

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SPECIAL WARFARE ASSAULT CRAFT AND FORCES: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, special warfare units of the United Kingdom played a crucial role in the British success in the Falklands. Since Vietnam, our own special warfare units have been reduced and little notice has been given to them, except for a brief flare of publicity over the ill-fated rescue attempt in Iran. David Fitzgerald, himself a former SEAL, has written an article on special warfare that appeared in *Military Technology* magazine for May 1982. In my view, this type of warfare needs more attention from our military leaders, and Mr. Fitzgerald's article provides a good forum for discussion of the naval aspects of special warfare. The article follows:

SPECIAL WARFARE ASSAULT CRAFT AND FORCES: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE  
(By David Fitzgerald)

(America's war in Vietnam has increasingly been a topic for analysis among those scholars and analysts who are attempting to draw some conclusion from that unfortunate experience for future U.S. military operations, both with respect to strategy and tactics. Most of the military analysis to date has focused on the large issues such as the effectiveness of the pacification programs, the costs and benefits of Vietnamization or the utility of the bombing campaign in the north.)

Unaddressed as yet, however, have been some special military issues, one of which was dramatized by Francis Ford Coppola in "Apocalypse Now," an updated rendition of Joseph Conrad's classic *Heart of Darkness*, that is riverine warfare and special operations. While perhaps a sideshow of the major conflict, the U.S. devoted significant assets to controlling the Mekong River with somewhat greater success than in other areas of the war.

The American experience with riverine warfare in Vietnam is not so important as an aspect of that war, but it does hold some significance in that it would well reflect an important dimension of naval warfare in the future. Although the British fleet has been dispatched to the Falkland Islands in a naval exercise reminiscent of traditional naval missions, the British effort in the South Atlantic could well be the exception to the rule in the future. If, as seems likely, the majority of conflicts witnessed by the world during the next decade will be in those of irregular warfare and in areas of the globe defined as the Third World. Large scale naval encounters of the World War II variety, let alone Trafalgar, will not occur. The most likely will be the use of smaller, unconventional naval forces in specialized

roles. During the last decade, technology has combined with geopolitical change, such as a new law of the sea regime, to propel a proliferation of missile-armed fast patrol craft around the globe. For the most part, these vessels are used for routine patrol activities. In some cases, however, small naval craft are being developed for specialized tasks that, in some military confrontations in the Third World especially, could spell the difference between naval success and failure. It is this Special Warfare and its implications for naval technology that the remainder of this essay is addressed.

Special Warfare is a limited, but dangerous, activity. Those trained for Naval Special Warfare are highly motivated and prepared for unconventional military actions in and near hostile waters to reconnoiter and clear beaches, blow up bridges, attach mines by swimmer attack to docked ships in enemy areas, and generally conduct direct highly sensitive missions against an unsuspecting enemy. Most usually they are organized into underwater demolition teams as frogmen or, in the U.S. case at least, into SEAL (Sea-Air-Land) Teams.

It is important to understand what Special Warfare is not. By Special Warfare, one is not referring to amphibious assault, the capability for forcible entry into hostile areas from the sea by large numbers of marines. Amphibious assault remains an important naval mission and an amphibious capability is a vital component for any navy seeking the ability to project power. It differs from Special Warfare, however, in that the goal of an amphibious assault is often the direct defeat of enemy forces whereas the goal of Special Warfare differs significantly. Special Warfare is often designed to have an indirect impact by disrupting the enemy's ability to conduct military operations through attacks on his logistical pipeline and political and military infrastructure. Amphibious assault is frequently straightforward; Special Warfare often uses deception and capitalizes on unique intelligence, equipment, and experienced personnel. The difference can be seen in alternative plans that have been put forward for the British recapture of the Falkland Islands. Some have suggested an over-the-beach assault by British marines to defeat entrenched Argentine troops. Others have suggested first inserting special commando squads of royal marines at night which could engage in special operations to disrupt Argentine capabilities prior to a British assault.

