a sustained economic recovery is to take place, deficits must be reduced. The bleak economic outlook has persuaded many legislators and citizens that a constitutional remedy is needed to bring federal expenditures into line with revenues. So far, 31 of the necessary 34 state legislatures have petitioned Congress for a constitutional convention to propose an amendment to curtail federal expenditures.

The idea of a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget is not new; such amendments have surfaced from time to time in past years. Today, however, as budgets have become less subject to direct control, more than 60 balanced-budget amendments have been introduced in Congress. One of these amendments has been approved by a Senate committee and will be studied by a House committee this summer. The proposal, known as H.J. Res. 350, has been formally endorsed by President Reagan and appears to be the one that will receive the attention of Congress this year.

H.J. Res. 350 is not a strict balanced-budget amendment. Rather, it would require that Congress formulate a yearly plan in which outlays did not exceed revenues. A three-fifths vote of each house of Congress would be required to run a deficit, and federal revenues could not increase in any year above the growth in "national income" in the previous year unless special legislation were passed. Also, H.J. Res. 350 contains a provision to ensure that no new unreimbursed costs would be passed on to the states as a result of the amendment. In the event of a declaration of war, Congress could waive all these provisions.

H.J. Res. 350 has some real merit. It demands that Congress at least plan to balance the budget each year, and it functions to limit taxes by formally tying the growth of receipts to the growth of the economy. There are, however, several problems.

First, the provision requiring a three-fifths vote of both houses of Congress before a deficit could be run (the so-called "super majority") could lead to legislative stalemate in years of high unemployment, when a deficit might be used to stimulate the economy or to meet unpredictable spending demands (for example, a natural disaster or an unexpected increase in interest rates). Such a stalemate could depress the economy even further. Sufficient flexibility to respond to current economic conditions should be a central objective of fiscal policy.

Second, the "tax limitation" provision has come under close scrutiny, principally for two reasons. There is deep disagreement among economists as to the advisability of tying the growth of revenues to the growth in national income the year before. Moreover, setting up this relationship could cause severe problems when revenues fall short of those projected for a particular fiscal year; as recent experience shows, this is not an unusual occurrence. If revenues fell below projected levels, increasing them over the limits of the formula would require

passage of legislation by a majority vote in both houses of Congress. This could open up the entire tax structure to debate because Congress would have to decide exactly which taxes to increase in order to raise revenues. In an atmosphere of controversy, the majorities needed to increase receipts might be unachievable, again leading to stalemate on the budget.

Third, H.J. Res. 350 leaves key terms undefined, such as the measure of national income to be used for limiting tax increases and the powers that Congress and the President have to ensure that actual outlays do not exceed the outlays set forth in the yearly budget statement. By leaving such key terms undefined, the sponsors have invited the court interpretation of these terms. The courts, with little expertise in this area, are ill-prepared for the role.

Finally, this constitutional amendment could cause unchecked growth in the number of so-called "off-budget" items. Efforts would be made to redefine the budget, perhaps, for example, by taking social security out of it. Ways can always be found to circumvent a law or a constitutional amendment. Off-budget activities escape the basic control of the current budget process, so they are more likely to run wild.

In recent years we have experienced an erosion of fiscal discipline in the federal budget. If a constitutional amendment can help restore that discipline, then we should support it. We should not, however, hold out the promise that a formula written into the Constitution can balance our national priorities. If we are to achieve lasting budget restraint and lower deficits, Congress and the President must show the discipline to exercise restraint in the yearly budget review. Firm resolve is needed to control budget growth. If the will does not exist, a constitutional amendment will not help. If the will does exist, a constitutional amendment may not be necessary. Certainly an amendment, which could take several years to approve, should not be viewed as a way to solve our immediate budget problems. A balanced-budget amendment, if adopted, should provide room to respond to a national economic emergency or a threat to our national security. The challenge is to draft an amendment which encourages fiscal discipline but does not straight-jacket economic policy. ●

THE PLIGHT OF WASHINGTON TREJOS MARTINEZ IN URUGUAY

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1977, Washington Trejos Martinez, a member of the Metallurgists Union, was arrested while waiting for a bus on a street in Montevideo, Uruguay. In 1973, the Uruguayan Government had declared all labor unions to be illegal, and it is strongly suspected that Mr. Trejos' arrest was a direct result of his union association. In 1979, after being tortured, Mr. Trejos was sentenced to 6 years in prison, even though we cannot determine the nature of the charges against him. Mr. Trejos is now serving his term in the infamous Libertad Prison, the site of some truly

deplorable human rights abuses. The International Red Cross was permitted to visit the prison last year, but shortly after the visit, the number of deaths and incidences of torture increased.

We do know that, under Uruguayan law, a prisoner is eligible for parole after having served one-half of his sentence. Thus, Mr. Trejos should be eligible for a review of his sentence. I have written to the President of Uruguay and the Uruguayan Ambassador to the United States, urging that the case of Washington Trejos Martinez be reviewed. I would urge my colleagues to do the same, by sending letters to the following addresses:

Exco. Sr. Presidente de la Republica,
General Gregorio Alvarez,
Case de Gobierno,
Plaza Independencia,
Montevideo, Uruguay.

His Excellency Jorge Pacheco Areco,
Ambassador to the United States,
Embassy of the Republic of Uruguay,
1918 F St. NW.,
Washington, D.C. 20036. ●

CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN SO-CALLED ANIMAL QUARANTINE AND PLANT QUARANTINE ACTS

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by Congressman GEORGE BROWN in introducing legislation that would authorize civil penalties to be assessed for violations of various laws aimed at preventing the introduction and dissemination of livestock and poultry diseases, plant diseases, and plant pests. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to impose, administratively, civil money penalties for violations of certain plant and animal quarantine laws, which are administered by the Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Currently, these laws are punishable by criminal sanctions and, in some cases, monetary penalties. This legislation retains the sanction of criminal prosecution now provided for in the acts, but would increase the monetary penalties where they already exist, and provide for monetary penalties where none exist.

Criminal sanctions are vital in assuring the enforcement of our laws, but they are sometimes not enough. Criminal prosecution is a lengthy and cumbersome process in an already overburdened judicial system, and sometimes culminates in no prosecution because of a breakdown in the system. While the process proceeds sluggishly, the violator is often free to continue the same practices, and continue to threat-

en the American agricultural industry. Civil penalties, on the other hand, can be imposed administratively, insuring that the violator will be dealt with in a timely and effective manner. Moreover, a monetary penalty is more real to most individuals and businessmen than a distant and lengthy legal process that can sometimes be overcome. Just the threat of a monetary penalty could discourage some violators, particularly "knowing" violators, from breaking the law. Civil penalties thus become not only an effective enforcement tool, but a potential deterrent as well.

This does not mean that civil penalties will be imposed indiscriminately; cases must be supported by substantial evidence. Such a penalty cannot be imposed without notice and opportunity for a hearing. Appeals are also provided for through judicial review in the U.S. courts of appeals. Nor does it mean that criminal sanctions will not be pursued; that course remains open. The legislation will simply expand the scope of sanctions that can be imposed on violators. It will give the potential offender one less reason to violate the law. If it is financially advantageous to violate the law, it is likely that a violation—at least a knowing violation—will occur. If it is financially prohibitive, violations are less likely to occur.

The animal and plant quarantine laws were originally enacted to protect American agriculture from potentially devastating pests and disease. The cost of effective enforcement of these laws is minimal compared to the cost of combating animal and plant diseases and pests that seriously affect the quality and quantity of the food and fiber produced in the United States. It is the purpose of this legislation to make the enforcement of these important laws more effective.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D.C., March 16, 1982.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEIL, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill "To authorize civil penalties for violations of various laws for preventing the introduction and dissemination of livestock and poultry diseases, plant diseases, and plant pests."

The Department of Agriculture recommends that the draft bill be enacted.

The purpose of the draft bill is to expand the scope of sanctions for violations of certain so-called "Animal Quarantine" and "Plant Quarantine" acts intended to prevent the introduction into the United States and the dissemination within the United States of livestock and poultry diseases and plant diseases and pests.

The draft bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to impose, administratively, civil money penalties for violations, whenever he believes that such penalties are appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the act involved. Provision is made for af-

fording the alleged violator an opportunity for hearing in connection with such action. The acts to be amended now contain no authority for the imposition of civil money penalties. The additional authority will enable the Department to handle many violations more expeditiously, provide greater flexibility in sanctions for more effective enforcement, and insure a greater degree of consistency in the sanctions. The provisions for civil money penalties are consistent with "Recommendation 72-6: Civil Money Penalties as a Sanction" adopted on December 14, 1972, by the Administrative Conference of the United States.

The draft bill retains the sanction of criminal prosecution now provided for in the acts but increases the fines applicable to such violations. The maximum fine for violation of the Act of February 2, 1903, the Act of March 3, 1905, or the Act of July 2, 1962, or the regulations promulgated thereunder, would be raised from \$1,000 to \$5,000 (21 U.S.C. 122, 127, 134e). The sanction of imprisonment for a period of not more than one year would also be maintained. This accords with the provisions in the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U.S.C. 117). The maximum fine of \$5,000 would be retained in section 6 of the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U.S.C. 104). However, the maximum period of imprisonment in that section would be reduced from three years to one year, to be in accord with the definition of a misdemeanor prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1 and to conform to the term of imprisonment prescribed in the other "Animal Quarantine" acts as cited. A maximum fine of \$1,000 and imprisonment not exceeding one year would be provided for a knowing violation of section 8 of the 1890 Act (21 U.S.C. 103) for which no penalties are currently provided in the act.

The forfeiture provision of section 6 of the Act of August 30, 1890 (21 U.S.C. 104) would be deleted. The present provision is not applicable to all means of conveyance. This forfeiture authorization has never been used. The administrative officials of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service do not view the provision as a practical tool in their disease control and eradication programs and find more practical recourse under other authorizations contained in the Animal Quarantine laws and this bill.

In the Act of May 23, 1957 (7 U.S.C. 150gg) and the Act of August 20, 1912 (7 U.S.C. 163), the maximum fine would be increased from \$500 to \$5,000 and the provisions for a maximum one year period of imprisonment would be retained. However, knowledge would be specifically required as an element of additional criminal offenses under these two acts. Currently, knowledge is specifically required only for certain offenses under these two acts. The bill also would add to the 1912 Act, provisions for civil and criminal penalties for the knowing unauthorized use of certificates provided for under the act and limit the provisions on alterations, defacing or destroying such certificates to such actions when unauthorized by the Secretary.

The bill would also provide for the imposition of civil and criminal penalties for violation of regulations under the Act of January 31, 1942 (7 U.S.C. 149). Such authority is not presently provided.

This Department believes that the bill, if enacted, would substantially aid in the protection of the livestock and poultry populations, plants and other agricultural interests of this country.

Enactment of the draft bill will result in an estimated additional cost to the Department of approximately \$100,000 annually.

Section 102(2)(c) of Public Law 91-190 does not apply. The proposed legislation does not significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

An identical letter has been sent to the President of the Senate.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. BLOCK,
Secretary.

ISLANDS IN THE STORM: OUR NATIONAL PARKS

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, when most people hear the words "national park," visions of Yellowstone and the Grand Canyon immediately spring to mind. We should not forget, however, that almost 60 percent of our 333 national park system units are cultural and historical sites, such as the Homestead National Monument within my district, Carol Sandburg's home in North Carolina and the Florissant Fossil Beds of Colorado.

These fragile sites suffer equally from the wear and tear of natural forces and the constant onslaught of civilization. Another excellent article by Robert Cahn, which follows, explains in detail the types of threats facing these delicate areas. I hope that my colleagues will read the following and then understand why their support for park service improvement legislation, such as H.R. 5976 which I introduced, is so essential.

The article follows:

CHACO CANYON: PRESERVING A CULTURAL TREASURE

(By Robert Cahn)

One can almost feel the presence of the ancient people who mysteriously departed eight centuries ago from this remote part of New Mexico. Walking about Pueblo Bonito, one of the most significant archaeological sites in the hemisphere, I found myself wondering what life was like in this earliest American "apartment complex," a multi-story, 800-room communal dwelling that once housed 1,200 people.

An ancient people—the Anasazi—built a relatively advanced civilization here. They cultivated the land, performed elaborate religious ceremonies in their great kivas, designed and made pottery and textiles, and constructed extensive pueblos using sophisticated masonry and architectural techniques. And without pack animals or wheeled vehicles, they developed a complex trade network connecting as many as 75 outlying communities with a system of roads. Then, at the end of the 12th century, they left without a trace.

In 1907, about 21,000 acres of public land was set aside as Chaco Canyon National Monument to preserve the remnants of this highest point of pre-Columbian pueblo civilization. Chaco's cultural interest, together

with its beautiful example of high-plateau, desert terrain, makes it one of the gems in the national park system of the United States.

PARK FACES THREATS FROM WITHIN AND WITHOUT

But like nearly all the National Park Service's cultural and historical sites, as well as its natural areas, Chaco faces threats both from within and without its own boundaries. The 1980 State of the Parks Report ticked off 37 threats to Chaco's resources (the average park had 14), many the effects of current or planned energy development near the park.

The three-mile-wide and nine-mile-long park is surrounded by federally owned land and a Navajo reservation. These were long thought to constitute a protective buffer for the park. Today, however, those lands have become the leading source of trouble for Chaco. The stark reality is that Chaco sits in the midst of the San Juan Basin, which is estimated to have one-fourth of the nation's stripable coal reserves, oil and gas deposits, and one-sixth of the world's uranium supply.

Large-scale strip mining poses special problems. It could accelerate erosion at Chaco and carry toxic wastes into the park. Uranium mining could affect the quality and quantity of the ground water. Considerable amounts of air pollution are already being measured in the park, probably from the Four Corners coal-fired power plants 60 miles away.

The Santa Fe Railroad has plans for building a spur just outside the northern part of the park to transport coal. A new community of 20,000, complete with a 2,000-megawatt coal burning power plant, is on the drawing boards. It would be built 16 miles from the park.

These external threats come at a time of great opportunity for the park. Years of research and exploration have uncovered evidence of more than 75 outlying prehistoric communities spread over 26,000 square miles. The discoveries hold the potential for unlocking many of the intriguing mysteries of the Chaco culture. To protect this heritage, conservationists and the National Park Service two years ago urged expansion of Chaco Canyon National Monument and its designation as a national park.

Late in 1980, Congress passed a law establishing the slightly larger Chaco Culture National Historical Park. This provided minimal protection to 33 of the outlying sites. But no protection was given the land around them, which includes thousands of other archaeological sites.

Inside Chaco's boundaries other problems are readily apparent. A rear wall of Pueblo Bonito sags so badly it has to be supported by two crude wooden braces. The wall could collapse at any moment, but repairs might cost more than \$1 million. And they can't even be requested until park officials understand why the wall is collapsing and what can be done about it. But this research would cost money, too, and no funds are available.

EROSION IS CHACO'S MOST URGENT PROBLEM

All around the ruins signs of erosion point to the most urgent threat. Rain water pours from the steep cliffs and box canyons into narrow Chaco Wash. Many of the cottonwood trees planted years ago to reduce erosion are dying out, and the park can't get the money to replace them. The alluvial soils underlying many ruins are affected by "piping," a natural phenomenon that causes

soil to collapse, creating huge subsurface caverns.

Chaco superintendent Walter Herriman worries that the park faces serious damage from the many threats to its resources. Mr. Herriman, a Park Service veteran, who has been nine years in his present post, battles vigorously, often outspokenly, to save Chaco.

He saw visits to the park increase 40 percent between 1980 and 1981, while personnel to take care of the park and its visitors was cut back. The ranger staff is so thin and so busy with other duties, he says, that it is unable to prevent vandalism and theft of artifacts from the ruins. And they rarely get to patrol the outlying areas. While attending to other duties, chief ranger Ken Mabery happened upon a uranium exploration crew just outside the park, which had inadvertently bulldozed one of the ancient roads. Herriman persuaded the mining company to hire an archaeologist to work with the drilling crew and steer them away from valuable historical sites.

Despite the urgency of its problems, Chaco is not authorized to have a resource management specialist. Erosion control, air pollution monitoring, and wildlife management are done by ranger John Miller. He holds forestry and wildlife management degrees, but his job at Chaco carries only a low-paying technician rating, and he has to fit resource management in among his normal ranger duties.

FUNDS TO COMBAT EROSION MAY BE TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

Herriman was able to get \$60,000 this year to begin erosion control work. But it may be too little, too late. A just-completed engineering study found that four of the park's nine major excavated ruins will be destroyed by erosion unless the park undertakes a multimillion-dollar program to control the entire Chaco watershed.

The Navajo tribe, the State of New Mexico, and several federal agencies are working on a plan to protect the 33 newly discovered outlying sites. But they will not complete the plan for two more years. And the Interior Department may at any time authorize strip mining of coal on the public lands adjoining the park.

"Chaco represents the heritage not only of the American Indians but of our country as a whole," says Herriman. "And we will miss out on understanding an important part of our roots if we let Chaco be harmed. It ought to be preserved for all future Americans to see and understand."

The threats to the resources at Chaco may be unusually severe, but they are not unique. Historical and cultural sites comprise 60 percent of all Park Service units, and many are in immediate need of repair and protection. Independence Hall's bell tower and the Statue of Liberty need rehabilitation; Fort El Morro in San Juan, Puerto Rico, is collapsing from the pounding of the sea; and Tennessee River water is eroding vital sections of Shiloh National Military Park in Tennessee. Vandalism, crime, and misuse are taking their toll on many of the historical sites in urban areas.

MANY CULTURAL RESOURCES YET TO BE INVENTORIED

Are the threats to the cultural areas like Chaco as severe as the threats to natural areas? I put the question to F. Ross Holland, the National Park Service associate director for cultural resources. His answer: "We don't know what we are losing. And we don't have the people even to identify all of

the problems." I'd heard much the same comment from the stewards of Yellowstone and other natural areas.

Mr. Holland noted that the Park Service estimates it has more than 20,000 historical structures, but only 12,000 have been inventoried. And of the estimated 10 million objects in park collections—which range from the pistol John Wilkes Booth used to shoot President Abraham Lincoln to the suit George Washington wore at his inauguration—fewer than 10 percent have been cataloged.

As the number of historical areas has increased (32 units have been added in the last eight years), the number of trained professionals working with them has remained static. At some sites it has even declined. The Park Service has fewer than 100 historical architects, architectural conservators, and preservation specialists. Of these, only two-thirds are permanent employees. Only 21 qualified "cultural resources management specialists" are at work in the 333 National Park Service units.

Answering a hurried call in February 1981 to identify resource problems in need of immediate budget attention, the Park Service's 10 regional directors proposed 63 cultural projects. The estimated first-year cost for those projects would have been \$34.6 million, if all had been fully funded.