Special Warfare must also be distinguished from the new tasks imposed on maritime forces as a consequence of the changing maritime environment flowing from the establishment of 12-mile territorial waters, 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zones and so on. Many countries of the world have procured or are procuring a variety of small attack craft to protect their newly found maritime resources from encroachment. There is also concern in some countries, especially in the Third World, that they need some capability to protect themselves against power projection by superpower navies or neighbors with relatively strong naval capabilities. Consequently, the small craft that are being procured are often

equipped with a relatively significant destructive capability in their surface-to-surface missiles. These craft, however, are not usually conceived to be employed in the rather specialized tasks associated with Special Warfare.

The number of navies that actually design or can adapt vessels for Special Warfare is actually quite small. Not surprisingly, they are navies of nations with considerable naval capabilities across the board, that are concerned with the projection of naval power, and/or that have the industrial resources that can be devoted to such a specialized task.

## THE UNITED STATES

In many ways, the United States has been the leader in conceptualizing the requirements for Special Warfare from the naval perspective. Since its experience in Vietnam, in particular, the U.S. Navy has explored alternatives for the conduct of these specialized tasks.

The American experience has been based in part on its use of the PBR (Patrol Boat River) that was first introduced into Southeast Asia in 1966. Designed for high speed patrol of rivers in hotly contested areas, the PBR was heavily armed and crew areas were given additional protection with ceramic armor. Extremely maneuverable, the PBR combined a fiberglass reinforced hull with pump jet propulsion so that it could operate in shallow, debris-filled waters. In order to achieve maximum patrol, guidepost and insertion capabilities the PBR was equipped with engine silencing and limited radar. They were often used to support SEAL Team operations which required a craft for effective insertion and extraction in enemy controlled areas of interest.

The United States built more than 500 PBRs between 1967 and 1973, attesting to its ruggedness, versatility and popularity. Most of the boats were subsequently transferred to South Vietnam with a few sent to Thailand. The Thais continue to use them for duty on the Mekong River. In Vietnam, however, the PBRs, totaling almost 300, are listed as "non-operational."

A second important development by the U.S. Navy was the PB (Patrol Boat) series, the MK I version of which was constructed by Sewart Seacraft of Beswick, Louisiana. The MK III was constructed by Peterson Builders in Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin.

The 65-foot PB was designed to be a high speed weapons platform for naval inshore warfare (NIW) forces. Using a modular design concept, the PB represents an extremely flexible platform that could be used for a number of missions, especially in rivers, harbors and coastal environments, although open sea performance would also not be ruled out. Initial missions for which the craft was designed included patrol, surveillance, interdiction, fire support against targets both ashore and afloat and insertion extraction of NIW units. Future mission capabilities that were considered possible when the craft was designed included ASW and mine-laying, detection of sweeping.

The main deck of the all-aluminum craft was reinforced to provide the capability for these additional tasks once the appropriate hardware systems became available. Other

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

design features worthy of note are the low silhouette, low radar cross section and low acoustic noise levels to avoid detection and reasonable stability in heavy seas that, together with good communication and radar capabilities, allows for all weather, day or night operations. It is interesting to note that in moving from the MK I to MK III version, the pilot house was offset to starboard to provide additional space for weapons on the port side, thereby further enhancing the craft's flexibility.

A third vessel produced by the United States with applicability in Special Warfare operations is the MINI Armored Troop Carrier (ATC). As the PB, the MINI is constructed of an all-aluminum hull with a low silhouette for difficult detection (made even more so by the craft's extreme quiet). As the earlier PBR, it is equipped with ceramic armor and pump jet propulsion. In addition to making the ACT effective in shallow waters laden with debris, the propulsion system also allows for effective beaching operations. This is especially important for the MINI since it is designed to transport 15 combat equipped troops. It could also carry frogmen swimmers or SEALs, or, in lieu of troops, 4400 pounds of cargo.

Like the PB and PBR, the MINI's mission is high speed patrol and interdiction in rivers, harbors and protected coastal areas. Its unique feature, obviously, is an assault capability for these restricted areas. The MINI would likely be less than totally effective in a traditional amphibious assault operation given its small size (36 feet, 15 tons displacement). In restricted environments, however, it could well fill an important need for the U.S. Navy, which currently has 22 ATCs in its inventory.

The newest American vessel contributing to the naval dimension of special warfare is the SEAFOX, developed after the Chief of Naval Operations advised in 1975 of the need for a craft especially for Special Warfare missions. Specifications that developed following the CNO's statement defined requirements for a craft that was to be small and light so as to be air-transportable, liftable by standard Navy davits and transportable over highways on its own trailer. At the same time, it had to be large enough to carry at least 10 frogmen or SEALs with their equipment, carry sufficient fuel for an endurance of 200 nautical miles at speeds in excess of 30 knots and be equipped with a wide range of electronics including radar, a variety of communications equipment, IFF, depth sounders and ESM. Additional requirements were the ability to operate at high speeds in sea state 3 and low detectability (that translates into low heat signature and radar signature as well as quiet engines).

SEAFOX, the first of which was undergoing final testing in late 1981, has yet to prove conclusively that it can meet these rigorous requirements. Nevertheless, it can meet its design reflects a variety of unique features making it especially suited to special warfare needs. Among these are the craft's dark grey finish to decrease detectability at night, a tailgate for frogmen egressing the stern when the craft is moving at high speeds, and easily folding canopies and removable hinged masts to facilitate transportability. The craft's size (36 feet, 13 ton displacement) should make it transportable by air.

SEAFOX has chalked up several "firsts" in its development. Among these are the fact that, in addition to being air-transportable, SEAFOX is the first naval craft to

apply an IFF system developed for aircraft, to use the latest DOD standard secure voice system and to install a new series of high reliability General Motors engines.

The SEAFOX represents the first major development in the area of light naval forces that could be applied to Special Warfare since 1976-1977 when the Navy phased out its other small craft, such as Assault Support Patrol Boats and Swimmer Support Craft. Clearly, the Navy does not apply to the development of this kind of capability as high a priority as it does to other missions.

Some critics contend that this position reflects an attitude held more generally throughout the services that Special Warfare is not receiving the attention it deserves since effective capabilities can be developed in areas of Special Warfare at limited costs. They argue that these capabilities could be particularly effective in Third World contingencies in which the conflict situation is often ambiguous and military confrontation likely to be limited in scope. Some key Reagan administration officials appear set on revitalizing Naval Special Warfare forces including Navy Secretary John Lehman. With the exception of Vietnam, the United States has yet to experience such a situation directly, with the exception of the hostage crisis in Iran in which naval power was rendered irrelevant. Nevertheless, the Falkland Islands crisis demonstrates that such contingencies could arise. In such a situation, the SEAFOX could prove to be a valuable addition to the American inventory.

#### THE SOVIET UNION

The Soviet Union has emerged during the last 15 years as a blue water Navy, prior to which its primary function was protection of the homeland and surrounding seas. As a consequence, the Soviet Union has not provided great evidence of paying great attention to the naval dimension of Special Warfare. However, they do understand the effectiveness and economy of highly trained naval KGB personnel who carry out sabotage and political operations. They often utilize the traditional means of covertly entering and leaving a target country. Within their inventory they do have some classes of vessels that could be used in support of special operations roles.

One such class is the ZHUK coastal patrol craft. First seen in 1976, these craft, of which 30 are in service in the Soviet Union, are manned primarily by the KGB. At 60 tons displacement, the ZHUK class is rather large for special warfare operations, although it is large enough for a complement of 17 men, but probably fewer if fully equipped. Nor is the ZHUK class designed for the insertion/extraction mission, although with two 14.5 mm guns and a 12.7 mm gun it has some armament for the interdiction role. The ZHUK has been a popular export item for Moscow which has sent it to at least 10 countries since 1976. These include Angola, Cuba, Iraq, Vietnam and both North and South Yemen among others.

Another Soviet light vessel that might be mentioned is the SHMEL class river patrol craft. Built between 1967 and 1974, the SHMEL class boats measure 92 feet and displace 80 tons fully laden. They are attached to the Black Sea and Pacific Fleets for riverine operations on the Danube, Amur and Ussuri Rivers. They are also part of the Soviet Navy's flotilla in the Caspian Sea.