THREATS TO NATURAL RESOURCES REMAIN THE PRIME CONCERN

The Park Service regards preservation of cultural resources as important and necessary. But it is the growing threat to natural resources that is especially troublesome. Safeguarding the scenic and natural value of these resources has, after all, been the service's traditional mandate. As evidence of these threats mounts, pressures build on Park Service officials to put increased emphasis on resource management, but the troops are skeptical.

Rangers know that in practice natural resource management gets the short end of the stick. Law enforcement, services to visitors, and maintenance of facilities take most of their time and eat up most of the budget. Every ranger and superintendent I talked with at the annual conference of national park rangers at Squaw Valley, Calif., last October favored reversing priorities. They wanted to make protection of the natural resources No. 1, providing more funds, personnel, and training for this purpose.

In fact, resource management was the theme of this fifth annual "Ranger Rendezvous," attended by 250 rangers and 25 superintendents and park administrators. They came on vacation time and paid their own expenses. For three days they delved into external threats to natural resources, management of endangered species, the problems posed by nonnative species, protection of wilderness, and other issues. National Park Service director Russell Dickenson admitted that park resources were being changed "in ways that, if it continues, will seriously degrade the natural and cultural resources for which we are held accountable." He received a standing ovation for promising to give higher priority to resource management.

MANY RANGERS FEEL BETRAYED BY WATT STATEMENT

The rendezvous participants responded to Interior Secretary James G. Watt's videotaped talk with silence, even though his remarks indicated support for resource protection. Talks with rangers revealed an undercurrent of resentment against the secretary.

Many spoke of feeling betrayed by Mr. Watt's statements about the "shameful" state of the national parks. They felt those statements exaggerated the problem of deteriorating park facilities, and drew public attention away from the more serious resource protection issue.

Members of Congress got an earful on the threats to parks' natural and cultural resources early this year during hearings called by Rep. John Seiberling (D) of Ohio. The aim of the hearings was to find out what was being done in response to the 1980 State of the Parks Report, which listed hundreds of threats to park land.

Thurman Trooper of Montana, a former Park Service official and past president of the Wilderness Society, testified that Glacier National Park is threatened by a planned huge open-pit coal mine just over the border in Canada, proposed gas and oil development on all sides of the park which could disrupt wildlife movement, and by acid rain and second-home development.

ENERGY DEVELOPMENT CALLED A "TIGHTENING NOOSE"

"The noose is tightening around our national parks," said Terri Martin, Utah representative of the National Parks and Conservation Association. She was referring to planned energy development on public lands adjacent to park areas of the Colorado Plateau—including tar sands extraction within Glen Canyon, strip mining adjacent to Capitol Reef, and a nuclear waste repository one mile from Canyonlands.

My own investigations bear out what these witnesses and others told the committee. Consider two national parks in California. In both cases, there's evidence of threats to the principal resources for which the parks were established.

SEQUOIA AND LASSEN: NATURAL RESOURCES ON THE LINE

At Sequoia National Park, the second oldest national park, scientists discovered in the early 1960s that putting out lightning-caused forest fires, instead of letting them burn out, interfered with the natural cycles that perpetuate the majestic 2,000-to-3,000-year-old giant sequoias, largest of all living objects in the world. Fire removes undergrowth, prepares the soil to germinate new trees and allows them necessary light. Also, if the underbrush remains, it can lead to abnormally hot fires that could penetrate the sequoias' fire-resistant bark, which is impervious to normal fires.

The Sequoia National Park management plan calls for "prescribed" burning in key areas as a preventive measure. But the plan has been hampered by lack of funds and personnel. Most of the \$300,000 budgeted for controlled burning in 1981 had to be used to meet general park operating costs.

Sequoia has other resource problems as well: rising amounts of acid rain; nonnative plant species intruding on the natural vegetation; and the constant movement of visitors compacting soils at the lodges and cabins within Giant Forest, which threatens the shallow-rooted sequoias.

CALL TO BEEF UP RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Superintendent Boyd Evison says he feels that the park cannot protect its resources adequately until natural science and resource management programs are given more attention.

"One of the greatest needs of our parks is a basic inventory of natural resources, supported by effective computer capabilities, in

order to get an accurate picture of changes," Mr. Evison says.

Although 79,000 of the 107,000 acres in northern California's Lassen Volcanic National Park are officially designated wilderness, the park's most unique resource is its thermal activity. There are hot springs, sulfur works, fumaroles, and steam vents. Lassen Peak, a 10,457-foot-high smoldering mountain, is one of two active volcanoes in the continental United States. Its 1915 eruption was the most recent in the U.S. until Mount St. Helens blew its top.

The chief threat to Lassen's resources is geothermal development on national forest land bordering the park. The U.S. Forest Service wants to grant 57 leases to would-be developers. And the park's single most unique natural phenomenon, Terminal Geyser, has already been compromised. Really a steam vent, it continuously blows water and steam 50 to 75 feet into the air, a spectacular small-scale Old Faithful.

Adjoining the geyser is a 566-acre "inholding"—a privately owned tract that lies within the original park boundaries. The tract could have been purchased for a small sum in 1916 when the park was established, but in those days public funds were not used for direct purchase of land for parks. Parklands were carved out of other public lands or donated by individuals. The family that owned the tract did not offer to donate it. In later years, after federal policy changed to allow the purchase of land for parks, the parcel could still have been bought at a very low price, but it wasn't.

GEOTHERMAL WELL DRILLED NEXT TO GEYSER

In 1962, the owner leased the mineral rights to an oil company, which sank a geothermal test well and then capped it, finding that the well had too little economic potential. Then in 1978, while the Park Service dawdled over a congressionally approved decision to condemn the area, Phillips Petroleum Corporation sent heavy equipment into this semi-wilderness. Within 50 yards of Terminal Geyser they leveled a hillside area the size of a football field, sink a 4,000-foot geothermal test well, and capped it.

Once the damage had been done, the Park Service condemned the land and now will have to pay upwards of \$6 million for the property. In time the leveled hillside can be replanted and, fortunately, development was halted before Terminal Geyser was damaged. But it was a close call, and the desecrated site serves as a mute reminder of how quickly a priceless natural resource could be destroyed.

IS WASHINGTON BEING PENNYWISE AND POUND-FOOLISH?

What nearly happened to Terminal Geyser lends ammunition to the national park advocates who insist that it is pennywise and pound foolish not to use the more than \$1 billion available for new park land in the Land and Water Conservation Fund to acquire certain lands within congressionally approved park boundaries that are vital to the parks' well-being. Most of the key properties could be paid for with money to spare, out of one year's authorization from the fund—if Secretary Watt's park land acquisition moratorium could be lifted and Congress approved the expenditures. ●

BILL TO DELAY EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO RULE 4 OF FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure relates to "Process". On April 28, 1982, the Chief Justice sent to Congress some proposed amendments to this rule. The accompanying draft would postpone the effective date of these amendments to October 1, 1983, or until Congress acts affirmatively on them, whichever is earlier. In the absence of such an enactment the amendments will become effective automatically on August 1, 1982.

Rule 4(c) now provides that "Service of process shall be made by a United States marshal, by his deputy, or by some person specially appointed by the court for that purpose. . . ." It also provides that "Service of process may also be made by a person authorized to serve process in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction of the State in which the district court is held or in which service is made." In addition to proposing that this rule be amended to authorize service of a summons and complaint "by any person who is not a party and is not less than 18 years of age", the Court eliminates from the rule the provision for service by persons authorized to serve under State law. There is no explanation offered for this change. It is respectfully suggested that the Congress should inquire into the change and satisfy itself that there is good and sufficient reason for departing from a system which keys the Federal court procedure to that of the State in which it is located.

The Court has also proposed a new rule 4(d) providing for service of a summons and complaint by certified or registered mail, with provision for the entry of default judgments. Although an effort is made in the proposed rule to provide otherwise, there is a good possibility of the entry of default judgments against persons who never even knew they were defendants. A congressional hearing on how certified or registered mail, restricted delivery, is handled seems prudent. Many people have had experience with return receipts on which signatures are illegible or clearly not those of the addressees.

In my home State of California process may be served by ordinary mail, accompanied by a notice and acknowledgment of receipt form. In the vast majority of cases the persons sought to be served return the acknowledgments

and the cases may proceed to judgment. When there is no such return, personal service is required. This system is in use in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California and has been characterized by Judge A. Wallace Tashima, writing for his court, as "low cost" and "efficient."

Present rules 4(d)(7) and 4(e) now provide service may be made on certain defendants in the manner prescribed by the law of the State in which the Federal court is held. For some reason, again not suggested in any of the papers submitted to the Congress, the Court has proposed an exception to these provisions—if mail service is used it must comply with the new rule 4(d)(8). Since circumstances vary so differently around the country, New York being so different from Wyoming or Montana, it may well be that a system of service found to be efficient by a State for its people should continue to be available to them even when they litigate in the Federal court.

Before compelling the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California to abandon the mail system for serving process which has been serving the court well, and before compelling other courts throughout the country to abandon whatever systems they have been using effectively, the Congress should explore whether there is merit in a uniform system throughout the United States and if so, whether the uniformity should pertain only when mail service is effected or whether it should pertain however process is served.

It should also be noted that present law, 28 U.S.C. 659(b) provides that "United States marshals shall execute all lawful writs, process and orders issued under the authority of the United States, including those of the courts * * *". The interrelationship between this statute, a mandate of the Congress, and the proposed rule amendments requires some investigation. There is no objection to removing the marshals from the service of private civil process, but it may well be that a statutory amendment is required concomitant with the rules change.

Efforts have been made in past Congresses, and are being made in the current Congress, to amend the statute. The House Judiciary Committee in its report on the Justice Department authorization bill for fiscal 1982 (H. Rept. 97-105) observed that "taking the Justice Department out of the business of serving civil process would have required substantive amendments to title 28, United States Code." Senators THURMOND and BIDEN have introduced S. 2567, an authorization bill for fiscal 1983, in which they have included such an amendment. That

bill has passed the Senate and is pending with the House Committee on the Judiciary. The accompanying draft is keyed to that authorization bill for timing, although it provides that if the Congress acts on the proposed changes to rule 4 earlier, they may be implemented earlier.

In sum, introduction and the prompt enactment of the accompanying bill are urged. Unless this is all accomplished before August 1 of this year, the changes will become effective without the Congress having had an opportunity to inquire into their appropriateness and desirability. ●

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING
THE INTERNATIONAL GEO-
PHYSICAL YEAR

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution commemorating July 1, 1982, as the 25th anniversary of the beginning of the International Geophysical Year. It is important that the House focus the Nation's attention on the remarkable scientific accomplishments that the International Geophysical Year initiated, and reaffirm its commitment to the continued cooperation of all nations in the pursuit of scientific knowledge that benefits all the people of the world.

The International Geophysical Year began on July 1, 1957, and ended on December 31, 1958, coinciding with what scientists anticipated to be an entire period of solar activity. Sixty-seven nations sent representatives to study aurora and airglow, cosmic rays, geomagnetism, glaciology, gravity, ionospheric physics, longitudes and latitudes, meteorology, nuclear radiation, oceanography, seismology, solar activity, and upper atmospheric studies utilizing rockets and satellite vehicles. The knowledge gained from those studies forms a sparkling legacy from the International Geophysical Year. Improvements we now take for granted, like refined methods of weather prediction, to those whose existence is predicated on the work done 25 years ago, such as space exploration, illustrate the success and continuing benefits of the International Geophysical Year.

Perhaps the highest tribute I can pay to the International Geophysical Year is to describe briefly the state of science and the world prior to July 1, 1957. Before the International Geophysical Year artificial satellites had never been launched; the Antarctic had not been explored; there was no Antarctic Treaty; there was no Test Ban Treaty; there were no world data

centers for the storage and sharing of scientific knowledge; there were few international organizations based purely on scientific cooperations. The International Geophysical Year removed all these ideas from paper and turned them into reality. Satellites were launched, new lands were explored. Most importantly, the means for putting the newly discovered knowledge to good use was created.

The impact the International Geophysical Year had on international relations is just as important as the scientific discoveries. The nations of 1957 feared nuclear weapons and sought peace. Both those in Government and in the sciences searched for cooperation, not conflict. This need for cooperation is evident in the writings of Lloyd Berkner, the originator of the International Geophysical Year proposal:

But most encouraging in all has been the genuine enthusiasm with which the scientists of Earth, and the nations that support them, have embraced this program. Tired of war and dissension, men of all nations have turned to "Mother Earth" for a common effort on which all find it easy to agree.

That the International Geophysical Year filled the need for cooperation is beyond dispute. As Wallace Atwood, one of the participants in the International Geophysical Year, has noted:

I think it is fair to say that the international significance of the program, as its name bears out, has been of greater significance than even the very important discoveries which have been made. At a time when we are torn asunder by ideological differences and by selfish national attacks upon the freedom we stand for, it is heartening to find that there are some things that people can do together with common amity.

The words I have quoted apply today as well. We still live in a world fearful of nuclear war. In the last few months we have watched an escalation of war, and the conflicts have resulted in the unnecessary killing of many. Yet, as a result of the International Geophysical Year, coexisting with these tensions are functioning organizations of international scientific cooperation. The legacy of the International Geophysical Years lives on.

It is for these reasons that I introduce my resolution to the House of Representatives and urge its speedy passage. Commemorating the International Geophysical Year honors the great achievements that have come before, and reaffirms our Nation's commitment to the peaceful and cooperative use of scientific knowledge, and to a renewed era of international goodwill.

The resolution follows:

H. Res. —

Whereas July 1, 1982, is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the beginning of the International Geophysical Year, and further, the year of 1982 is the fiftieth anniversary of the Second International Polar Year and the one-hundredth anniversary of the First International Polar Year;

Whereas the First and Second International Polar Years established the precedent for the International Geophysical Year, by organizing scientists from as many as 40 countries in a series of studies covering the fields of aerology, astronomy, biology, geology, glaciology, hydrography, meteorology, and oceanography, and involving studies of auroral physics, cosmic rays, aurora borealis, atmospheric electricity, earth currents, geomagnetism, ionospheric physics, latitude and longitude, nacreous clouds, noctilucent clouds, ozone, and radiation, all of which produced a wealth of new data in these areas;

Whereas the International Geophysical Year involved scientists from 67 countries, and brought together the world's most respected scientists with the most modern technological equipment of that time to study aurora and airglow, cosmic rays, geomagnetism, glaciology, gravity, ionospheric physics, longitudes and latitudes, meteorology, nuclear radiation, oceanography, seismology, solar activity, and upper atmospheric studies utilizing rockets and satellite vehicles;

Whereas the studies conducted during the International Geophysical Year produced unprecedented and invaluable information that included many discoveries of major importance;

Whereas the International Geophysical Year advanced the sharing of data and the cooperation of all governments through the creation of the World Data Centers;

Whereas the International Geophysical Year was the largest, most comprehensive, and most successful cooperative program in science ever undertaken;

Whereas the International Geophysical Year brought a new space age to the planet Earth, and launched individual governments into the search of the solar system;

Whereas the International Geophysical Year has had a lasting beneficial impact on cooperative scientific programs, as is evidenced by the creation of cooperative bodies such as the Special Committee on Oceanic Research, the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research, the International Geophysical Cooperation, the Inter-Union Committee on Contamination by Extraterrestrial Exploration, the Committee on Space Research, Scientific Committee of Solar Terrestrial Physics, and the International World Days Service;

Whereas the International Geophysical Year has had an immeasurable positive impact on the scientific community and the public's understanding of scientific advancements and their importance to society; and

Whereas the efforts of the individual scientists participating in the International Geophysical Year extended beyond their own work and into the international environment, fostering cooperation among nations and a sense of good will and achievement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commemorate July 1, 1982, which is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the beginning of the International Geophysical Year, and reaffirms the commitment of the House of Representatives to a new, vigorous era of international cooperation in all the sciences. ●

EFFECTS OF MILITARY
SPENDING ON THE ECONOMY

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to reflect on one of the issues at the heart of the current budget debate. Perhaps more this year than any other in recent history, the House is being asked to examine the effects of military spending on the economy.

Regardless of which budget is finally adopted by this Congress, the 5-year defense plan will call for increased defense spending. While the need to maintain our Nation's security is the primary factor behind the defense budget increases, Congress also has an obligation to provide for a healthy economy. At a time when the economy is in a recession, with high unemployment and interest rates, some argue that increased defense spending is economically and socially wrong.

The unemployed people of this Nation do have a right to question increased defense spending and how it will affect their employment opportunities. In researching this matter, I have come to the conclusion that increased defense spending has a direct and positive effect on the economy of Indiana.

The House Armed Services Committee, on which I sit, recognizes both the need to improve the economy and provide for an adequate military. To insure a better understanding of the effects of increased defense spending on the economy, the committee invited the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Dr. Alice Rivlin, to testify on the potential effect of the increases.

Dr. Rivlin pointed out that between 1955 and 1962—years in which the economy was considered healthy—defense spending accounted for 8 percent of the Nation's GNP. Under the President's 5-year defense plan, defense spending will increase from 6 percent of the Nation's GNP to 7 percent.

It is obvious to any student of economics that the Nation can easily absorb defense spending levels below 8 percent of our GNP without any adverse effect on the economy. In fact, Dr. Rivlin testified that defense spending stimulates economic activity just as much if not more than other Government spending. In particular, she said that defense spending stimulates the economy more than transfer payments that account for almost 50 percent of the current Federal budget.

It is clear that providing for an adequate defense posture, with the requisite increases in defense spending and

improving the economy are not mutually exclusive goals.

I mentioned earlier that I felt defense spending had a beneficial effect on the economy of Indiana. A detailed examination of defense spending in Indiana will illustrate my point. In Indiana, the Department of Defense personnel compensation in fiscal year 1981 totaled \$561,916,000. That figure included civilian pay, military active duty pay, Reserve and National Guard pay, and retired military pay. Indiana was 31st in the Nation in total military compensation. California had the highest total compensation, \$8,978,933,000 and Vermont the lowest with only \$40,424,000. However, the real importance of defense spending in Indiana can be found in the money paid to contractors who perform a wide variety of services for the Department.

Prime contractors in Indiana receive \$1,766,019,000 from the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1981. Indiana was 17th in the Nation in receiving defense contract money. California was first with a total of \$17,313,918,000 and Montana was 50th with a total of \$49,314,000. There were a total of 765 different contractors in Indiana who did at least 10,000 dollars' worth of business with DOD. In the new Fifth Congressional District, which has Grissom AFB in the center of it, there were 75 separate contractors. Those 75 contractors did 29.5 million dollars' worth of business with the Defense Department.

The entire State benefits from defense contracts. The top 10 counties which received business from the Department are spread throughout the State. Those counties are Marion, \$541,079,000; St. Joseph, \$414,116,000; Allen, \$384,090,000; Lake, \$107,518,000; Clark, \$98,488,000; Vigo, \$26,695,000; Hamilton, \$21,017,000; Knox, \$14,413,000; Miami, \$10,979,000; and Wabash, \$10,936,000.