Most of the other naval vessels of the Soviet Union usually classed as light forces

are well over 100 tons displacement, demonstrating that the Soviet Union defines its light forces more for the traditional role of coastal protection than any kind of Special Warfare role. The widespread distribution of the ZHUK class patrol boats around the world and the experience with the SHMEL suggests that in the future the Soviet Union could move in that direction, if only to fill out its naval capabilities.

Little is known about the Soviet irregular swimmer forces. However, training is thought to be comparable with that of their U.S. counterparts. Moscow appears particularly interested in this type of investment as they reportedly employ more than 200,000 military personnel in their Special Purpose forces under the KGB.

#### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Chinese experience has been similar to that of the Soviet Union's in that it has concentrated on the development of light naval forces. Unlike the Soviet Union, however, it has not enjoyed the resources to allow major expansion into blue water regions. Consequently, the Chinese Navy has perhaps the largest force of light craft in the world, operating almost 20 different classes of light vessels for fast attack coastal and river patrol. As with the Soviet Union, however, none were designed specifically for the specialized missions associated with Special Warfare. The four major classes of ships designed for riverine duties were built in the 1950's and 1960's and some are soon to be removed from service.

Over one third of the Peoples Republic of China's light craft are various types of the SHANGHAI class patrol boat. A conventional general purpose craft, the SHANGHAI class vessels are mainly intended for coastal patrol work. With combinations of 37 mm, 25 mm and 57 mm guns depending on the type, they carry a powerful complement of light weapons. Whether they could be used for Special Warfare missions beyond interdiction and fire against some select targets afloat or on shore remains an open question. The Chinese are known to have a frogman team which could be supported by various types of boats in the Chinese inventory depending upon the particular coastal mission.

#### ISRAEL

Given its unique military requirements and innovative strategy, it should not be surprising that Israel has produced a system that exhibits characteristics adaptable to Special Warfare missions. The DABUR class is a small (65 feet, 35 ton displacement) coastal patrol craft with an aluminum hull. Initially, twelve of the craft were built in the United States and the balance of the 37 now in service were produced by the RAMTA division of the Israeli Aircraft Industries. Deployed in both the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, the DABUR class boats have been praised for their good rough weather performance and the flexibility in armaments of which there are several variations. The DABUR can carry two 20 mm. guns or twin machine guns. It can also be equipped with two launchers for MK. 48 torpedoes or depth charges. Some reports also indicate that the vessel will be equipped with GABRIEL surface-to-surface missiles.

A particularly interesting feature of the DABUR class system is that it has been designed for overland transport, suggesting a flexibility in employment that dovetails with Israel's emphasis on exploiting the maximum from limited resources.



It should be noted that in 1978 Israel transferred 4 DABUR class vessels to Argentina. Israel has also been developing a somewhat larger version of the class and armed it with GABRIEL missiles. This DVORA class boat is 71 feet and 47 tons displacement. While it represents the smallest missile craft built thus far, its larger size and standard armaments limits its flexibility and potential for use in Special Warfare roles. Israeli special swimmer forces are an elite group of highly trained men who have perfected their warfare.

Special Warfare from the naval perspective is a narrowly defined mission which most navies of the world have little call to seek. As a consequence, few naval platforms are specifically designed to facilitate the performance of tasks associated with Special Warfare such as small landings in hostile territory of under circumstances intended to surprise the potential adversary. This is not to say that the myriad variety of patrol vessels and fast attack craft now in service with virtually all of the navies in the world could not be used for such missions should specific circumstances dictate the need. Perhaps they could, but unless they are used with great creativity, these vessels will not be as effective as craft, like the SEAFOX, designed specifically for that mission. It should not be surprising that in addition to the United States, which has had the resources to explore exploiting Special Warfare, one country that seems to have given some attention to the possibilities is Israel, a nation that has had to make up in innovative strategy and tactics what it lacks in resources and physical military power. The other is the Soviet Union. Special Warfare has been a neglected realm of military combat in the last decade. Perhaps we could learn a lesson from these two countries. ●

#### SCIENTISTS FROM 36 STATES SEEK ACID RAIN CONTROLS

#### HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD a statement endorsed by 100 scientists from 36 States calling for acid rain controls. Their remarks are timely, particularly in light of the decision by the Commerce Committee to resume work on Clean Air Act legislation.