The largest single contractor in Indiana was General Motors doing about 443 million dollars' worth of business. For GM this involves several hundred different contracts for a wide variety of activities.

The point to be made is that increased defense spending is not inconsistent with our efforts to reduce unemployment or bring the economy out of the recession. There are thousands of businesses across the Nation with millions of employees who benefit directly from defense contracts.

In the April 18 South Bend Tribune, Mr. Ray M. Leliaert, Jr., wrote an article entitled "Defense Spending Influx Spurs Michiana Economy." In that article, David Kilk, an economist at Indiana University at South Bend noted that some 9,000 jobs in the South Bend area alone were directly dependent on military spending.

In reviewing the contractors located within the Fifth Congressional District, I estimate that nearly 20,000 people work for companies that did at least 10,000 dollars' worth of business for the Defense Department. While it is difficult to determine how many of those jobs are directly dependent on military spending, the number is certainly significant.

A detailed listing of prime contractors located in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana is available through my office should anyone desire a copy. ●

COLD SHOULDERS FOR ARMS
FREEZE

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, recently Stephen Chapman had a column in the Chicago Tribune with comments on the arms race and the nuclear freeze.

That column says very pointedly what I believe the situation to be, that we are not pursuing arms reduction vigorously.

We are chasing illusions that somehow we can arm ourselves more while the Soviets will not and then we can dominate an arms reduction situation.

I urge my colleagues to read the Stephen Chapman column.

COLD SHOULDER FOR ARMS FREEZE

(By Stephen Chapman)

"Twice in my lifetime, I've seen the world plunged blindly into global war that inflicted untold suffering upon millions of innocent people... such a tragedy, which would be rendered even more terrible by the monstrous, inhumane weapons in the world's nuclear arsenals, must never happen again. My goal is to reduce nuclear weapons dramatically, assuring lasting peace and security."

Those uncharacteristic sentences came from the mouth of Ronald Reagan at his press conference last Wednesday. Though at first glance they look like a call for genuine arms control, their only purpose was to rationalize an accelerated arms race.

The President's gesture came only three days after some 23,000 people marched in Washington to support a freeze on nuclear arms by both the United States and the Soviet Union. A freeze is not a flawless approach to arms control. But right now, given the administration's views, it is the only game in town. For all his pious avowals of concern about the danger of nuclear war, Reagan has done more than any other American political figure to derail arms control.

It was Reagan, after all, who led the successful campaign to kill the SALT II agreement. As a candidate, he took the position that a full-scale arms race would be to our advantage, since the Soviets would exhaust their resources long before we exhausted ours. He has requested huge increases in the

military budget, much of it for expensive strategic weapons.

Only politics has forced Reagan to feign an interest in arms control. His administration has continued the talks begun by President Carter to limit tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, but only at the insistence of our NATO allies. He has proposed Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) with the Soviets, again mainly to mollify his critics in Europe, but has refused to set a date.

His latest move was to endorse the Jackson-Warner Senate resolution, which calls for a freeze on nuclear arms—after the U.S. has deployed some new weapons. It was drafted as an alternative to the Kennedy-Hatfield resolution, which includes no such qualifications. Reagan's position, put in layman's terms, is that we have to build up our nuclear arsenal before we can begin dismantling it.

Exhibit A against a freeze now is Reagan's claim that the Soviets have "a definite margin or superiority." But there is no persuasive evidence on his side. The Soviets lead in some respects, such as number of delivery vehicles and total megatonnage, but we lead in others, such as number of warheads and survivability of weapons systems. Even such conservative experts as Jeffrey Record, a former defense aide to Sen. Sam Nunn (D., Ga.), say the two sides have established "rough parity."

In only one respect, namely intermediate missiles in Europe, do the Soviets possess a clear advantage. They have deployed 300 SS-20s, while we have yet to deploy our new Pershing II missiles. But that does not leave our NATO allies naked to the enemy. The U.S. can hit Russian targets with nuclear missiles launched from submarines in the North Atlantic or with bombers—or, if necessary, with our own ICBMs.

The administration's other argument is that we have to increase our nuclear arms so the Soviets will have an incentive to negotiate reductions. But the Soviets badly need to reduce the burden weapons production places on their shaky economy. And they are well aware of the United States capacity to gear up its defense industry if it has to—in other words, if the negotiations fail.

Problems like the imbalance in Europe argue against an across-the-board freeze. But whether or not everything should be frozen is irrelevant. What proponents of the freeze really want is tangible steps toward reducing the arsenals of the two sides. A freeze makes for nice slogans, but it is not the real issue. The real issue is whether or not to negotiate arms control with the Soviets.

The whole debate over whether to freeze now or freeze later has an air of fantasy. The administration pretends that a freeze could happen tomorrow, leaving the U.S. stuck with its supposed disadvantages. No one who remembers the negotiations over SALT I and II can take this possibility seriously. Negotiating the terms of a freeze would take years.

In fact, if Reagan wanted genuine arms control, he would have every reason to preempt his critics by requesting immediate negotiations with the Soviets to freeze nuclear arms. He would have plenty of time to pursue the arms buildup he wants, while laying the foundation for the reductions he endorses.

But nothing in Reagan's record suggests the slightest interest in reducing nuclear arms. He and his advisers are still chasing after an impossible victory instead of a real-

istic peace. In the debate between the freeze movement and the administration, it's not clear that either side has all the answers. But it's easy to see who's serious about arms control. ●

MARY LEE WOLFE HONORED BY EMORY UNIVERSITY

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored that my alma mater, Emory University of Atlanta, each year gives an award bearing my name to an outstanding student in political science. This year's winner of the Elliott Levitas Award for Outstanding Achievement in Political Science is Mary Lee Wolfe.

I would like to offer my congratulations to Mary Lee for her achievements. I did some checking with Dr. James Larry Taulbee, the director of undergraduate studies in the Department of Political Science at Emory and learned about Mary Lee's performance as a student.

Mary Lee was described as "one of the best students in the department over the past several years." She completed the 4 year B.A./M.A. program in which unusually gifted students have an opportunity to pursue graduate study during their senior year and so earn the master's as well as the bachelor's degree. The selectivity of this program is such that the department has invited only one student from among all majors—approximately 300—during each of the last 3 years. Mary Lee not only completed the program with distinction, but produced a thesis that, in the judgment of her committee, is publishable without revision. To put this accomplishment in perspective, Mary Lee produced a superior piece of work in 8 months, in contrast to the normal 18-24 months that regular M.A. students take to finish. Her thesis probed the genesis of civil defense programs, their place in deterrence theory and their problems in implementation, concluding with what is described as a "discerning critique" of Reagan administration policies in this area.

It is indeed gratifying to hear of such accomplishments. We are fortunate that people such as Mary Lee Wolfe are focusing on the major issues confronting our Nation today. I wish her continued success and know that her efforts will benefit us all. ●

WE LOVE AMERICA WEEK

HON. EUGENE V. ATKINSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1982

● Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the Ukrainian victims of the cold war. The Soviet brutality of this time rivals the victimization of innocent peoples during World War II.

As a Member of Congress, it is a heartfelt honor for me to become the sponsor of Mr. Vasyl Semenovych Stus, another Soviet prisoner of conscience.

One of the finest Ukrainian poets and literary critics of our time, Vasyl Stus was sentenced to 10 years of special regimen labor camp activity and 5 years of exile for alleged "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." His crime is to have a heart that yearns for freedom and a mind that will not be subjected to Communist domination. The Communist barbarians would incarcerate this man for his work on behalf of human rights and in fulfilling the Helsinki accords which were signed by the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

Stus' plight is a grave miscarriage of justice. He is being punished for trying to enunciate the age-old freedoms of thought and expression that are God given and no totalitarian regime can ever stop.

It is a privilege to join with my colleagues today in honoring Vasyl Stus and to bring to the public's attention to continuing fight for human rights led by this brave soul. This example is a shining light and we will not forget him, ever.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1982.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Board of Commissioners of Hopewell Township of Beaver County in my home district in Pennsylvania recently proclaimed the period from June 27, 1982 through July 5, 1982 as "We Love America Week."

The Hopewell Township Commissioners feel that in this time of economic uncertainty and increasing criticism of our nation in the international arena, it is of extreme importance that the American people express their pride and patriotic spirit for the United States of America, which for more than 200 years has been the symbol of freedom and justice in the eyes of the free world.

The citizens of Hopewell Township feel—and I heartily concur—that there is no better time than the 4th of July to have the most magnificent and impressive display of American flags and patriotic activities this country has ever known in order to show the world we are proud to be Americans. I am encouraged when, amid the grumbling and complaints, and among those who always seem to be pointing out what they feel is wrong with this country, Americans are stepping forward and celebrating all that is right with America. For this reason I am submitting to the House of Representatives a resolution urging the President to proclaim the period from June 27, 1982

through July 5, 1982 as "We Love America Week," and to urge the President to request that all levels of government across our nation promote "We Love America Week" by flying our nation's flag, and that all citizens participate in the same manner by displaying the flag from their places of residence and places of business.

It is my belief that this effort to show our patriotism and honor our heritage in this week-long celebration of all that our nation represents, has the potential to issue a tremendously powerful statement to each and every nation. The United States of America is the greatest nation in the world. We, its citizens, are proud of this country and are confident that it will rise from this economic crisis as it has risen from every crisis it has ever encountered.

I urge you to sign your name to the attached resolution and in doing so, indicate your deep feeling and faith in America and its people.

Sincerely,

EUGENE V. ATKINSON,
Member of Congress.

Whereas, our townships, cities, counties States, and country are going through trying times with the economy;

Whereas, the Congress in this time of economic uncertainty feels that it is of extreme importance that the people express their pride and patriotic spirit for the United States; and

Whereas, there is no better time than the 4th of July to have the most gigantic display of American flags and patriotic activities to show the world we are proud to be Americans and that we love our country; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period from June 27, 1982, through July 5, 1982, is designated as "We love America Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on all Federal, State, county, and local governments to promote such week by flying flags and banners, and all citizens to participate by flying individual flags at their place of residence, to show our faith that we will survive the economic crisis as we have all other crises in our history. ●

TRIBUTE TO THE MAYOR OF NEBRASKA'S CAPITAL CITY

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of the 1-year term as president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors for the Honorable Helen Boosalis, the mayor of Lincoln, Nebr., the capital city of my State and largest city in my congressional district. As she turns over her job to Mayor Coleman Young of Detroit, I would like to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate Mayor Boosalis and share with my colleagues some of her accomplishments as mayor of Lincoln and president of the Conference of Mayors.

While continuing her fine leadership as mayor of Lincoln, Mayor Boosalis

also took her enthusiasm and dedication to her capacity as the chief spokesperson for the Nation's cities. Just as she has been innovative and effective in Lincoln, she brought new ideas to the conference and effectively voiced its views on urban issues.

A member of the President's private sector initiatives task force, the mayor has helped make Lincoln an excellent example of how volunteer efforts can complement tax dollars in providing government services. Her innovative gift catalog helped generate donations of needed equipment and services to the city from private sources.

Mayor Boosalis also has been nationally recognized for her work in historic preservation, a fact which I recently brought to the attention of my colleagues. She created a Conference of Mayors Subcommittee on Historic Preservation, the first involvement of the conference in that area since 1965.

Mayor Boosalis' accomplishments are a source of pride to all Nebraskans and I am proud to have her as a constituent in the First Congressional District. Congratulations, Mayor Helen, on a job well done! ●

ENCOURAGING THE PURCHASE OF DOMESTIC STEEL

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that seeks to deter the domestic mass transit industry from importing capital equipment which has been subsidized by foreign governments. This bill, which is similar to S. 2616, introduced in the Senate by Senator RIEGLE, would prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from furnishing assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to mass transit authorities which have purchased equipment sold in violation of international trade agreements designed to prevent governments from unfairly subsidizing their exported products.

The problem of subsidized steel imports is one which this Congress cannot ignore if we are serious about our goal of building a healthy and productive economy. Two recently announced purchases have reinforced in my mind the need for the legislation I am introducing today. In its program to replace wornout subway cars, the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) has contracted to purchase 325 subway cars from Kawasaki Heavy Industries, Ltd., of Japan, and 825 cars from a Canadian company, Bombardier, Inc. The Kawasaki deal, worth \$274.5 million, was financed by a \$126 million loan from the Japanese Government, with an ef-

fective interest rate of 12.25 percent, well below the U.S. prime lending rate. Similarly, the Canadian Government plans to finance the Bombardier deal by loaning New York's MTA 85 percent of the \$663 million contract, at the incredibly low interest rate of 9.7 percent.

Partially, because of the attractive finance terms provided by the Canadian and Japanese Governments, MTA did not award the contract to the Budd Co., a U.S.-based firm, even though Budd offered to make the cars for significantly less money. The subway cars, if made by the Budd Co., would consist of approximately 80 percent U.S.-produced steel. The foreign-produced cars would use only about 40 percent American steel. This difference represents a great loss of business to many American specialty steel manufacturers. For example, translated to Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Corp., 13 million dollars' worth of business would be lost, representing 1,000 man-months of employment, \$3 million in wages to employees, and over \$1 million in tax revenues which would be paid to Federal, State, and local authorities.

MEANS MORE UNEMPLOYMENT

Buying steel products from foreign manufacturers is particularly untimely when unemployment is rampant in this country, and especially in the steel industry. In January 1982, 26.6 percent of all steel shipped in the United States was imported from foreign sources, an alltime high. The U.S. steel industry is currently operating at about 45.4 percent of productive capacity, contributing greatly to the unprecedented overall U.S. unemployment rates we are now experiencing. In the specialty steel industry alone, unemployment has skyrocketed to 25 percent. In Pittsburgh, one-third of all steelworkers are out of work. Throughout the industry, 105,000 workers have been laid off, and another 27,000 are working short workweeks.

The productivity of our domestic steel industry is an urgent matter of national economic and national security policy. The bill that I am proposing today takes steps to clarify and make more consistent our Federal policies relating to steel purchases, not by throwing Federal funds at the steel industry in order to bail it out, but by insuring that Federal funds do not encourage unfair trade practices which violate the spirit of international agreements and put more people out of work. This urgent legislation will incorporate the spirit of the subsidies code of the GATT agreement into Federal policies governing the expenditure of Federal funds, and thus set an example for the domestic mass transit industry to follow when considering future purchases of subsidized imports.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to promptly enact this important piece of legislation.

I am very pleased to learn that the administration has responded quickly to the Canadian Government's unfair finance terms by initiating dispute settlement proceedings provided for in the GATT subsidies code, which will begin with formal consultations in Geneva the week of July 12. I believe that moving quickly like this will send a strong signal to foreign nations that we will insist on fair trade practices. The Reagan administration is to be commended.

Along this line, I would like to share with my colleagues two letters I sent in May protesting the purchase of subway cars from foreign countries.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1982.

Ambassador WILLIAM E. BROCK,
U.S. Special Trade Representative, 600 17th
Street NW, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROCK: I am writing to inquire about the Administration's plans to deal with the Japanese sale of government-subsidized subway cars to the New York City Transit Authority. This sale was reported in the March 19 Wall Street Journal and the April 2 Washington Post. According to the Post article, an unnamed Administration spokesman indicated that "the administration has no plans to take any action in the Kawasaki case."

The rise in steel imports and unemployment in the last two years and the general deterioration of the economy, in my view, demand that the Administration begin tough enforcement of our fair trade laws. As you know, The House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, on which I serve, is conducting an in-depth investigation of the problems of the steel industry. In our hearings, we have found that imports are at all-time highs—25% penetration—that the steel industry is currently operating at about 52% of capability, and that there are over 116,000 employees on layoff or short workweeks.

The award of this contract to Kawasaki could set a dangerous precedent. It is well-known that the major attraction to Kawasaki's bid was the Japanese government's offer to provide \$126 million in financing at the lower interest rate of 12.25%, while domestic producers must contend with the U.S. prime rate of 16.25%. We cannot expect our industries to compete with foreign subsidization. This kind of policy only encourages foreign countries to saturate the U.S. with subsidized imports that harm domestic industries and jobs.

This contract will particularly adversely affect America's specialty steel industry, which already suffers from an unemployment rate nearing 25%, although it is the most technologically advanced and efficient special metals industry in the world.

I would appreciate knowing what steps the Administration plans to take on the Kawasaki contract, specifically whether you have determined if, subsidization has taken place and what U.S. trade laws and the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade have been violated. I would hope too that the Administration would take the lead encouraging state and local governments to "Buy American," and that the federal govern-

ment set an example by purchasing domestically produced steel for federal projects.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

DOUG WALGREN,
Member of Congress.

MAY 12, 1982.

To the New York Delegation:

The New York Metropolitan Transit Authority will soon place an order for 825 new subway cars (a commitment of over one billion dollars representing tens of thousands of months of new employment).

Whether or not this employment goes to a foreign source will largely depend on the weight the transit authority gives to more generous financing terms offered, directly or indirectly, by foreign governments. As you know, this is a controversial indirect subsidy which many believe will trigger "countervailing duties" under the federal trade laws—which would essentially wipe out any advantage that a foreign source may appear to have.

In view of the widespread unemployment in America, and the interest that our public has in investing their dollars in America, I want to respectfully ask you to take every possible step to assure that the New York Transit Authority gives maximum consideration to awarding this contract to American sources.

I appreciate any help you may be able to give in this regard.

Sincerely,

DOUG WALGREN,
Member of Congress.●

THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1980

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of all Members of the Congress what I believe to be a serious threat to the effectiveness of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980. The tax compliance bills presently pending in Congress contain an exemption which is unacceptable to the small business community. Under two bills—H.R. 6300 and S 2198—the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 would not apply to any rule or regulation promulgated under the Internal Revenue Code or to any information collection request that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be authorized by the Code or by any rule or regulation.

Many people worked very hard for the 1980 act. This act, along with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, forms what has been called the "Guts" of the Federal regulatory protective barrier for small business. No one worked harder or required such a law more than the Nation's small business community. It has been estimated that as much as 60 percent of all the Federal paperwork burden emanates from the Internal Revenue Service. To exempt them from the act would, in my opinion, practically render the law ineffective.

Our committee has heard time and time again of difficulties encountered by small business in dealing with the IRS. In particular, we have been repeatedly told that the paperwork maze created by the IRS has become almost incomprehensible. In fact, we have even been informed by some certified public accountants that the new withholding tax deposit requirements are so complex that they will not even attempt to advise their clients how they can make timely legal deposits.

In view of all this, I do not believe that a Treasury exemption from the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 will be in the public interest. I hope you will join with me in an effort to make sure that such an exemption is not contained in any final tax legislation passed by the Congress.●

THE GALILEE: PEACE AT LAST

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 17 days ago the Israeli defense forces moved into Lebanon to end the reign of terror on Israel's northern border. It now appears that Israel's action was successful and that now, at long last, the civilians of the northern Galilee are free to live their lives free of the shelling from beyond the border. The Wall Street Journal of June 23 describes the peace that has now descended on the Galilee. It is essential that any political settlement that ends the Lebanese crisis guarantees that Israel's north remains free of the terrorist menace. I commend Frederick Kempe's Wall Street Journal piece to my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 23, 1982]

IN ISRAEL'S FAR NORTH, THE WAR IN LEBANON MEANS BLESSED PEACE

(By Frederick Kempe)

METULLA, ISRAEL.—The loudspeakers crackle, breaking into the still evening in this northernmost of Israeli villages. But this time the commanding voice doesn't issue the familiar order to take to the bomb shelters. The gunplay it announces tonight is benign: a special showing of "The Godfather, Part II" for soldiers passing through town.

These days, the 300 residents of Metulla don't flinch when the loudspeakers come on. The Israeli march into Lebanon this month has put their homes out of reach of Palestinian terrorist attack for the first time in 12 years. "We have entered a new era," Mayor Yossi Goldberg says with obvious pleasure. "Our lives are starting to bloom. We no longer wander out of the house with the fear that a Katyusha would fall on our heads."

Israel's invasion of Lebanon wreaked vast destruction and death on residents of that troubled land, and yesterday the fighting flared again (see story on page 2). But the

invasion has been a godsend for the 40,000 people of the Galilee panhandle, a thin seven-mile finger of Israel poking northward into southern Lebanon. This part of Israel has been by far the area most punished by infiltrating guerrillas and by bombardment from the Palestinians' Soviet-made Katyusha rocket launchers.

After King Hussein's army drove the guerrillas from Jordan in 1970, they drifted by the thousands to southern Lebanon. Israel's northern border became an open wound, and government efforts to lure more people and capital to the area failed dismally.

BIG PLANS

Mayor Goldberg is laying plans to change that. He wants Metulla, a plateau town founded in 1896 by Baron Edmund Rothschild, to grow into a major tourist center. He has already asked the government to put a bank at the border to cater to Israeli and Lebanese sightseers. And just two weeks after its invasion of Lebanon, the Israeli government is sending experts to Metulla and the rest of the northern panhandle to prepare development plans.

"Until now, business has stunk. Travel offices wouldn't risk bringing people up here," says Reuven Winberg, the 28-year-old manager of the often-empty Sheleg Helevanov hotel. He steps behind the small snack bar and pulls down his jeans to display a right leg bearing three thick white scars. A soft-drink cooler beside him has a deep gash. All resulted when a shell exploded in the front window into a thousand flying shards of glass.

"You don't know what it was like here," says Mayor Goldberg. "We were all so afraid. Mothers would stay two or three days in shelters with their children when they only needed to stay a few hours. I, a mayor, slept with a gun by my bed."

Mr. Winberg, the hotel manager, gestures in the direction of Beaufort castle, the crumbling Crusader fortress on a peak in Lebanon just two miles away. From the outpost the Palestinians had a clear shot at Metulla. "Maybe now the castle will become a tourist attraction," he says.

Three miles south down a winding road lies Qiryat Shemona, the panhandle's largest town with 13,000 residents. Ten years ago, it had 18,000. More than 1,000 homes stand empty. Property prices are one-fifth those elsewhere in Israel.

In April 1974, 19 Israeli men, women and children were killed in a terrorist attack in Qiryat Shemona. Some were hostages who were slain after the government refused their captors' demand to free prisoners. "People wouldn't live here," says Yuval Itai, the manager of the Gigor pantyhose plant, the town's biggest employer.

The factory has sometimes had to close for weeks at a time because of heavy shelling. Other times, workers would periodically emerge from its bomb shelter to keep essential machines going before submerging again. Now, Mr. Itai believes, "we'll get people from the center of the country to live and work here. Now we have a future like anybody else."

Now he may also get along better with his wife. She has long been trying to persuade him to move their family of three boys out of the shells' range.

Qiryat Shemona's mayor, Robert Reuven, runs through his list of development projects like a frustrated salesman who at last has a desirable product. He wants two hotels. He wants to expand the university. He wants to open a technical school and build an electronic-products plant.

But some here aren't so bullish. Elfrieda Federmann, who with her husband owns a dusty roadside restaurant and boarding house, watches as repairmen replace windows shattered by Palestinian shells on the first day of Israel's advance into Lebanon. "I wanted to sell the place long ago," says Mrs. Federmann, a 54-year-old Austrian-born Jew who fled Hitler's armies in 1938. "But who would buy something that could be rubble the next day?"

Mrs. Federmann doesn't plan to wait for Mayor Reuven's bonanza. She only hopes the calm lasts long enough for someone to buy her business.

On a border hill overlooking Metulla to the north and Qiryat Shemona to the west, stands the Kibbutz Misgav Am. It is a barbed-wire-enclosed enclave of pillbox buildings and security-conscious residents. Everything is built of bomb-shelter-strength reinforced concrete, including the indoor swimming pool. They couldn't risk building the pool outdoors.

Five terrorists infiltrated the kibbutz in 1980 and took over a nursery, killing a man and a two-year-old child. Last year a Katyusha explosion killed a young woman as she walked out of her house. A kibbutz rule has long required male residents to carry a gun at all times.

The people of Misgav Am are grateful for the respite the Israeli invasion of Lebanon has brought them. "Every day now, fewer and fewer people carry their guns," says Rafi Telem, who has spent half his 48 years at the kibbutz.

The 250 people here hope the kibbutz can attract more residents now. "You can't have a good social life in this small community," complains a man called Papo, who manages a ribbon and bandage plant. "When you are a chess player in a community of 1,000, if 1% of the community plays chess, then you have 10 people to play with. Here you must play by yourself."

But Misgav Am is less than euphoric. Like many kibbutzim, it supports Israel's Labor Party, the party out of power, and believes Israel can't finally defuse the Palestinian threat until it reaches a political settlement.

The kibbutz population, now even smaller with many members called to military service, gathered recently at the cafeteria to celebrate the birth of a baby boy. The father, however, was somber. "I hope this gives my boy a better future," said Annon Salzburg. "Everyone here hopes it will be better, but not everyone believes it. I've got a funny feeling the problem with the Palestinians won't be solved this way."

WELCOMING THE TONG DU CHON DELEGATION

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleagues here in the House, I would like to extend a warm welcome to the delegation from the city of Tong Du Chon, South Korea, on the occasion of their visit to their sister city in California, the city of Marina.

Mr. Speaker, the sister city relationship between the cities of Marina and Tong Du Chon is symbolic of the long-

time relations between our two countries. With the building of mutual friendships and understanding through the sister city program, we can come to comprehend more fully the languages, cultures, and views of our two peoples. In this manner, we can improve our understanding for one another and expand upon our great friendship.

The sister cities of Tong Du Chon and Marina, Calif., share a common relationship with the Army's 7th Infantry Division. Marina is today, and Tong Du Chon was in years past, the home of this great division. We on the central coast of California are proud to be the home of the 7th Infantry Division today because it represents our Nation's commitment to a strong defense and our desire to defend the fundamental democratic principles which guide our country.

I am sure my colleagues in the Congress share my hope that the dignitaries from Tong Du Chon will enjoy their stay in the United States. Their visit is sure to create one further link in the ties which bind our two nations. I am confident that the sister city relationship between Tong Du Chon and Marina will be a fruitful and productive one. ●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE GENE L. BOYLE, JR. OF CLIFTON, N.J., ESTEEMED RESTAURATEUR, COMMUNITY LEADER AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 30, the residents of Clifton, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to an esteemed restaurateur, distinguished citizen, community leader, and good friend, the Honorable Gene L. Boyle, Jr. of Clifton, N.J., whose aspirations and success in the mainstream of America's business enterprises does indeed portray a great American success story. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to Gene Boyle, his good wife Marge, sons Gene III, Tom and Gary, and daughters Maureen and Sassy as we commemorate a milestone of achievements in their family endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of great personal dedication and always working to the peak of one's ability with sincerity of purpose and determination to fulfill a life dream—that is the success of the opportunity of America—and the mark of our honoree, Gene L.

Boyle, Jr. who will be retiring from a most illustrious career as a highly respected and esteemed restaurateur of national prominence and renown.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress, a profile on the life of Gene L. Boyle, Jr. which warmly embraces the quality of his leadership, richness of wisdom and expertise, and the abundance of his caring and dedication that has endeared him to all of us. This brief narrative which eloquently unfolds the real heartbeat and pulse of America—the businessman and his family—and the dream and achievements of Gene Boyle is, as follows:

GENE L. BOYLE, JR.

Born September 2, 1920 in Hazelton, Pa. At the age of 2, his father, Gene Boyle, Sr., moved the family to Clifton and started in business by running the old Clifton Hotel.

In 1930 Gene Boyle Sr. opened the legendary Gene's Grill on Hoover Ave. in Passaic, while Gene Jr. was distinguishing himself academically, athletically and socially at Passaic High School.

After graduation he joined his father in the business and began what was to become an illustrious career. Shortly thereafter he married his high school sweetheart, the captain of the Passaic High School cheerleaders, the former Marge Tunkel. He then enthusiastically responded to his country's call to arms and served with distinction for 3 years. Over the course of the next 13 years came Gene III, Maureen, Sassy, Tom, and Gary.

In 1949 Gene Boyle, Sr. and Gene Boyle, Jr. opened what was to become for over 34 years the restaurant showplace in New Jersey, entertaining the luminaries in the business, political, sports, entertainment, and social worlds.

Public service also became a major consideration in his life, first as chairman of numerous charitable, religious, and philanthropic organizations; then as a commissioner on the Passaic Valley Water Commission and finally as candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives, Eighth Congressional District.

In short, Gene Boyle, Jr. is a man who epitomizes that person we all strive to be. He has truly achieved the "American Dream" and has become genuinely and universally admired for his untiring devotion and dedication to his family, friends, business, and community.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect upon the history of our great country and the good deeds of our people who have made our representative democracy second to none among all nations throughout the world, I appreciate the opportunity to call your attention to this distinguished gentleman and seek this national recognition of all of his good deeds. I share the pride of the people of our congressional district and State of New Jersey in the accomplishments of Gene Boyle.

As Gene retires from his career as a restaurateur catering to gourmards with informed and astute discrimination in matters of taste, I am pleased to join with his many, many friends in deep appreciation of all of his good

works. Gene Boyle's Restaurant is a landmark in our community. State, and Nation having hosted Presidents and directed by a connoisseur extolling the warmth of inspiration and hope that is ever present in our land of opportunity. We do indeed salute an outstanding restaurateur, distinguished citizen, community leader, and great American—the Honorable Gene L. Boyle, Jr., of Clifton, N.J. ●

THE SMALL BUSINESS ACCESS TO TRADE REMEDIES ACT

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Small Business Access to Trade Remedies Act of 1982, a House counterpart to legislation introduced by WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine's senior Senator, to aid small U.S. enterprises in obtaining the trade injury remedies to which they are entitled.

Although many of us champion free trade as an ideal, small businesses in all parts of the country are suffering the consequences of foreign trade practices which may be free, but which are certainly not fair. In fact, the only meaningful barriers which do exist often stand between legitimately injured businesses and the import relief programs administered by the U.S. Government. As a result, we are losing countless manufacturing, farming, and fishing jobs in States from Maine to California. This legislation is a first step toward eliminating those barriers and providing our small businesses with the equal access to existing trade remedies they need and deserve.

As many of us know, the profit margins of numerous small businesses have been substantially eroded by unrelenting waves of imports. The Maine potato industry, for example, has watched its market shrink and the volume of Canadian imports grow by over 300 percent since 1977. Many of these foreign products, including Canadian potatoes, are less expensive, not because the supplying country enjoys a comparative advantage in production, but because the country's government offers generous business subsidies, pursues an aggressive export policy, and sanctions the sale of goods in foreign markets at prices well below the actual cost of production. Additionally, although fluctuating exchange rates may be beneficial to some sectors of our economy, many of our regionally concentrated industries ranging from cement manufacturers to mushroom growers simply cannot compete with foreign products enjoying the advantages of a weak and undervalued medium of exchange.

It is true that appropriate channels do exist for the redress of these unfair trade practices. The Trade Act of 1974 established both the section 201 and 301 import relief petitioning procedures, and amendments to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) adopted in 1979 instituted a new code governing the use of both subsidies and dumping practices by countries whose trade practices are regulated under GATT. Successful petitioning under any of these options can result in the imposition of countervailing duties and other import restrictions. Granted, the guidelines for determining injury need to be rigorous. Unfortunately, even for those small businesses with legitimate grievances, successful resolution of a trade case generally remains elusive.

Prohibitively expensive and time-consuming legal exercises; complicated, incomprehensive, and often irrelevant data requirements; and flaws in injury determination criteria ignoring regional variations in import impact constitute the major problem areas and the barriers to grievance relief. The Small Business Access to Trade Remedies Act addresses these problems in the following manner.

To begin, this legislation would establish a Small Business Trade Access Trust Fund financed with a set percentage of annual customs receipts. Proceeds from the trust fund would be used to create a Small Business Trade Assistance Office in the Department of Commerce whose primary responsibility would be to aid small businesses in preparing for participation in the grievance procedures now on the books. In an effort to help small enterprises defray legal costs, proceeds of the trust fund would also provide the first \$50,000 in initial petition costs and 50 percent of costs incurred thereafter. This cost-sharing provision has been designed to discourage the pursuit of frivolous cases while still bringing the cost of an unfair trade practices petition within the financial grasp of most small businesses.

To compensate for the financial, legal, and information-gathering advantages enjoyed by large corporations and major industries in the pursuit of import protection, this legislation directs the ITC to make special allowances for small businesses and to take into consideration the limitations these businesses have with respect to the collection of previously required data. The data required to prove injury under the countervailing duty and antidumping statutes is especially demanding and, in many cases, the only data sufficiently detailed to satisfy the ITC is that belonging to the implicated foreign government. The ITC must introduce an extra degree of pragmatism into existing requirements so that small businesses with limited

resources can at least attempt to prove the extent of their injury and have that attempt at proof recognized as legitimate.

Of equal importance to our small businesses are provisions in this legislation directing the ITC to recognize regionally concentrated instances of import injury and to modify petitioning procedures under section 201 of the Trade Act accordingly. Furthermore, provisions in the bill call for additional emphasis on regional economic conditions and on the availability of alternative job opportunities during petitioning procedures. The legislation also addresses differences in monetary policy by directing the ITC to consider the effect of exchange rates on regional markets. Finally, a fast-track system for perishable commodities would be established in an effort to provide expeditious relief to small farmers suffering the consequences of unfair trade practices. This provision would also allow farmers with import-sensitive crops to better plan future marketing strategies.

I commend my colleague from Maine, Senator COHEN, on this long overdue proposal and I thank him for the opportunity to introduce the Small Business Access to Trade Remedies Act in the U.S. House of Representatives. This legislation simply provides our small business community with the access to fair treatment they deserve in the resolution of unfair and legitimately injurious trade practices.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ACCESS TO TRADE REMEDIES ACT OF 1982—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SHORT TITLE

Section 1 sets forth the short title of this bill, the Small Business Access to Trade Remedies Act of 1982.

SECTION 2: FINDINGS

Section 2 presents the findings that existing trade remedies are not available to small businesses because of the complexity and expense of filing petitions and the difficulty of documentation; that trade remedies are not available to producers of perishable products because of the length of normal proceedings; and that regional considerations are not given sufficient weight in proceedings under section 201 of the 1974 Trade Act when petitioners are small businesses.

SECTION 3: SMALL BUSINESS TRADE ACCESS TRUST FUND

Section 3 would create a Small Business Trade Access Trust Fund financed by a percentage of customs receipts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. It is intended that the appropriations process determine the level of funding needed for the functions outlined below.

First, the Commerce Department is directed to establish a Small Business Trade Assistance Office to assist small industries in preparing for participation in any proceedings under our trade laws. To the extent that the existing statutes direct agencies other than the Commerce Department to investigate trade complaints, these agencies are to cooperate with the Office for purposes of section 3 of this Act.

Second, the Office of Small Business Assistance is charged with administering a system of awarding reasonable costs to small business petitioners. Reasonable costs are intended to include such things as attorney's fees, consultant fees, and any expenses incurred in gathering information for a petition. The government would pay the first \$50,000 of the petition cost and 50 percent of any costs incurred thereafter. The provision is intended to lessen the expense to the small business petitioner of participating in proceedings related to the administration of the trade laws of the United States. The limitation on the extent to which the Federal government will defray these costs is intended to ensure that a small business petitioner bear some financial responsibility for the action. It is also intended to discourage frivolous claims.

For purposes of section 3, the definition of small business is the same as "small business concern" as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act or an association whose members are substantially all small business concerns.

SECTION 4: DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY

Section 4 amends section 771(7) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 which contains the definition of material injury. The International Trade Commission is directed to take into account the differing circumstances and resources when the petitioners are small businesses as defined in this Act. This is intended to give industries whose information is not organized to coincide with normal ITC practices an opportunity to substitute information that is available.

SECTION 5: REGIONAL IMPACT

Section 5 is intended to require the President to give more weight to regional economic considerations when a small business files a petition under section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974. The President would be charged with considering the general economic situation of the affected region including employment levels and alternative job opportunities, the impact of exchange rate fluctuations on the region's industries, and the ability of the small industry to adjust by converting to alternative employment lines.

SECTION 6: PERISHABLE PRODUCTS

Section 6 would establish a fast-track system for perishable commodities. The industry would file a petition with the Secretary of Agriculture to request emergency action. The Secretary of Agriculture would then have 14 days to make a determination that there is reason to believe that the imports are a substantial cause of serious injury to the industry. If the determination is favorable, the Secretary would recommend action to the President. If a negative determination is made, the Secretary must publish a rationale for why the petition was denied.

The petitioner may request emergency action under section 6 at any time during the 201 investigation and no such request shall interfere with normal proceedings at the International Trade Commission under section 201. If an industry's circumstances have changed since a denial by the Secretary of Agriculture, the industry may file another request.●

FIRE COMPANY CELEBRATES ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Barrington Fire Co. on its 75th anniversary which occurred on May 15. The company started with only 10 charter members and a treasury of \$73.53, but has grown to meet today's needs thanks to the many fine members who have contributed their time and efforts for no remuneration. Today, the company is composed of approximately 50 men, including the fire police.

The company has grown materially. During the 1920's a motor-driven truck was obtained. The company purchased a 1917 Ford chassis to which a body was attached. In the spirit of cooperation, one of the members painted the assembled vehicle which proved to be one of the first major advancements for the company.