[News release of the National Wildlife Federation, June 28, 1982]

#### 100 EXPERTS SUPPORT ACID RAIN CONTROLS, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION— POSITION REFUTES ADMINISTRATION POLICY

100 acid rain scientists across the country say there's a need for immediate control of the pollutants that cause acid rain, according to the National Wildlife Federation, a leader in the ongoing debate over congressional reauthorization of the Clean Air Act.

The scientists have endorsed an NWF position statement which concludes that control of acid rain-causing pollutants is called for by existing scientific evidence.

The statement refutes the Reagan administration's stand on acid rain, which claims that further study is necessary before control measures can be designed and implemented.

"Our position statement, endorsed by so many scientists, lends important weight to our contention that most knowledgeable scientists consider the evidence in support of acid rain control to be ample and compelling," said Dr. Jay D. Hair, executive vice president of the NWF.

The NWF mailed the position statement to over 400 acid rain specialists in late May, seeking their endorsement. Ninety-three percent of those responding agreed to publicly identify with the statement. Of those who declined to sign the statement, many claimed to have a governmental affiliation that prevented them from taking a public stand that contradicted their employing agency. Only seven took issue with the statement's premise.

Scientists from the following states endorsed the NWF statement:

Arizona 1	New Hampshire 3
California 5	New Jersey 2
Colorado 3	New Mexico 1
Connecticut 3	New York 12
District of Columbia 1	North Carolina 4
Florida 5	Ohio 3
Georgia 2	Oregon 4
Idaho 2	Pennsylvania 4
Illinois 4	South Carolina 1
Indiana 1	Tennessee 1
Kansas 1	Texas 2
Kentucky 1	Utah 1
Maine 4	Vermont 1
Maryland 3	Virginia 4
Massachusetts 3	Washington 1
Michigan 4	West Virginia 1
Minnesota 3	Wisconsin 2
Mississippi 2	Wyoming 1

#### POSITION STATEMENT ON ACID DEPOSITION

Overwhelming circumstantial evidence indicates that the primary cause of acid precipitation in the eastern United States is fossil fuel emissions of sulfur and nitrogen oxides. As these emission products are transported by wind and air mass movements, they are further oxidized into acidifying compounds and hydrogen ions before falling back to earth in either wet or dry form.

Acid deposition stresses aquatic ecosystems, particularly poorly buffered ones, and can kill sensitive plant and animal populations, either directly or by creating food web imbalances. In addition, acid precipitation promotes the loss of soil nutrients and cations in a manner which may be irreversible. Leaching of ions from soils can be damaging to both the soil and to aquatic organisms. Acid deposition also destroys man-made materials by accelerating metal corrosion, by blistering painted surfaces, by destroying surface cohesion of sandstone and limestone, and by eroding statues and stone structures.

As has been concluded recently by two panels of acid rain specialists, slowing the rate of deterioration of sensitive freshwater ecosystems would require a reduction of 50 percent in deposited hydrogen ions (i.e., an achievement in precipitation pH levels to no lower than 4.6 to 4.7) (NAS, 1981) and a possible even greater reduction in wet sulfate deposition (U.S.-Canada Work Group I, 1982). Although uncertainties regarding the kinetics of atmospheric transformation processes make precise predictions impossible, it can be anticipated that a significant reduction in sulfur and nitrogen oxide emissions will produce significant (although perhaps not directly corresponding) reductions in acid deposition.

Accordingly, a plausible acid rain control strategy should seek to begin reducing emis-

sions of sulfur and nitrogen oxides—especially in the eastern U.S. where most sources and receptors are concentrated—by an amount on the order of 50 percent. Since control of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from new electrical generating plants would be insufficient to accomplish this, restrictions on older plants must be considered.

Although gaps remain in our knowledge of acid precipitation and further research is needed to fill these gaps, we the undersigned scientists believe that what is already known about acid deposition justifies and requires immediate legislative steps to begin abating sulfur and nitrogen oxide emissions, particularly in the eastern half of the United States.