The members of the Barrington Fire Co. have long showered the town with charity. On Christmas Day of 1931, the firemen distributed almost 700 boxes of candy to children with the help of Santa Claus, who rode on the firetruck. In 1970, 3,800 boxes were distributed. To raise additional money, the firemen also sponsor carnivals.

Even more important than charity are the lessons the members try to teach citizens. The company adopted a fire code which has been modified to coincide with the national fire prevention code. The members also present speeches to organizations demonstrating how to avoid and control home fires. Because of the guidance and information they provide, these presentations enjoy wide popularity. The office of the fire marshal makes mercantile, apartment, and industrial inspections at various intervals to further aid in prevention of fire, an aspect of firefighting which is important to the members.

The firefighters of the Barrington Fire Co. have proven to be heroic throughout times of trouble and strife throughout the century. Not only did the founding members form a beneficial humanitarian organization, but were involved in general civil defense matters during World War II, and even went so far as to invest funds in war bonds. After the war, they were able to form the Barrington Ambulance Association, furthering their original humanitarian intent. They have continually benefited the community with their increasingly high standards. I think they deserve much recognition for their efforts. I wish them a prosperous future and even

more success than they have experienced in the past.●

HOUSE RESOLUTION 506—CALLING ON THE SOVIET UNION TO ALLOW LEV SHAPIRO AND HIS FAMILY TO EMIGRATE

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 506, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Soviet Union should allow Lev Shapiro, his wife, Elizaveta Shapiro, and their child to emigrate and rejoin Mr. Shapiro's parents and other family members in Israel.

The Shapiros are refuseniks. In 1975, they expressed their desire to leave the Soviet Union. From then on, they entered the peculiar half-life of nonpersons in a totalitarian regime. Lev Shapiro has also served a convenient role as a scapegoat. Branded as a traitor, a hooligan, a Zionist in the Soviet press, Lev Shapiro and his family have received the full attention of the KGB, the government informers, the harassers and ideologues, and all the other apparatus of the Soviet Union and its party. From this we can only conclude that the masters of that Soviet Union, whose ICBM's are poised to destroy Western civilization, whose thousands upon thousands of tanks stand ready to extend fraternal assistance—one of the most outrageous euphemisms in an outrageous century—to their neighbors are afraid of Lev Shapiro and his family. It would so appear, for the desire for freedom is highly contagious. So they have had to quarantine Lev Shapiro and his family to a tiny apartment in Leningrad.

There, however, the Shapiros do not waste away. They are incubating freedom, writing to people in the United States, even taking risks of inviting visiting Americans to their home—and we know how dangerous it is for any Soviet citizen, let alone a refusenik to extend hospitality to an American. Such people certainly deserve all that we can do to help them achieve their goal.

The plight of the Shapiro family is just one example of the widespread repression inside the Soviet Union. Jewish emigration has slowed to a trickle. The Jewish community, along with the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Christians, and other religious and ethnic groups, have been subject to the severest measures seen since the death of Stalin. The Soviets are hoping that the sheer magnitude of this suffering will blind us to the fact that the statistics are made up of individual men and

women, like Lev and Elizaveta Shapiro. That is one factor we must never lose sight of in this debate. We must never lose sight of it in our dealings with the Soviet Union. We are not talking about abstract principles and rhetoric, but about people like ourselves.

I have appended the text of House Resolution 506, and I ask your help in passing it and sending the Soviet Union a message that we are watching them, and that we are unceasing in our devotion to the freedom, not only of the Shapiros, but, through them, to all those who suffer in that great "jail-house of peoples," the Russian Empire.

H. RES. 506

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the Soviet Union's obligations under international law to allow Lev Shapiro, his wife Elizaveta Shapiro, and their child to emigrate to Israel

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights guarantee to all citizens the right to freedom of religion, the right to hold opinions without interference, the right to freedom of expression, and the right to emigrate;

Whereas the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe commits the signatory nations to respect individual rights and freedom, specifically the right to emigrate to the country of one's choice to rejoin relatives;

Whereas the Soviet Union is a signatory to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, has subscribed to the general principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and has ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

Whereas Lev Shapiro has applied to the Soviet Government for an exit visa for himself and his family on numerous occasions, starting in 1975, to rejoin his parents and other family members currently living in Israel; and

Whereas all of Lev Shapiro's visa applications have been refused and he has been subjected to extensive harassment in response to his desire to exercise his rights guaranteed under international agreements to which the Soviet Union is a party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President, acting directly or through the Secretary of State, should—

(1) urge the Government of the Soviet Union to grant exit visas to Lev Shapiro, his wife Elizaveta Shapiro, and their child and allow them to emigrate to Israel to rejoin Lev Shapiro's parents and other family members, in accordance with the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and

(2) inform the Government of the Soviet Union that the Government of the United States, in evaluating its relations with other countries, will take into account the extent to which such countries honor their commitments under international law, especially commitments with respect to the protection of human rights.

Sec. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this reso-

lution to the President with the request that the President further transmit such copy to the Ambassador of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United States.●

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

HON. RAY KOGOVSEK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, in *National Wildlife Federation v. Gorsuch*, 530 F. Supp. 1291 (Jan. 29, 1982), the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia held that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was required to regulate the discharge from the Nation's more than 2 million dams under the national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) mandated by section 402(a) of the Clean Water Act. The court based its decision on the conclusion that by changing water quality as a result of impoundment, dams "discharge pollutants" within the meaning of sections 502(12) and 301(a) of the act.

It is clear to me that in enacting the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, Congress did not intend that water quality effects attributable solely to the impoundment of water be regulated under the NPDES program. Rather, it was Congress intent that such effects would be addressed exclusively through the mechanisms made applicable to non-point-source pollution. It was and is the intent of Congress that such water quality effects do not constitute the "discharge of a pollutant" within the meaning of section 502(12) of the act.

As a result, I am introducing an amendment to section 502(12) which is intended to overturn the impact of this recent decision, clarify the intent of Congress, and affirm past interpretation and practice, since enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments, that: First, the release of impounded waters with water quality effects caused solely by the impoundment, or with water quality effects resulting from the method of release do not constitute the "discharge of pollutants" as defined in section 502(12); and second, dams, reservoirs, flow diversion facilities, and other water impoundments are not intended to be subject to the NPDES program.

It is not my intention that this amendment alter or affect other aspects of the existing Clean Water Act programs. Nor is it my intent by this amendment to alter or affect existing requirements associated with the construction of dams under section 404 or with the operation of dams under section 304(f)(2)(F); or to interfere with

the established policy of Congress as expressed in section 101(g) that the authority of each State to allocate quantities of water within its jurisdiction shall not be superseded, abrogated, or otherwise impaired by this act.

However, the court's recent decision not only contradicts what I believe has been the intent of Congress all along, but it also exposes dam operators throughout the country, and particularly in arid Colorado, to lawsuits to halt their continued activity without a permit. This result is totally unacceptable as a matter of public policy and accordingly, I ask my colleagues to join me in urging prompt consideration and passage of this bill.●

HOME TAPING OF AUDIO AND VIDEO WORKS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Supreme Court decided to grant certiorari in the Sony Betamax case. I have been asked by colleagues about the effect of the Supreme Court's action on the congressional effort to provide a comprehensive remedy to the audio and video home taping problem.

I do not think the Court's action will have any significant effect on congressional action on this issue.

Whatever might happen in the Supreme Court, the Betamax case will only resolve the narrow legal question whether taping television programming constitutes copyright infringement. What is not before the Supreme Court is the question of just how to permit home taping of audio and video works while at the same time assuring fair compensation to the creators and copyright owners of those works.

No one in the Congress wants to prevent home taping. But unauthorized taping is today displacing sales of copyrighted audio and video works. It is gutting the creative incentive that has been crucial in the flourishing of one of our greatest national resources—American entertainment.

Record companies, for example, are losing sales of \$1 billion annually as a direct result of home taping. The taping industry is the beneficiary of that loss. Its blank tapes are worthless until they capture someone else's song.

Over 100 Members of both the House and Senate support legislation to resolve this situation. We will continue actively to pursue this issue.●

RABBI ABRAHAM HASELKORN— RELIGIOUS AND COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I report to my colleagues the death of Rabbi Abraham Haselkorn of Salinas, Calif. Rabbi Haselkorn had been a dedicated community leader of Salinas over the past three decades, and his loss is a blow to our area as well as to his family.

Rabbi Haselkorn's continuous activities on behalf of the Salinas community are perhaps exceeded only by the interesting life he led before arriving in that community.

After graduating from New York University and studying at the Harvard Law School, he attended the Jewish Institute of Religion. He was ordained as a rabbi in 1932 by the founder of that institute—and the father of the reform movement in Judaism—Rabbi Stephen S. Wise.

Serving in the U.S. Army in Europe during World War II, Rabbi Haselkorn helped establish an orphanage in France for Jewish children who had survived the Nazi occupation there and he helped set up one of the first displaced persons camps in Austria for other Jewish survivors of the holocaust. He later worked in France as an agent for the Haganah, a group which transported Jews from Europe to what was then Palestine and later became Israel and which served as the Israeli defense force.

Rabbi Haselkorn lived in Israel for several years at various times beginning in 1946. Following his retirement in 1973, he and his wife, Alda, lived there for 3 years before returning to Salinas.

Rabbi Haselkorn was the rabbi of Temple Beth El in Salinas for 20 years, beginning in 1953. His community activities included serving as chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, vice president and board member of the United Crusade, an officer of the Salinas Rotary Club, and secretary of the Monterey County Grand Jury. He was a man who cared deeply both about the Jewish community in Salinas and the welfare of the entire Salinas community, and his work was a tribute to that double commitment.

Rabbi Haselkorn will long be remembered by those who worked with him both at Temple Beth El and in the general community. He was a fine example of a citizen whose primary goal in life was to help others, and for that reason, his wife and family can be very proud even at this sad and difficult time for them. I am sure my colleagues share their sadness, as I do,

for the loss of this great community leader.●

SALVADORAN TRAGEDY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the March 28 elections which resulted in the concentration of power for the extreme right wing elements in El Salvador have proved to be a disaster for the administration's policy of nurturing the democratic center. It is time for Congress to begin to exert some control over our policy toward El Salvador and insist on a cease-fire and a negotiated political solution.

An article published in the Council on Hemispheric Affairs' newsletter, the Washington Report on the Hemisphere, accurately points out that the recent suspension of the land reform program is but one of several incidents aimed at undoing the progress made on all social reforms. This article, entitled "The D'Aubuisson Specter," also reveals the true political character of the president of the constituent assembly, Roberto D'Aubuisson, who now sits in the most powerful position in the new government.

Because of the many broken promises made by the rightists, the great number of Christian Democrats killed since the elections, the increases in tenant evictions, and the continued lack of cooperation in resolving the murders of the four American churchwomen, the time has come for Congress to assert itself. We must pay heed to the example set by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and immediately cut off military aid to El Salvador.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the following article, and to support the only sensible alternative: a complete cutoff of aid to El Salvador until true progress in reforms is achieved.

The article follows:

THE D'AUBUISSON SPECTER

The May 18 suspension of the land reform program in El Salvador by the new Constituent Assembly was a rude awakening for many members of Congress. Senators and representatives who initially hailed the March 28 elections as a triumph for Salvadoran democracy are now facing up to the hard reality of the results of the U.S.-sponsored contest—that the already enfeebled Christian Democrats have been relegated to an all but meaningless opposition role, and government power handed over to the murderous Roberto D'Aubuisson and his ARENA party.

The land reform, or what was left of it, has been one of the main reasons why congressional moderates have so far been willing to support the Reagan administration's requests for continued economic and mili-

tary aid. Its suspension was enough to induce the usually docile Senate Foreign Relations Committee to freeze additional military aid to the Salvadoran government. In contrast, just two weeks earlier the House Foreign Affairs Committee approved a 120 percent increase in such aid to the right-wing regime, pointing to the elections as justification for its actions (see WRH, 6/1/82). Citing the large turnout as a "vote for peace" like an irrefutable litany, administration supporters on the committee seemed to ignore the rightist victory, as if the slogan itself had some magical power to conjure away the specter of D'Aubuisson.

No doubt the Salvadoran Assembly will now temporarily reverse itself on the land reform issue, which will enable President Reagan to certify again on July 27 that progress in that area is still being made. But the affair clearly demonstrated the intentions of the new regime, and confirmed the doubts in skeptical congressional quarters that right-wing extremists could suddenly become reformist democrats by virtue of winning an election.

The administration is likely to face other difficulties if it attempts to repeat the certification charade of last January. Local authorities have suspended charges against two wealthy Salvadorans accused of killing land reform director Jose Rudolfo Viera and two U.S. advisers on Jan. 4, 1981, despite the fact that an eyewitness to the murders identified the two as guilty parties (see WRH, 1/26/82). After 17 months of investigation the FBI has been unable to obtain the fingerprints of two of six confessed suspects in the December 1980 killings of four North American churchwomen. Salvadoran authorities have also failed to fingerprint more than a dozen military men known to have been in the area at the time of the killings, and have thereby prevented the FBI from identifying many sets of prints on the burnt-out van from which the foursome was abducted. Yet the President will have to assert that "good faith efforts" are being made to bring the murderers in the two cases to justice.

There are signs that the freeze on land reform is only the first stage in the rightists' program to undo all progressive programs and militarily defeat the guerrilla forces. The military is gearing up for a major offensive in early June to take advantage of the return of an estimated 1,200 troops from U.S. training installations. The government, meanwhile, has clamped down on local human rights information sources, pressuring the Catholic Church to close the Legal Aid office of the Archdiocese of San Salvador on May 13. The director of the Salvadoran Green Cross, a low-profile relief organization which often cleans up after fire-fights and massacres and helps citizens to locate missing relatives, was kidnapped from his home on May 20 and held for interrogation by the government.

Embarrassed by the emergence of D'Aubuisson as the leading figure in Salvadoran politics, but convinced that any alternative is better than negotiations with the FDR/FMLN opposition front, the State Department has been scrambling to soften his image as a "pathological killer." The task has been made all the more daunting by the growing interest in his violent past being expressed by a concerned Congress Rep. Pete Stark, (D-Calif.), presented a written request on April 28 to Asst. Secretary of State Thomas Enders for divulgence of the State Department's files on D'Aubuisson. After dodging the request for several weeks, the file was finally surrendered on May 26 in a

closed briefing between department officials and members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Committee sources said the file contained information on D'Aubuisson's alleged role in the March 1980 assassination of Archbishop Oscar Romero and a March 1981 attack on the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador. The committee also reviewed the circumstances surrounding the revocation of D'Aubuisson's visa to visit the U.S. in 1980. The State Department said at the time that "his activities would be prejudicial to the public interest and are a danger to the welfare and safety of the United States . . ." The revocation stemmed from an incident on Salvadoran TV, when D'Aubuisson threatened to cut the throat of then-U.S. Charge d'Affaires James Cheek for "leading El Salvador to Communism."

A growing number of Christian Democrats, trade union officials and reform-minded military officers in El Salvador share skepticism that D'Aubuisson will nurture the democratic process. Leaders of the U.S. supported Salvadoran Communal Union who visited Washington urged the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to freeze all military aid to El Salvador in the wake of the suspension of the land reform. An open letter has been circulated in Salvadoran military barracks which calls for a return to the ideals of the October 1979 coup led by Col. Adolfo Majano. Christian Democrats, many of whose party colleagues have been killed since the March 28 elections, according to Salvadoran sources in Washington, appear to be joining a growing movement of Salvadoran moderates who are finding they have more in common with their countrymen in the opposition than with Mr. D'Aubuisson.

The Reagan administration and the Congress are slowly realizing that Salvadoran oligarchs didn't spend a fortune on ARENA's slick U.S. style campaign to exchange one form of Duarte-ism for another. The new regime is committed to returning the country to the status quo ante October 1979. ●

LABELING OF IMPORTED MEAT

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products be labeled at all stages of distribution until preparation for ultimate consumption. The intent of this legislation is to assure that the consumer is fully aware of the source of the meat being consumed in order to make as informed a choice as practical. The legislation does not impose any new restrictions on imports. It simply requires full disclosure of the source of the meat to be purchased prior to preparation for final consumption.

During debate on the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, the problems encountered with the cleanliness and wholesomeness of imported meat were discussed in detail. Section 1122 of the

conference report provides that all imported carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, and meat food products of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines, capable of use as human food shall be subject to the same inspection, sanitary, quality, species verification, and residue standards as are applied to similar products in the United States. Any imported meat which does not meet these standards will not be allowed to enter the United States. Moreover, significantly improved sampling and testing procedures are to be put into place to implement these provisions.

I support these new procedures, Mr. Speaker, but I remain concerned about the ability of the Department of Agriculture to make certain that imported meat reaching the American market is clean and free from contaminants which have been banned in this country. Abroad, the United States has only a handful of inspectors to supervise over 1,000 foreign meat plants. It is unrealistic to expect that this number of inspectors and the amount of testing for pesticides and contaminants can be substantially increased to the level I believe necessary to fully protect both the American consumer and producer.

At this point, I believe honesty is the best, if not the only, policy. Tell the buyer whether his beef is imported or domestic—and let the choice be made there. A national meat labeling law will allow consumers to decide if they wish to purchase foreign meat, meat which the USDA has certainly made an effort to certify as wholesome but which has not been subjected to the stringent standards required of meat produced in the United States: systematic inspection of plants and animals, the banning of harmful pesticides and additives, the removal of products from the market, and punishment of fraud and abuse.

In my view, the simplest and most effective way of protecting the efforts of the American livestock producer and the interest of the American consumer is to provide information of the source of the meat and allow the consumer to make a choice. An informed consumer is the best judge and information is the service this legislation is intended to provide.

Mr. Speaker, I include here the text of this legislation:

H.R. 6665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) All carcasses, parts of carcasses, meat, and meat food products of livestock which is capable of use as human food (or the packages or containers thereof) shall be labeled as 'imported', 'imported in part', or 'may contain imported meat', as appropri-

ate. This paragraph shall not apply if the meat or meat product (or its package or container) is marked and labeled to show the country of origin as required under regulations issued under subsection (a).

"(2) If a person cuts any carcass, part of a carcass, meat, or meat food products into pieces (or breaks its package or container), other than to prepare it for ultimate consumption, and the carcass, part of a carcass, meat, or meat food product (or its package or container) is marked or labeled under paragraph (1), the person shall mark or affix a label to each of the pieces (or to each of the packages or containers into which it is separated) to provide the information which was so provided before it was cut (or broken)."

THE DEATH OF INFANT DOE

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an article that requires no comment.

THE DEATH OF INFANT DOE

(By James Bopp, Jr.)

Infant Doe did not have to die. Ordinary medical treatment and care would have allowed Infant Doe the chance to live his life loved by his parents in a home surrounded by loving, caring people.

Infant Doe never had that chance. He was drugged almost from the moment he was born. One cannot help but wonder. . . .

"Did he cry?"

"Did a kind nurse or doctor even place a pacifier in his mouth in an effort to comfort him?"

"Did he know the consolation of being held in someone's arms . . . or did he die alone?"

His mother, whom we may never know, cared for him, felt his movements and had great hopes for him—while he was inside her womb. But when he was born on Good Friday, April 9th, his parents were overwhelmed with grief, guilt, and hopelessness.

The joyously awaited experience turned into one of catastrophe and profound psychological threat. Infant Doe was born with Down's Syndrome, a condition with varying degrees of mental retardation.

But Infant Doe did not die from Down's Syndrome. Infant Doe died because his parents and his doctor refused to feed him and give him fluid to drink. Infant Doe died from starvation and dehydration.

This little baby suffered from a physical defect which sometimes accompanies Down's Syndrome. The esophagus and windpipe were joined. Feeding by mouth was impossible without surgical correction.

This physical defect is routinely repaired at Riley Children's Hospital in Indianapolis, only sixty miles away. Infant Doe could have been fed intravenously and the operation performed within twenty-four hours. This surgery is ordinary medical treatment with a relatively low complication rate. Infant Doe's prognosis was good.

Feeding by mouth was impossible without this surgery. But it was not this physical defect which killed Infant Doe. The parents, offered the choice by their physician between treatment and no treatment, refused medical care for their son.

The attending physician, the hospital, and several state court judges agreed. Infant Doe would receive no medical care, no food and no liquid.

It took six excruciatingly long days for little Infant Doe to die.

But not everyone agreed with this decision to condemn Infant Doe to death by starvation. A pediatrician, Dr. James Shaeffer, consulted by the parents on possible medical treatment, urged that the child's physical defect be repaired.

Any other child born with such a physical defect would have been rushed to surgery. Infant Doe, because he had Down's Syndrome, was not. Because of his handicap, the parents refused treatment and the judge ruled that the parents had the "right to choose" . . . the right to choose to starve their child until he died.

And there were others who did not agree with their choice.

Bob and Shirley Wright tried desperately to adopt Infant Doe. Bobbi, their three-year-old daughter, is afflicted with Down's Syndrome. When she was born, they too were anguished. But Bobbi has provided them with all the joy—and heartache—of any normal child. Bob and Shirley were willing—no, deeply wanted—to adopt this tiny boy so that he too would know the joys—and sorrows—of life.

Barry Brown also did not agree.

As Prosecutor for Monroe County, Indiana, he filed suit to declare that Infant Doe was neglected, the child, by then, having had no food or drink for three days. He urged the court to allow that normal medical treatment and care be afforded Infant Doe. The judge denied this request.

The Indiana Supreme Court, two days later, refused to alter that decision.

Infant Doe had by then been without food and water for five days. Can we be forgiven if we try to blot from our minds the condition of his poor wasted little body?

The Indiana Supreme Court decision now made the unbelievable story public.

Phones began to ring. People throughout Indiana, and the country, were shocked and appalled as the story spread.

Calls to the Indiana Supreme Court expressed outrage. Calls to public officials of all kinds, including the governor, demanded that something be done. Calls to the prosecutor commended his actions and offered to adopt Infant Doe. I, too, was called. Concerned people throughout the state wanted to know what could be done. The reports were still very sketchy and incomplete.

By that time, I had been contacted by the Wrights. "Can we do anything?" They offered to adopt Infant Doe.

Six hours later I filed a petition with the Monroe County judge to appoint the Wrights guardians of Infant Doe. They promised to keep and care for him. Dr. Shaeffer would arrange medical care. The feeding of Infant Doe would begin. The Wrights would adopt him.

The hearing before the judge on the Wrights' petition began at 5:00 P.M. A strained atmosphere enveloped the court as all but the judge, court personnel and lawyers were excluded.

The press—the people's eyes and ears—was ordered out.

The attorney for Infant Doe's parents defended their right to choose starvation for their tiny son. "But why not allow the Wrights to care for Infant Doe—to feed him, give him medical care?"

"Because," said the parents' lawyer, "Infant Doe is now 'in extremis' . . ."

There is no reason to change your order, Judge, since Infant Doe will die anyway."

And then the judge denied the Wrights' petition to make Infant Doe their son.

The tiny baby almost died that afternoon, after the judge had refused temporary feeding. Suffering from severe dehydration, pneumonia and weakened by starvation, Infant Doe stopped breathing. But, miraculously, his brave little heart began to beat again, and he resumed breathing.

Now only one chance remained . . . an appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

Even though Infant Doe's life was measured in only hours, the prosecutor prepared his appeal to the nation's highest court. The appeal had to be presented at 9:00 A.M. Friday, when the Supreme Court offices in Washington opened.

But before the attorneys arrived in Washington, D.C., Infant Doe was dead. Without food, drink, or medical care, the little boy had died at 10:03 P.M., only five hours after the Wrights had been denied the opportunity to adopt him as their third child.

The legal system failed Infant Doe.

The parents, consumed by grief and anguish, chose death for their baby. They deserve our pity and sorrow for the burden they will carry.

The physician, however, should not have failed Infant Doe. Non-treatment is not treatment. Infant Doe was his patient. Doctors are trained to cure, not to kill.

Ominously, the courts also failed Infant Doe. Empowered by the Indiana legislature to protect the young and helpless, the courts ordered that no medical treatment or care be given to this helpless baby. The courts are intended to be the ultimate protectors of the neglected and abused. Instead, they refused to act as Infant Doe slowly starved to death.

I am sorrowed by Infant Doe's death to the bottom of my soul. But I must believe that everything has a purpose.

Infant Doe does not have to die in vain. He is the symbol of those we must protect.

Everyone must be entitled to ordinary medical treatment and nourishment. A child must not be killed because he is handicapped.

We must ensure that Infant Doe died so that others, who are now known only to God, will live.

Since writing this, I have learned that Infant Doe cried for four days.

(This letter was part of a correspondence between NRLC President J. C. Willke and the membership of the National Right to Life Committee.)

(James Bopp, Jr., is an attorney in Terre Haute, Indiana, and represented Bob and Shirley Wright in their attempt to adopt Infant Doe. He is also General Counsel for the National Right to Life Committee.)

STRIKING AT LABOR VIOLENCE

HON. CLINT ROBERTS

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, freedom to choose has always been the greatest of our freedoms. When a working man or woman is faced with deciding whether or not to join a labor union, it is absolutely necessary to have that choice made in

a climate of freedom. Violence and intimidation of employees or employers has no place whatsoever in a free system.

This is why it is essential to extend protection of the Hobbs Act to legitimate labor union activities, so as to protect all sides in a labor dispute from threats and violence—by placing representatives of management and labor under Federal jurisdiction should they commit acts of violence in a labor dispute.

Recently, the junior Senator from South Dakota, JAMES ABDNOR, summed up my sentiments precisely in his article, "Striking Out at Union Violence" which appeared in the May 1982 Issue Update of the Senate Republican Conference.

I would ask my colleagues to ponder Senator ABDNOR's words with care and then to join me, Mr. Speaker, in co-sponsoring this important protection in the House.

STRIKING OUT AT UNION VIOLENCE

(By Senator James Abdnor)

A State legislator in Kentucky—the sponsor of a right-to-work bill—drew quick reaction as a consequence of his legislation.

According to a Williamsburg, Kentucky, newspaper, this solon was warned that he would be "burned out" if his bill was introduced. Shortly thereafter, a restaurant he partially owned was victimized twice in one night by arson, causing \$30,000 damage.

The Garland Coal and Mining Company has been hampered for about a year by a United Mine Workers strike at its Poteau, Oklahoma, mines. Violence has been rampant. Last fall, three union negotiators were shot after leaving a union meeting and, this February, the home of the mining company's chief negotiator was damaged by dynamite bombs.

Collective bargaining, since its inception in this country, has done a lot of good for our nation's workers. However, the two aforementioned incidents are only recent contributions to the stigma of extortion, crime, and violence that has followed the rise in power of organized labor in the United States.

And where, one might ask, is the federal government in this growing problem?

The answer is a textbook case of one branch of government taking actions that spite the efforts of another. In 1945, Congress passed a law, the Hobbs Act, that specifically allowed for federal prosecution of extortion and violence affecting interstate commerce, no matter who committed the crime.

However, the Supreme Court, in its 1973 *U.S. v. Enmons* ruling, effectively kept the federal government from applying the Hobbs Act to labor disputes. Specifically, the Court said that threats or acts of violence in the pursuit of "legitimate union objectives" should not be prosecuted as Hobbs Act violations.

While there is a need to protect legitimate union activities, I believe the Supreme Court was wrong in its interpretation of the Hobbs Act. It effectively gave all sides of a labor dispute the right to threaten or commit violence without fear of federal prosecution.

That's why I am urging my colleagues to adopt Senate Bill 2189, authorized by Senator Strom Thurmond (R-SC), that would

place representatives of labor and management under federal jurisdiction should they commit acts of violence during a labor dispute.

Although this type of legislation has already aroused vocal opposition from organized labor, unions would have no realistic fear of government harassment from this bill.

If there is one thing business and organized labor can agree on, it is the need to keep America the "land of the free." If Congress takes the proper steps, we can go a long way toward maintaining the right to make a fair and honest living without fearing the loss of property or life. ●

WOOD ENERGY MONTH

HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, September 1982 has been declared Wood Energy Month by the Wood Heating Alliance and the American Forestry Association. Along with my distinguished colleagues: Mr. D'AMOURS of New Hampshire, Mr. EMERY of Maine, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDESON of Connecticut, Mr. JEFFORDS of Vermont, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Ms. SNOWE of Maine, and Mr. WEAVER of Oregon, I am pleased to endorse this declaration.

The Wood Energy Month campaign prepared by the sponsoring groups focuses on the safe use of wood-heating appliances and on the preservation of our wood fuel resources. The sponsors have distributed television and radio announcements urging the public to use our wood fuel resources wisely.

A new study entitled "The Critical Link: Energy and National Security in the 1980's" contends that the United States risks its national security as well as its economic future by assuming the oil crisis is over. Written by Charles Ebinger and Richard Kessler of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies, the new work argues that it is shortsighted to build a rapid deployment force to help protect foreign oil supplies while neglecting cheaper and simpler steps domestically.

The use of wood for home heating is a major alternative to oil and natural gas. Industry estimates that about 14 million homeowners presently use wood for all or part of their heating needs. But the rate of installation of wood-burning devices has fallen dramatically in the face of the current oil glut and our general economic crisis.

Homeowners have reduced their efforts to seek alternatives to limited fossil fuels. America is going back to sleep, just as we did after the 1973-74 oil crisis ended. That time, as you know, we were rudely reawakened by the sudden disruption of supply in 1979.

We cannot allow ourselves to be fooled yet a third time. Congress has a responsibility to encourage Americans to continue their movement toward inexpensive, available, renewable fuels such as wood for home heating.

The wood fuel appliance industry is suffering a terrible depression. Many firms are going out of business. Research and development on new, more efficient, cleaner burning, and more convenient appliances has been severely cut back.

We cannot let this go on. We must stand up and be counted on behalf of the wood heating alternative. I urge every Member of Congress to personally endorse the campaign for September as Wood Energy Month. ●

AN EDITORIAL VIEWPOINT

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, although the House has finally given its approval to a budget resolution, even tougher choices still remain for the 97th Congress and succeeding ones. At question is whether we will opt for continued reductions in the Government's role in the economy or not.

As the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News recently editorialized, the Government's impact on the economy must be reduced to create economic stability in the future. The wise advice of the News should be kept in mind by all of us as we consider the difficult decisions ahead in the budget and appropriations debates.

A second editorial in the News, "Incomes Not Eroded," also offers us some timely analysis of the positive effects of reducing the rate of inflation.

I insert both editorials in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, June 12, 1982]

HOUSE COMPROMISE AN ENCOURAGING SIGN

President Reagan's long-range lobbying may have helped, but it was more likely the final realization by most members of his party and some conservative Democrats that the time had come to quit arguing and reach a budget compromise. Whatever the reason, the result was a 219-206 vote Thursday in the House of Representatives in favor of a 1983 budget that puts a \$765 million limit on spending, but estimates a \$99 billion deficit.

It was virtually the same coalition that agreed to the tax cut and spending package last year which provided the winning margin this week. Rejected was a Democratic budget calling for \$784 million in spending and projected a \$107.4 billion deficit.

That deficit, should it remain less than \$100 billion after the Senate's vote and, more importantly, the subsequent budget decisions to be made during the remainder of this legislative session, would be smaller than feared. It is still much too large for

economic stability unless it is the obvious start of a declining trend in deficits.

Of special importance is that in reaching the compromise, major violence was not done to the centerpiece of the economic policies of the president. That is, the schedule of 10 percent tax reductions over this year and the next has not been changed. Revenue is to be boosted by still unspecified means, but the principle of those tax rate reductions scheduled last year was left in place.

That can eventually lead to sustained, stable economic growth.

There is much to be done to make the new budget outline approved by the House conform with the one passed by the Senate which projects a \$115.8 billion deficit. The major requirement that a public strained by the effects of a recession ought to impose is that the differences be made up with spending cuts, not tax increases. It is only by adhering to such policies that the dominance of the public sector in the nation's economic life can be reduced. It has been too little appreciated that this dominance restricts more opportunities than bureaucracy can create by new spending and taxing programs.

If the nation can weather this recession and still adhere to the thrust of the change in political philosophy which was evident in the 1980 election, then the stage will be set for a new era of growth with less Big Brotherism.

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, May 12, 1982]

INCOMES NOT ERODED

For those fortunate enough to be fully employed and for all those on regular pensions or receiving Social Security payments, the economic news is especially good. Inflation has not eroded their incomes by an appreciable amount in the past five months. Calculated annually, the inflation rate during the period was four-tenths of 1 percent.

Of course, inflation rates translate into different costs to each individual and family. Some have to spend more on energy, less on food or shelter. Homes paid for years ago mean low housing costs today, whatever the current rental rates or new home construction costs may be.

But it remains obvious that a 10 percent increase in wages or benefits in 1982, when inflation was running at a 12 percent rate, had relatively little meaning. A 5 percent raise when inflation is at today's rates offers the possibility for more savings and more discretionary spending.

The insidious tax that inflation imposes has been effectively reduced. Some say that a recession is the price of doing so, and that it is much too high to pay. Inflation doesn't mean good times, though. Good fiscal and monetary policies would not find a recession the device for dealing with inflation. Even if it were the "price," however, there would be merit in paying it. Better to have these economic adjustments made now than postponed until that tragic day when dollars would have had to be hauled to the grocery store in wheelbarrows. The fact that inflation has been reduced sharply provides everyone with a tax cut, and it also sets the stage for sound recovery. ●

"WIN-WIN FREE TRADE POLICY"

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I am finding increasing frustration among Americans about trade policies which leave our country on the short end of the stick.

I have always supported free trade policies. I still support free trade policies. I believe most Members of Congress, most American business, and most American citizens support free trade policies. I believe that we understand clearly how trade restrictions, trade barriers, and other inhibitors of free trade work the best long-term interests of against all nations.

Beyond that, I represent a congressional district which depends heavily on exports. Were the United States to adopt a protectionist trade policy, the people in my area would be among the first to be hurt.

However, I strongly share the frustration I sense among those I represent that our free trade policy appears to be only a one-way street.

Robert W. Galvin, chairman and chief executive officer of Motorola, Inc., spoke on June 2 to the Communications Division of the Electronic Industries Association at a conference in Hyannis, Mass. As head of a major American industry concerned with international trade and a genuinely free trade policy in the world, his remarks are important and thought provoking.

Mr. Galvin notes that Japan has a concerted national program to protect and promote certain industries to the point that they dominate individual industries worldwide.

These policies include establishing a thoroughly protected domestic market. This is done, Mr. Galvin suggests, by the Japanese preventing or discouraging foreign investments most of the time, promoting an explicit or implicit buy Japanese policy, by establishing standards and specifications for imports that discourage foreign suppliers, by subsidizing industrial efforts and, thereby, signaling Japanese investors as to what national priorities are to be supported, by using high tariffs to discourage imports, and by employing nontariff barriers. These are certainly not free trade policies and yet, as Mr. Galvin says, "Free trade will (only) be fair trade if an undistorted market makes the decision in both countries over a period of time."

Mr. Galvin also senses that:

A substantial majority of American and European business leaders believe that Japan has protected and publicly supported its industries too much and too long, and have combined to excessively impose their

production and unemployment on the rest of us too much and too long, and that they intend to extend these consequences too much and too long, and this can no longer be tolerated.

Mr. Galvin then goes on to list a number of very specific suggestions as to what can be done to reverse this trend in our trade relations with Japan. They are well worth thinking about.

Some will suggest that these are antfree trade proposals. Let me make two points. The first is stated well by Mr. Galvin himself when he says:

When (the Japanese) finally understand, as they clearly do not yet understand, that the net consequences of following the long path that we have been on will be unnaturally and unnecessarily destructive to their largest foreign market, and that we and they cannot tolerate that, they will adjust.

The second point is that there is growing concern in the United States throughout business and industry, among labor unions, and among citizens who believe we are just being played for a patsy. This is building a political climate in which trade restrictions are virtually inevitable. A rational policy which will signal to the Japanese that we will no longer tolerate their playing the game armed with their own restrictive trade policy while all the rest of the industrialized democracies are supporting free trade.

If I could again quote Mr. Galvin:

If some of us don't speak out further to eliminate this engulfing problem (of Japanese protectionism) before it swells into a national revolution, we will not have done justice to the cause of a win-win trade objective.

What it boils down to is simply this: while it may take two to make a fight it only takes one person to start the conflict. The clear record of Japanese protectionism is obviously provocative. If we respond to that provocation Japan can only say, as the little boy did trying to explain a fist fight, "Mama, it all started when he hit me back."

The Japanese must understand that the United States wants a free trade policy. We have been exceedingly tolerant. Our patience is coming to an end. More and more Members of Congress, such as myself, who are advocates of free trade are fed up with being played for fools. We would like to see some indication from the Japanese that they recognize that, at last, the free ride is over and that they have got to come out from behind their protectionist walls and play the game like the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the entirety of Mr. Galvin's speech and I commend it to the study of my colleagues.

REMARKS BY ROBERT W. GALVIN, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MOTOROLA INC., COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION, ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, HYANNIS CONFERENCE, JUNE 2, 1982, HYANNIS, MASS.

This conference focuses on the prospects for the communications business of the electronics industry. Those prospects are a function of everything from technology to public policy, and are interrelated with the destiny of the component business that serves it and the computer business it serves. My focus is on our country's trade and investment policy on Japan.