#### SCIENTIST SIGNERS OF ACID DEPOSITION STATEMENT

Professor Quintus Fernando, University of Arizona.

Bruce R. Appel, Group Leader, California Dept. of Health Atmospheric Research.

Professor Robert E. Connick, University of California.

John Harte, Senior Scientist at U.C. Berkeley.

C. Ray Thompson, Biochemist, University of California.

W. Williams, Petaluma, California's Black Apple Institute.

Jill Baron, Bellevue, Colorado.

John Heasley, systems Ecologist, Colorado State University.

Karl Zeller, FC-ERT-LSC, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Meredith Colket, III, Ph.D., United Technologies in Conn.

Thomas G. Siccama, Forest Ecologist, Yale at New Haven, Connecticut.

Hideo Okabe, Chemist, National Bureau of Standards.

Professor Robert S. Braman, University of South Florida.

Professor Patrick L. Brezonick, University of Florida at Gainesville.

Alistair C.D. Leslie, Oceanography, Florida State Univ., at Tallahassee.

Hans W. Rudolph, Project Manager, NASA at Kennedy Space Center, Fla.

Curtis R. Jackson, Assoc. Director, University of Georgia Experiment Stat.

Professor Jack Winnick, Georgia Institute of Tech., at Atlanta.

Prof. Sherry O. Farwell (Chemistry), Univ. of Idaho at Moscow, Idaho.

Karl A. Gebhardt (State Hydrologist), Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho.

Prof. William Buck, University of Ill., Urbana, Ill.

P.T. Cunningham, Chemical Engineering Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Illinois.

H. Sievering, Ph.D., Rickton Park, Ill.

John Stockham, Manager Fine Part. Res., 11T Research Institute at Chicago, Ill.

Orie Loucks, Science Director, The Institute of Ecology, Indianapolis, Ind.

Thomas W. Lester, Assoc. Professor, Kansas State Univ., Dept. of Nuclear Eng., Manhattan, Kansas.

Hugh T. Spencer, Sc.D., Professor of Env. Eng., Univ. of Louisville.

Samuel S. Butcher, Bowdoin College.

Ass't Prof. Chris. Cronan, University of Maine at Orono.

Professor Ronald B. Davis, University of Maine at Orono.

Stephen A. Norton, Chairman of Geographical Sciences, University of Maine at Orono.

Prof. John W. Winchester, Florida State University Oceanography Dept., Tallahassee, Florida.

Robert D. Conkright, Maryland Geological Survey at Baltimore.

Dr. Fred Davis, Meteorologist, National Weather Service, Baltimore, Maryland.

Charles L. Mulchi, Associate Prof., Univ. of Maryland Agronomy Dept., College Park, Maryland.

Lyle E. Craker, Assoc. Prof., UMASS at Amherst.

Professor William A. Feder, Univ. of Mass. at Waltham.

Professor Michael B. McElroy, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Paul O. Fromm, Phytology Dept., Michigan State Univ.

Prof. Stephen G. Shetron, Michigan Technological Univ., L'Anse-au-Loup, Michigan.

Douglas G. Sprugel (Ass't Prof.), Forestry Dept., Michigan State Univ.

Donald H. Stedman (Assoc. Prof.), Univ. of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

Steven J. Eisenreich (Assoc. Prof.), Univ. of Minn. at Minneapolis.

Kenneth E. F. Hokanson, Res. Biologist, U.S.E.P.A. at Monticello, Minnesota.

Prof. James A. Zischke (Biology), St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota.

Prof. C.H. Kuo (Chemical Engineering), Mississippi State University.

William M. Vaughan, Vice-President, Environmental Measurements, Inc., University City, Miss.

Prof. Noye Johnson, Geo. Dept., Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Charles F. Thoits, Chief, Inland Fisheries, New Hampshire Fish and Game, Concord, New Hampshire.

Prof. Ida Leon, Dept. of Plant Path., Cook College at New Brunswick, N.J.