A brief Motorola story will set the stage. Most of you may be aware that our company has gone public with our commitment to win as we meet Japan's challenge. Ads under that headline, "Meeting Japan's Challenge", address our respect for Japanese competitors. They aim also at countering the myth of some inherent Japanese corporate superiority. We publish experiences. Practices and successes as models for and about companies in our U.S. industry. We demonstrate that our company and local industry invest extensively here and in Japan, engineer for the long term, and practice the basics in thorough and progressive ways. We sign off by noting certain leadership, based on quality and productivity, through employee participation in management.

Hopefully, thoughtful observers of our industry. Most particularly those who influence public policy, believe and appreciate that our companies, individually, are capable, independent risk-takers reaching out to serve our markets' highest expectations and deserving of respect and support.

Yet, as able as are the hundreds of excellent individual electronic companies in our industry, many represented in this room, the challenge that we face from Japan has a special two part dimension beyond the individual competence of most companies.

It is embodied in:
First, a demonstrated willingness and proven capability by Japan to dominate individual industries worldwide. Second, a concerted national program to protect and promote certain industries to the point where such domination has occurred or is potentially and probably the predictable result.

Japan has action programs ordained in law to intensively rationalize and restructure industries, including the defining of facilities to be installed, the sizing of their production scale, the specialization to be assigned among companies, and the legislating of concerted collaboration between corporations under corporate exemptions from their anti-monopoly law.

How many Americans understand or even know of the series of public laws enacted in Japan starting in 1956 and continuing through Public Law 17 in 1971 and Public Law 84 in 1978—those particularly aimed at our industries—that ordain the actions I just lightly touched on? How many understand these and other laws sanction the establishment of cartels, allow the specifying of favored or limiting standards, provide for concessionary loans under conditions allowing for interest and/or even loan forgiveness, collaboration among companies to fix prices on exports, exhorting companies that don't fit the restructuring plan not to play in the game or upset the scheme.

Can you imagine the nightmare of anti-trust difficulties we would be in if our American industry members were to conspire in such manners. Including—just to add one

more anti-competitive practice—manufacturers in cartels notifying members of their desire to offer a new product and the others being allowed to comment and influence the implementation.

These policies and concerted actions are supported by the interlocking financial structure of government, banks and manufacturers whose socialized method of financing provides funds on such a low risk basis that one can hardly sense the actions of a free market.

The additional structural policies of Japan then essentially oblige that when capacity is staffed it shall be operated, and the output will be disposed of almost irrespective of the immediate cost burden to their society. The rest of the Japanese system is accustomed to support this objective in the interest of exports, and sees each targeting industry through to a successful conclusion.

Remember the early examples of MITI granting import licenses for low cost sugar to exporters who could use the gain from the resale of sugar at artificially high prices in Japan to offset costs. Even losses in their non-related targeted exports, or the allocation of income from bicycle and horse racing in the amount of a half million dollars annually to just one exporting industry? Theirs is a system, to say the least, that is at variance with our market system.

We'll return to those issues momentarily. Now let's also review other principal policies and practices that the Japanese have employed over the last quarter of a century vis-a-vis many businesses. Including electronics that reveal Japan as a protected society at home.

1. The Japanese have prevented or discouraged foreign investment most of this time. I was particularly intrigued with the so called Ten Commandments on foreign investment they pronounced in the 1967-73 period. In addition to specifying then that only certain industries were allowed foreign investment, and only up to 50 percent of what effectively would be a start up. Two other of the commandments obliged that foreign investors as a whole should avoid concentrating in any particular industry and foreign investors should cooperate with Japanese competitors to avoid excessive competition.—Interesting! It was around this period that the American electronic investors were setting up—successfully incidentally—all over the rest of the world. We might have done just as well in Japan if allowed to and if we were fully welcomed;

2. They have explicitly and implicitly practiced "buy Japanese". They have created a national psychology that views imports as a necessary evil to fuel the industrial sector;

3. They used standards and specifications to discourage foreign suppliers;

4. They used subsidies to underwrite certain industrial development efforts and to signal to the Japanese banks what national priorities are to be supported;

5. They used high tariffs and other forms of customs such as uplifts to discourage imports;

6. They employed other non-tariff barriers including quotas whenever the situation warranted.

In summary, Japan has nursed itself to competence in a privileged sanctuary for twenty-five years. Those distortions protected their home market. How have they orchestrated exports?

Japan's success as a world trader is made possible by its protected home base. Japa-

nese firms acquire their basic capabilities in a "hothouse" environment. Where a prescribed form of competition produces a few strong contenders who then move simultaneously and aggressively into world markets. The protected base provides not only large market volumes on which to realize economies of scale, but also buffers the home market against aggressive pricing.

In the area of high technology we see a particularly threatening new phenomenon where subsidized collaboration enables selected major Japanese firms to acquire state-of-the-art technology while each U.S. firm must primarily solve its own problems. The ability of a special few Japanese firms to simultaneously exploit state-of-the-art technologies acquired through means presumed to be anti-competitive in our country constitutes a grave and unnatural threat to U.S. technology industries.

These practices, plus a tax system inherently providing pricing advantage, and cartelization and other concerted actions that cause emplacement of capacity that combines to serve the lion's share of targeted markets here and elsewhere, demonstrate they are prepared to do what is necessary to pursue their national objectives. Whether or not the means are consistent with free market principles or the international trading rules. They have demonstrated that they press those objectives to the point that groups of their companies do, or potentially could, assume dominant market shares here. This is driving American investors away from opportunities they might otherwise chance.

For the United States, the implications of this concerted effort and historical reality cannot be ignored in terms of its current and carry-over effect on the prospects of the American electronics industry and other targeted high technology sectors.

For sure, the Japanese now possess excellent operating capabilities; the marketplace recognizes Japanese technology, manufacturing and quality competences; their people are talented and work well together; the structure of their society and their culture enhances all of the above. But, it cannot be ignored that these capabilities were only nursed by distortions of world trade and investment rules for a quarter of a century. Had the Japanese permitted market-determined investment and trade, they would not have been left alone to have learned all these competences so soon or so well. Now, with the existence of the acknowledged capabilities, there is some relaxation by them of other now less required barriers to imports. And, for their giving in on the latter, there is a suggestion that all is to be forgiven.

One can sense at this point in the speech each of us moving to one or the other side of the issue. Free traders there. Protectionists there. And fair traders, who and where are they? Well, most of us are not all that far apart. Most of us want free trade, and have wanted it for twenty-five years. Free trade will be fair trade if an undistorted market makes the decisions in both countries over a period of time. Americans haven't wanted protectionism on either side in the electronics industry for these twenty-five years. Some of us thought that the U.S. dispensation to Japan in the early years and the fact that their early rationalization laws were claimed to be short term would mean that all that would shortly disappear. But it didn't. Even today, while the targeting strategy continues unabated, most of the

other distortions and/or their effects prevail.

My sense of the situation is that a substantial majority of American and European business leaders believe that Japan has protected and publicly supported its industries too much and too long, and have combined to excessively impose their production and unemployment on the rest of us too much and too long, and that they intend to extend these consequences too much and too long, and this can no longer be tolerated. If defense against such excesses is to be labeled protectionism. So be it.

I believe that a substantial majority of business leaders in our industry and European industry feel that way privately. Some are restrained to acknowledge so publicly, out of concern for multiple relationships. And, of course, any experienced world trader is concerned that raising these questions and seeking effective solutions may stir up a different or greater problem.

All of us understand that point and I will address it further at the conclusion; but let me say here that the continuance of the status quo, where the practices on the other side are so much of an anathema to our system and country, is intolerable if we desire to preserve the American system based on private ownership and individual direction of the means of production with a strong propensity for the market being the determinant of how business is earned by each company on its own.

For the good of our trade and broader relations with Japan, the issue must be clearly faced and resolved.

So, what should we do?

First, the United States should continue to raise to a level of special attention its trade and investment relations with Japan.

Second, the United States should declare the intent and parameters of its policy regarding trade and investment relations with Japan—in a manner that will impress the Japanese with the certainty that policy will be vigorously and consistently implemented—including the following:

The U.S. does not accept that national industrial policies based on non-market mechanisms should enable any country to assume a dominant position in this country's markets. The U.S. believes that all countries benefit from an open competitive environment that permits market forces to determine success or failure. Those who employ industrial policy to subvert such an environment work against their own long-run interests as well as those of their trading partners.

The government will identify the U.S. industries targeted by Japan.

The government will take any necessary steps to ensure that such U.S. industries are not placed at disadvantage in competing with Japanese firms whose competence and resources derive from the means noted above.

Should Japan adopt and implement substantially free market principles, abandon its target industry policy, and assure that U.S. firms can participate in the Japanese market in a significant way. The U.S. could agree, after a reasonable period of time, to revert to its traditional trade policy posture.

As the above formulation implies, the current U.S. policy of primarily pursuing improved or equivalent access to the Japanese market is an insufficient answer to the problem.

Third, we should reexamine the application of certain antitrust defenses which inequitably favor foreign competitors in our

market. This may require a rethinking of the act of state and sovereign compulsion doctrines, which shield foreign producers from antitrust liability here if their anti-competitive conduct is ordained by their national government.

Fourth, we must recast U.S. trade laws to: Make targeting by foreign industrial policies which has produced demonstrable consequences grounds for relief.

Assign to the government affirmative responsibility to ensure that any part of a competent U.S. industry is not crippled or prevented from maintaining its future competitiveness by such unreasonable or unjustifiable trade practices.

Modify regulation and enforcement policies which have made remedies all but unattainable.

Define shorter time periods for implementing provisional actions.

Permit setting of market share ceilings for the country that targets and bases their practices on non-market mechanisms.

Permit fines or other penalties as well as retroactive application of penalties to recover damages to impaired U.S. industries.

Our antidumping laws should be reexamined with the objective of preventing predatory pricing by foreign suppliers' offerings during the introductory and emerging stages of new high technology.

Our countervailing duty laws should be reexamined with the objective of assuring that the full benefits of foreign subsidies are actionable.

Fifth, the U.S. Government should establish a strong surveillance capability to monitor Japanese and other foreign industrial policies aimed at competitive U.S. industries. The results of such monitoring and analysis of the implications for U.S. industries should be reported regularly to the Congress. The government should initiate actions on its own in cases where there is a significant threat to a U.S. industry.

Finally, the U.S. Government should bring a complaint or series of complaints under appropriate provisions of the GATT against the actions, policies and practices of the Japanese Government that nullify or impair GATT agreements or otherwise are inconsistent with such agreements. The European Community has recently begun such a proceeding. The United States should do so also.

This description of the problem and this prescription for solution is admittedly vigorous; but the trade problem that exists is already of a grand scale and predictably will worsen. We have been tiptoeing around this problem, seeking to resolve it with partial measures at best, and ineffective ones at worst.

I regret having to be one who feels compelled to step forth and risk proposing a vigorous program. Hopefully by doing so, it will allow for all of us to deal with the issue in its full dimensions. I invite my associates in industry to join the issue publicly and hopefully support change.

Inescapably, each of us at first will examine this issue from our legitimate positions of self-interest. There will be those who believe as a matter of free trade ideal that no proposal should be considered. As much as some people may privately hope for a vigorous solution, there will be the special problems of those with investments or sourcing or resale arrangements, who believe that they can benefit at least temporarily from a retention of the status quo. Others may presume that the trade distortions will somehow not touch them. But anyone in the

electronics industry who does not think that the bell tolls for them is ignoring the obvious. They, and their suppliers and customers, are all caught in this storm.

But, will enacting these proposals lead to a chain of retaliatory moves elsewhere? I strongly doubt it. One's intuition may suggest that, but in this instance, the counter-intuitive is more likely. The rest of the world, as do we, sees the Japan problem as special and serious. Many in that rest of the world—certainly the other developed industrial nations—have already positioned themselves more realistically vis-a-vis Japan. They will note our specific bilateral focus. Ours is likely to be judged a salutary and long overdue action that does not and need not affect significantly other trade relations.

Will the Japanese react? I presume so. But, mostly and eventually I believe they will settle in favorably. When they finally understand, as they clearly do not yet understand, that the net consequences of following the long path we have been on will be unnaturally and unnecessarily destructive to their largest foreign market, and that we and they cannot tolerate that, they will adjust.

I must say we're betting on that, as our company has been and intends to continue to invest our private means there and here to earn further the right to serve a fair share of the Japan market. As well as to retain, as we will, a healthy, privately earned share of our home market. I presume that initially some of our customers there will wonder if these proposals are the statements of a friend. I respectfully suggest they are. For if some of us don't speak out further to eliminate this engulfing problem before it swells into a national revulsion, we will not have done justice to the cause of a win-win trade objective.

In the ad campaign I described in my opening, Motorola speaks of winning as we meet the Japanese challenge. But, as we have amplified to Japan's press, we mean—being successful standing toe-to-toe with any Japanese competitor. We don't mean—"we win. You lose".

Both parties must win—remain viable—remain strong. As a matter of fact, at one and the same time we must be customers, suppliers, licensors, licensees, competitors to each other. Among developed industrial nations that means that each must remain viable and strong. Neither party can trade away or lose its industrial sector for some other.

Japan and the United States must have a win-win, non-dominated, profitable and balanced industrial trade and investment relationship. Serious consideration and implementation of these or similar proposals are essential to restoring confidence in achieving that objective. ●

OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR FREEZE RESOLUTIONS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement I made in the Foreign Affairs Committee on the question of a nuclear freeze:

A freeze on the production, testing and deployment of nuclear arms would not promote stability or reduce the risk of war. A freeze at current levels would leave the United States in a position of military disadvantage and would prevent us from taking the steps to correct that imbalance.

I daresay that none of my colleagues who have seen the secret Department of Intelligence briefing on the U.S.S.R. vis-a-vis the United States with regard to nuclear and nonnuclear positions would disagree with my statement.

It would give the Soviets little reason to negotiate actual reductions in their nuclear forces. Furthermore, certain elements of the proposal for the freeze would be virtually impossible to verify, leaving us unable to confirm Soviet compliance with the freeze.

My own personal experience in discussions with the Soviets leaves me skeptical about their sincerity in arms reductions. When I visited the Soviet Union in August 1979, I met with members of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. I raised the question as to what the Soviets were going to do to reciprocate for the United States having canceled, under President Carter, the B-1 bomber and development of the neutron bomb, having delayed deployment of the Trident II missiles and having canceled an atomic-powered aircraft carrier. I got no immediate response to my question; but later, one of the Soviets stated that the Soviet Union does not believe in "unilateral disarmament." If the Soviets do not intend to reciprocate for those American arms restraint initiatives, then the United States must neither freeze our military capability at an inferior level nor find ourselves negotiating arms reductions from a position of weakness.

You also have to wonder about the Soviets' sincerity on arms control and disarmament when you compare the reactions of our two governments to peace demonstrations. As you know, some 500,000 people demonstrated in New York last Saturday without incident and without interference from our Government, neither local nor federal. In contrast, however, 10 members of the Soviet's 11-member peace movement got thrown in jail for their activities in Moscow.

When Australian Prime Minister Fraser was in the United States in May, he delivered a speech to the Foreign Policy Association in New York on the importance of the Western alliance. Prime Minister Fraser strongly praised President Reagan's initiative in calling for arms reduction talks with the Soviets, but he also emphasized the West should make a serious effort in strengthening its conventional forces in order to reduce the Soviet advantage and to reduce their temptation to exploit that advantage. Prime Minister Fraser added, "It seems to me that it is not unilateral disarmament but such a combination of increased effort in the conventional arms field and serious engagement in nuclear arms control negotiations which offers the best means of reducing the risk of nuclear war."

Prime Minister Fraser also referred to the example of the 1930's and 1940's when there were those who proclaimed a "peace movement" but who ignored the fact that no one wants war. The argument is only between differing views of how peace can best be preserved, and preserved with a respect for human freedom and dignity. Prime Minister Fraser quotes Walter Lippmann, who wrote, in 1943, a commentary called "The Vicious

Circle of Pacifism," which bears repeating today:

"In the name of peace, the nation is made weak and unwilling to defend its vital interests. Confronted with the menace of superior force, it then surrenders its vital interests. The pacifist statesmen justify their surrender on the ground, first, that peace is always preferable to war, and second, that because the nation wants peace so much, it is not prepared to wage war. Finally, with its back to the wall, the pacifist nation has to fight nevertheless. But then it fights against a strategically superior enemy; it fights with its own armaments insufficient and with its alliances shattered. . . . The generation which most sincerely and elaborately declared that peace is the supreme end of foreign policy, got not peace, but a most devastating war."

There are two things that concern me about the current antinuclear campaign. One, if the American public should be convinced that nothing is worth the risk of nuclear war, then we would be leaving ourselves open to Soviet nuclear blackmail. Two, if fears about nuclear weapons are translated into a refusal to upgrade and protect our own nuclear weapons from a Soviet strike, we leave ourselves even more vulnerable to a potential Soviet strike. ●

DAYTON AND BICYCLING

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, few cities in the Nation can claim a closer involvement with the bicycle than Dayton, Ohio, within my district. That relationship continues this year when the League of American Wheelmen, the national association of bicyclists, holds its annual convention there on July 1 through July 5.

From the beginning of the bicycle's modern history, Daytonians have been building bikes and encouraging their use. When bicycles first became popular in the 1890's, Dayton was an important manufacturing center. Therefore, it was natural that the city became a major producer of bicycles.

Two important bicycle makers of this era later gained fame for another form of transportation: Wilbur and Orville Wright. They manufactured at least two models, both named after early Dayton settlers. Eventually, the brothers gave up their business to build airplanes.

Another company of this period built the "Dayton" bicycle, one of the highest quality bikes of the time. That company later evolved into the Huff Company, which today is the largest manufacturer of bicycles in the world.

In 1964, the Miami Valley Regional Bicycle Committee was formed to promote the development of cycling in the Dayton area. The committee, sponsored by the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce, is nationally known for its successful programs, and its annual bike-a-thon has served as a role

model for bike groups all over the country.

Dayton is home to one of the Nation's largest bicycle touring and racing groups, the Dayton Cycling Club, with over 600 members. The city also boasts a chapter of the Wheelmen, an organization dedicated to the restoration and preservation of antique bicycles.

Dayton's River Corridor Bikeway is an outstanding bicycle path stretching more than 24 miles along the scenic Great Miami River. It links downtown with residential areas, parks, meadows, and historic centers.

This year's recipient of the League of American Wheelmen's honored Paul Dudley White Award goes to Dayton native Horace M. Huffman, Jr., grandson of Huff's founder. Huffman has been termed "the bicycle advocate's advocate" for his leadership role in local and national bicycling organizations.

Dayton can be proud of its many connections with bicycling. Cycling is one of the greatest forms of physical exercise and it is fun for all ages. As an alternative form of transportation, bicycling is energy efficient, quiet, and pollution free.

Here's to many more years of bicycling in Dayton. ●

A GRASSROOTS RESPONSE TO AN ECONOMIC SURVEY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last month I mailed a questionnaire concerning the economy to each household in the Sixth Congressional District of Pinellas County, Fla., and received an overwhelming response from more than 42,000 constituents who provided me with their views and suggestions.