Nathan M. Reiss, Dept. of Meteorology, Rutgers at New Brunswick, N.J.

John Trijonis, President, Sante Fe Research Corp., New Mex.

James K. Edzwald, Assoc. Prof. at Clarkson College, Potsdam, New York.

Michael Coughenour, Syracuse University, New York.

John E. Gannon, Assoc. Director, SUNY at Oswego, New York Res. Center.

Ronald J. Hall, Reserach Scientist, Cornell Univ. at Ithaca, New York.

George R. Hendrey, Environmental Sciences Groups, Brookhaven Nat'l Lab, Upton, N.Y.

Prof. Gene Likens, Cornell Univ. Ithaca, New York.

Richard H. Mandl, Assoc. Env. Biol., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Dudley Raynal, Assoc. Prof., SUNY at Syracuse, New York.

Roy A. Schroeder, U.S. Geological Survey, Albany, New York.

Roger L. Tanner, Chemist, Brookhaven Nat'l Lab., New York.

Professor Dwight A. Webster, Cornell University at Ithaca, N.Y.

Roy T. Gorman, Env. Scientist, Raleigh, N.C.

Prof. Parker C. Reist, Univ. of N.C. at Chapel Hill.

Hugo H. Rogers, Assoc. Prof., N.C. State University at Raleigh.

Robert S. Wright, Env. Scien., Research Triangle Inst., Research Triangle Park, N.C.

Dean Patrick Dugan, Biological Sciences at Ohio St., Columbus, Ohio.

Professor David Nielson, Ohio Ag. Research Center, Wooster, Ohio.

William D. Ross, Monsanto Corp., Dayton, Ohio.

Ruth Fredricksen, USDA Forest Service, Corvallis, Oregon.

Arthur McKee, Instructor, Oregon State University, Blue River, Oregon.

James Pankow, Ass't Prof., Oregon Grad. Center, Beaverton, Ore.

Danny L. Rambo, Northrop Services, Inc., Corvallis, Oregon.

L. R. Archmoody, Northeastern Forest Exp. Stat., Warren, Pa.

Dr. John M. Skelly, Head, Penn. St. Plant Path. Dept.

Professor David Dewalle, Penn State Univ.

William F. Sharpe, Penn State Univ.

Prof. Ulysees S. Jones, Clemson University, Clemson, S.C.

Raymond C. Matthews, National Park Service, Gatlinburg, Tenn.

Dr. A. Rachel Laird, New Braunfels, Texas.

Ronald Matthews, Assistant Prof., University of TX, at Austin.

Prof. Gene L. Wooldridge, Utah State Univ. at Logan, Utah.

Prof. Richard Klein, University of Vermont at Burlington.

James Galloway, University of V.A. at Charlottesville.

Dale A. Furlong, V-P, ETS, Inc., Roanoke, Va.

Prof. J. L. Hudson, Chair, Dept. of Engineering, U.V.A., Charlottesville, Va.

Fred Ordway, Vice-President, Artech Corp., Falls Church, Va.

Halstead Harrison, Assoc. Prof., Univ. of Wash., at Seattle.

Anthony C. Tomkowski, Ass't Prof., West Va. University, Morgantown, W. Va.

Prof. T. T. Kozlowski, Biotron Director, Univ. of Wis., at Madison.

Prof. John Howatson, University of Wyoming at Laramie.

Lloyd A. Schairer, Bio. Dept., Brookhaven Nat'l Lab., Upton, New York.

Michael Steinmaus, Muscatine, Iowa.

J. H. Gibson, Ecology Lab, Colorado State at Fort Collins.

Bob Martini, DNR, Rhinelander, Wis.

Thomas B. Sheffy, Chair., Wis. Task Force on Acid Rain, Madison, Wis.●

#### McADORY WILL BE MISSED

#### HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives an editorial that appeared in the Independent Advertiser on Tuesday, July 27, 1982. The article written by the editorial board of the newspaper is a tribute to the late Louis McAdory.

It's difficult to say goodbye to a friend. But yesterday, Chilton County had to say goodbye to a real friend when Louis McAdory, retired air force colonel, was buried.