While this is in no way a scientific survey done by political analysts, the fact is that any time 42,000 people take the time to respond to a request for information, it provides a tremendous grassroots poll that is invaluable in helping me better represent the people I was elected to serve.

Each of the responses to my questionnaire was hand tallied and the results overwhelmingly indicate that the people of Pinellas County strongly believe the Federal budget must be balanced, as 70.4 percent of the respondents said they would support a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. When asked to rate the importance of a balanced Federal budget on a scale of 1 to 10, more than half answered with a 10, saying balanced budget should be our top priority.

It was also very obvious from the return that while my constituents support a balanced budget, they do not believe it should be accomplished through increased taxes. Although 76.5 percent said they would support increased taxes on cigarettes and liquor, 56 percent said they would not support higher gas taxes and 55.7 percent said they would not support increased taxes in general. Instead, they indicated their belief that a balanced budget should be achieved through reductions in Federal spending. For instance, 87.4 percent said they would support reductions in foreign aid programs, 66.7 percent said they would support reductions in spending for social programs, and 51.5 percent said they would support reductions in national defense programs.

It is very interesting to note that on the question of limiting or delaying cost-of-living increases for social security and other retirement programs, the response was evenly divided, as 49.1 percent said they do not support limited or delayed COLA's, while 47.9 percent said they support such limits.

Because I am concerned that the budgetary changes of the past year may have caused unanticipated hardships, I specifically asked how many had personally been adversely affected by the program, and found that 32.8 percent indicated they had been affected. To follow-up on this response, I have been contacting those people who said they were adversely affected to acquire more details about their individual situations to see if they are truly related to the economic recovery program and also to provide assistance when I can to those needing my help.

An interesting note to my findings is that half of those people who said they were adversely affected by the recent economic program also said that President Reagan's program for economic recovery should be given a chance to work, as did 71.8 percent of all those who answered the questionnaire.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming response to my questionnaire is further proof that the people of Pinellas County are among the most informed citizens in our Nation, and I want to publicly thank each of the more than 42,000 people who responded to the poll as well as my constituents who helped me tally the results. Since I believe the results of my questionnaire reflect the attitude of Americans throughout our country, I am including the results of my poll in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No opinion	Percent
1. Would you support a constitutional amendment to require a balanced Federal budget?	28,218	70.4	9,238	23.1	2,618	6.5
2. To help balance the budget, would you support increased taxes?	15,994	38.7	23,040	55.7	2,341	5.7
3. Some have suggested an increased gas tax to be used to either help reduce the deficit or accelerate highway construction and maintenance. Would you support such a tax?	16,090	39.1	22,995	56.0	1,993	4.9
4. Would you support increased taxes on cigarettes and liquor?	32,280	76.5	9,091	21.6	831	1.9
5. Would you support reductions in spending for social programs?	28,065	66.7	12,276	29.2	1,767	4.2
6. Would you support reductions in national defense programs?	21,244	51.5	17,925	43.5	2,054	5.0
7. Would you support limiting or delaying the annual cost-of-living increase for social security and other retirement programs?	19,235	47.9	19,721	49.1	1,187	3.0
8. Would you support reductions in foreign aid programs?	36,554	87.4	4,366	10.4	914	2.2
9. Have you personally been adversely affected by the President's "Program For Economic Recovery"?	13,153	32.8	25,268	63.0	1,685	4.2
10. Would you support the statement, "Give the President's economic program a chance to work?"	29,001	71.8	9,292	23.0	2,113	5.2

SOUTH BAY OBSERVES JEWISH EDUCATION DAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 27, 1982, the South Bay will observe "Jewish Education Day." This will be a time when the entire Long Beach-South Bay community will be able to get acquainted with the Jewish community and, in particular, the Jewish educational facilities available in the area.

Chabad of South Bay, a nonprofit education organization dedicated to preserving and increasing the progressive knowledge and development of the Jewish heritage and traditions, and the Spectrum Chemical Manufacturing Corp., of Gardena, Calif., are sponsoring the all-day program.

Of especial interest and importance to the community is the ground breaking and dedication of the new "Paul and Rodica Burg Jewish Learning Center." This modern and progressive educational facility will be completed in mid-September. It will provide the South Bay with a center where young and old can learn together. We can be proud that our community will have such an excellent learning center. I especially want to commend Rabbi Hecht, the director of Chabad of South Bay, and Mr. Paul Burg, the

president of Spectrum Chemical Manufacturing Corp., for their dedication to the Jewish community. Their efforts are appreciated by us all in the South Bay area.●

THE RETIREMENT OF COL. THOMAS S. SMITH

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 of this year, the State of Maryland will lose one of its most outstanding law enforcement officers, Col. Thomas S. Smith, superintendent of the Maryland State Police.

Maryland has been ably served by Colonel Smith's leadership since his appointment in 1970 to superintendent by then Gov. Marvin Mandel. Colonel Smith has the distinction of having been the first career trooper in the State to attain the rank of superintendent. He began service as a trooper in December 1940. Two years later, he joined the investigation and identification bureau as a criminal investigator.

One of the highlights of his 42-year career was his appointment to the U.S. Senate's Kefauver Committee on Organized Crime in 1951. His outstanding work in attempting to rid the State of organized crime resulted in promotion to captain and commander of a special State Police intelligence unit in 1962. Three years later, he was to become major in charge of the investigation and intelligence divisions. At the time of his appointment to superintendent by the Governor, he was completing his second year as lieutenant colonel and chief of operations, heading up all Maryland State Police field forces.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Smith has contributed exceptional talents to the people of Maryland and the State Police as its superintendent. Projects he has been involved with include the creation of a special narcotics strike force, upgrading of the State Police crime laboratory, and coordination of "sting" operations with Federal authorities.

The State of Maryland has a very fine "Medevac" team—State Police helicopters which provide emergency evacuation of critically injured persons to the shock trauma unit at Baltimore's University Hospital. This, too, was an effort spearheaded by Colonel Smith, serving as one of his first major projects upon investiture as superintendent. Two very special elite corps in the police were established during his tenure—the hostage negotiation unit and the special tactic assault team.

The State of Maryland has seen 100 fewer traffic fatalities this year as compared to the same period last year,

thanks to the colonel's direction of a special statewide crackdown on drunk driving. This is a fine example of how Colonel Smith combined his concern for the well-being of the community with the abilities and expertise of the State Police force.

Although we in the State of Maryland will sorely miss the exemplary work that Colonel Smith performed for the State, we wish him well. As he completes his 42d year of outstanding service, we know that Colonel Smith and his wife, Ginnie, will enjoy this most deserved retirement. ●

A STEP TOWARD ENDING THE NUCLEAR ARMS THREAT

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1982

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today the House Foreign Affairs Committee took a significant step toward the global peace by adopting the Bingham amendment calling on the world's nuclear powers to pursue a "complete halt to the nuclear arms race."

As a member of the committee and cosponsor of the resolution, I was pleased to cast my vote in favor of the resolution and will actively support its adoption on the House floor.

The resolution calls for a mutual, verifiable freeze and negotiated reductions as the best way to manifest our concerns about the impending threat of nuclear holocaust.

Specifically, the new Bingham resolution states:

That the United States and the Soviet Union should immediately begin the strategic arms reduction talks (START) and that these talks should have the following objectives:

- (1) Pursuing a complete halt to the nuclear arms race;
- (2) Deciding when and how to achieve a mutual verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and further deployment of warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems;
- (3) Giving special attention to destabilizing weapons whose deployment would make such a freeze more difficult to achieve;
- (4) Proceeding from this mutual and verifiable freeze, pursuing substantial, equitable, and verifiable reductions through numerical ceilings, annual percentages, or any other equally effective and verifiable means of strengthening strategic stability;
- (5) Preserving present limitations and controls on current nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems;
- (6) Incorporating ongoing negotiations in Geneva on land-based, intermediate-range nuclear missiles into the START negotiations.

The resolution may not have the force of law, but I believe it will help promote the earnest negotiations which are the only means of restricting and reducing burgeoning nuclear stockpiles.

No one can really estimate exactly who is ahead in the nuclear arms race,

yet it appears there is a rough equivalence between the super powers, each with a destructive capability to annihilate the other side. The United States has the edge in warheads, accuracy, and, I believe, in invulnerable counter-strike weapons—for example, nuclear submarines—the Soviets have larger missiles and more megatons.

But all the talk about megatons, throw-weights, and missiles obscures the basic object of our nuclear force—to deter nuclear war.

The only alleged justification for nuclear weapons is to prevent their use by the other side. The administration has consistently used this rationale to promote the buildup of our nuclear capability while it pursues the destabilizing and dangerous path of nuclear superiority. As Senator MARK HATFIELD said, "Striving for nuclear superiority is a fraud that has led this Nation to the edge of an abyss. * * * The Apocalypse is upon us."

Rough equivalence is sufficient; there is nothing to be gained from an attempt to match or exceed the Soviet missile for missile, megaton for megaton.

Once we have an adequate nuclear deterrent force, anything more wastes tax dollars, undermines stability and leads to another senseless round in the arms race. In the words of Winston Churchill, additional nuclear overkill would "only make the rubble bounce," in the event of nuclear war.

A former U.S. President and four-star general, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who understood something about security, said that "money spent for bombs where people are hungry is a threat to national security."

We also cannot ignore the enormous cost of supporting a nuclear arms program at a time when deficit spending is keeping interest rates high and inhibiting economic recovery. Whether it is an MX, missile silos, Trident submarines, or strategic bombers, the arms race is expensive. Incredibly, excluding social security and interest on the Federal debt, military spending comprised fully 50 percent of the President Reagan's original 1983 budget.

In backward logic of strategic nuclear weapons, more is not better. If we move ahead with the new generation of nuclear weapons—the MX, B-1, Pershing missile, and so forth—we will spend hundreds of billions of dollars and, ironically, be less secure than we are today.

Arms control negotiations are the only way to halt this madness. House Joint Resolution 521 is the best way to stimulate meaningful negotiations.

Finally, the movement behind the nuclear freeze and reduction proposal is the product of the public's cry for Congress and our Government to do something about the arms race. In local communities across the Nation,

people are saying that enough is enough. They have come to the realistic view that the problem of the arms race is not who is ahead of whom is a particular weapons system; the problem with the arms race is the arms race.

The support for the freeze movement is truly impressive. To date 385 communities in New England and 125 city councils around the country have adopted resolutions. In Washington, the State capital, Olympia, has voted to place a nuclear freeze measure on the ballot and the referendum is being considered by other communities as well.

Congress would be negligent if it did not hear this outpouring of public concern and sentiment. The time has come for us to act. House Joint Resolution 521, which is printed below, is a timely and important expression of the House of Representatives.

H.J. Res. 521

Joint resolution calling for a mutual and verifiable freeze on the reductions in nuclear weapons and for approval of the SALT II agreement

Whereas the greatest challenge facing the Earth is to prevent the occurrence of nuclear war by accident or design:

Whereas the increasing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems by both the United States and the Soviet Union have not strengthened international peace and security but in fact enhance the prospect for mutual destruction:

Whereas on May 9, 1982, President Reagan announced that he had written to Soviet President Brezhnev to propose negotiations to achieve an agreement that significantly reduces the number of nuclear weapons, enhances stability, and opens the way to even more far-reaching steps in the future:

Whereas the SALT II agreement mandates the prompt reduction of Soviet strategic forces by 254 deployable strategic nuclear delivery vehicles; imposes significant restrictions on Soviet multiple-warhead deployable intercontinental ballistic missiles, and on warheads for these missiles, in terms of numbers and throw-weight; prohibits equipment for rapid reload of intercontinental ballistic missile silos; and in these and other verifiable respects improves the ability of the United States strategic forces to carry out their deterrent mission:

Whereas the United States and the Soviet Union have observed the SALT II agreement since its signing:

Whereas adequate verification of compliance has always been an indispensable part of any international arms control agreement, and

Whereas a mutual and verifiable freeze followed by reductions in nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems would greatly reduce the risk of nuclear war; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the United States and the Soviet Union should immediately begin the strategic arms reduction talks (START) and those talks should have the following objectives:

- (1) Pursuing a complete halt to the nuclear arms race.

(2) Deciding when and how to achieve a mutual verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and further deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems.

(3) Giving special attention to destabilizing weapons whose deployment would make such a freeze more difficult to achieve.

(4) Proceeding from this mutual and verifiable freeze, pursuing substantial, equitable, and verifiable reductions through numerical ceilings, annual percentages, or any other equally effective and verifiable means of strengthening strategic stability.

(5) Preserving present limitations and controls on current nuclear weapons and nuclear delivery systems.

(6) Incorporating ongoing negotiations in Geneva on land-based intermediate-range nuclear missiles into the START negotiations.

In those negotiations, the United States shall make every effort to reach a common position with our North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies on any element of an agreement which would be inconsistent with existing United States commitments to those allies.

SEC. 2. The United States shall promptly approve the SALT II agreement provided adequate verification capabilities are maintained.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

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

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

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

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 24, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 25

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Con-

gressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.

2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Security and Terrorism Subcommittee

To continue hearings to review U.S. Attorney General's guidelines on domestic security investigations.

2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.

2221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 28

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to resume consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.

2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of Arthur J. Dellinger, Sr., of California, to be Deputy Inspector General of the Department of Energy.

3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

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

2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.

2221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 29

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the national materials and minerals program plan and report to Congress issued by the President on April 5, 1982.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Con-

gressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.

2221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider the nominations of William L. Earl, of Florida, Harold R. DeMoss, Jr., of Texas, Clarence V. McKee, of the District of Columbia, Howard H. Dana, Jr., of Maine, William J. Olson, of Virginia, George E. Paras, of California, Robert S. Stubbs II, of Georgia, William F. Harvey, of Indiana, and Annie L. Slaughter, of Missouri, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on S. 1482, providing a procedure for determining whether a plan for the Federal Government to participate in an international exposition should include construction of a Federal pavillion.

4221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the use of competition in the procurement process of the Department of Defense.

3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

2228 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider the nominations of Robert J. Hughes, of Massachusetts, to be an Associate Director of the International Communication Agency, James B. Burnham, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and George Q. Lumsden, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates, S. Con. Res. 93, urging the Government of the Soviet Union to facilitate the emigration of certain Soviet citizens, proposed Convention with Mexico for the Recovery and Return of Stolen or Embezzled Vehicles and Aircraft (Treaty Doc. No. 97-18), and other pending calendar business.

4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on El Salvador.

1114 Dirksen Building

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.

2221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 30

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2631, creating a uniform Federal product liability law.
235 Russell Building

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.
2221 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider the nominations of Joan D. Aikens, of Pennsylvania, Lee Ann Elliott, of Illinois, and Danny Lee McDonald, of Oklahoma, each to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission, and a proposed resolution of regulations and/or rules changes needed to implement television and/or radio coverage of the Senate.
301 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on indirect cost and contract provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (P.L. 93-638).
5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To hold hearings on the Boulder decision, relating to potential antitrust liabilities for local governments.
2228 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to examine certain health care services provided to older veterans.
412 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.
2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

JULY 1

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 2631, creating a uniform Federal product liability law.
235 Russell Building

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth rec-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.
2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on S. 1853, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for Radio Broadcasting to Cuba, Incorporated.
4221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2325, authorizing funds for Federal vocational and adult education programs, and to provide for State and local occupational assistance programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.
2221 Dirksen Building

JULY 2

9:30 a.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.
2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Finance

Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed legislation to meet reconciliation expenditures as imposed by S. Con. Res. 92, setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority for fiscal years 1983, 1984, and 1985, and revising the Congressional budget for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982.
2221 Dirksen Building

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2378, increasing the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans, increasing the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children of veterans, discontinuing duplicative payments to certain veterans, increasing the level of disability required for the payment of dependent's allowances, and providing for cost-saving improvements in veterans' programs.
412 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1795, providing for the transfer of certain lands in Ari-

zona between the Hopi and Navajo Indian Tribes.
457 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings in open and closed session to examine political, economic, and military interest in Southeast Asia.
S-116, Capitol

JULY 14

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 2204, promoting interstate commerce by prohibiting discrimination in the writing and selling of insurance contracts.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2294, providing for the settlement of certain land claims of the Chitimacha Indian Tribe of Louisiana.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings to review employee assistance programs for alcohol and drug abuse problems.
4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 15

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Investigations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review Federal and State expenditures for the purchase of vaccines for children.
4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1541, amending the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) by simplifying both reporting and disclosure requirements, and the process for employers to provide retirement income to employees, and providing incentives for employers to provide pension benefits to employees.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee
Business meeting, to continue markup of S. 1541, amending the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) by simplifying both reporting and disclosure requirements, and the process for employers to provide retirement income to employees, and

providing incentives for employers to provide pension benefits to employees.
4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on H.R. 3731, relating to the use of distribution of certain judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the U.S. Court of Claims.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation revising certain provisions of the Clean Water Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

JULY 22

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2500, reducing conflicts in the licensing of hydroelectric powerplants and expediting the development of and simplifying the regulation of hydroelectric powerplants.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation revising certain provisions of the Clean Water Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on America's role in the world coal export market, focusing on foreign coal ports and the international transportation of coal.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings to discuss alternative means of providing legal services to the poor.
4232 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation clarifying certain U.S. Code provisions

relating to veterans' employment programs.
412 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2153, providing for the distribution of funds awarded the confederated tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in Oregon by the Indian Claims Commission.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation revising certain provisions of the Clean Water Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2131, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

JULY 29

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To resume hearings on America's role in the world coal export market, focusing on the condition of U.S. coal ports.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation revising certain provisions of the Clean Water Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 4

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1405, proposed Carl Albert Congressional Research and Studies Center Endowment Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 5

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the effects of alcohol and drugs on individuals while driving.
4232 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 11

9:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1652, restoring certain lands in Arizona to the Colorado River Indian Reservation to be held in trust by the U.S., S. 2418, permitting the Twentynine Palms Band of Luisena Mission Indians to lease certain trust lands for 99 years, S. 1799 and H.R. 4364, bills providing for the transfer of certain land in Pima County, Arizona to the Pascua Yaqui Indian Tribe, and the substance of H.R. 5916, providing for certain Federal lands to be held in trust for the Ramah Band of the Navajo Indian Tribe.
6226 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 12

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 2378, proposed Veterans' Disability Compensation and Survivors' Benefits Amendments, and proposed legislation clarifying certain U.S. Code provisions relating to veterans' employment programs.
412 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 21

10:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive American Legion legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.
318 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 24

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Agency Administration Subcommittee
Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 1775, making the Federal Government liable for tort claims and generally the exclusive defendant in all tort suits involving Government employees acting within the scope of their employment.
457 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building