His obituary is located elsewhere in this edition. It contains the essentials that all obituaries should: his age, date of death, survivors and funeral arrangements. But it says very little about the man who spent his entire life in the service of his country.

For more than 30 years, that span three wars, Col. McAdory fought for his country. He could have retired earlier, but there was still a job to be done and he knew his duty to his country.

After retiring and moving to Chilton County, he began a new career. It was a

career of working long hours for no pay to help make this county a better place to live for everyone.

He worked day and night for the Chilton County Cattlemen's Association and has served the past several years as its president. He served on the state level as vice president of the Cattlemen's Association and has served the past several years as its president. He served on the state level as vice president of the Cattlemen's Association and treasurer of the Alabama Beef Cattle Improvement Association as well as president of the Central Alabama Feeder Calf Association.

He is immediate past president of the Chilton County Chamber of Commerce and was named Man of the Year in 1981 for his untiring efforts to improve the chamber and attract new jobs for the unemployed in this county.

In addition to the many organizations he served, he was willing to take on additional responsibilities when asked, no matter how busy he actually was.

He was a man who lived to serve, expecting nothing in return.

At the time of his death, he had offered his services again to the people of this county.

His hopes of becoming probate judge here were founded on the idea that he could help lead this county unselfishly into a new era where the government took an active, energetic role in attracting new jobs here. A goal that all candidates for that office would do well to adopt.

To say Col. Louis McAdory will be missed is not sufficient. Very few people in the recent history of this county have worked so hard for no pay just because he believed wholeheartedly in paying his civic rent.

He was a man that touched the lives of many thousands of people through his civic work. His efforts will continue to help people here for years to come.

Chilton Countians are fortunate that he chose to make this county his home. And now it is his final resting place. That is only proper for a man who did so much, for so many, for so little in return.

Mr. Speaker, not many people achieve the measure of admiration and respect that Louis McAdory enjoyed. He earned that admiration and respect because he genuinely cared about people and about the welfare of his community.

His life should serve as a memorial to him for all his time in Chilton County, for he truly devoted it to serving the people that he loved and cared for.

It is indeed an honor for me to share this tribute with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. He will be deeply missed by me and all others who were touched by his life.●

#### NEW FEDERALISM

#### HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, homeowners of this country who have been faced with steadily increasing property



taxes are now sitting on a time bomb that is set to go off in the next 2 or 3 years unless we do something about it. The Reagan administration's proposed New Federalism will have the effect of increasing property taxes at the local level by at least 20 to 30 percent.

For 8 years before coming to the Congress, I served as mayor of a suburban community. I know firsthand what the loss of revenue sharing, highway, water and sewer moneys will do to local taxes. I also know what the Federal cuts in education will do to property taxes. These homeowners, who are the providers of most of our tax dollars at both the Federal and State levels, are going to be hit with outrageous and unfair increases.

In 1983, we must move to restore sanity to our tax program and utilize our Federal dollars to help local communities rather than hurt them. The Federal Government does have a role to play and can do it and still lower interest rates and decrease the national deficit. ●

#### A THOUGHT-PROVOKING COMMENTARY ON NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, the Subcommittees on International Economic Policy and Trade and International Security and Scientific Affairs held a hearing on proposals to amend the Nuclear Non-proliferation Act of 1978. Our colleague, the Honorable MARILYN L. BOUQUARD, appeared as a witness at that hearing offering some valuable insights into the issues facing the administrations and this Congress on the subject of nuclear nonproliferation.

I urge my colleagues to consider the thought-provoking comments of Mrs. BOUQUARD.

The statement follows:

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARILYN L. BOUQUARD BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY AND TRADE

Chairman Zablocki and Chairman Bingham, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify before your Subcommittees this first day of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs' hearings to consider amending the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act (NNPA) of 1978.

Undoubtedly, the most visible and controversial problem in the international nuclear power arena is that of weapons proliferation. The international market for trade in nuclear power facilities has become increasingly competitive, and a growing number of nations have active nuclear programs—some signatories of the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and some not. As we are all aware, controversy is particularly wide-

spread over the domestic development and international marketing of sensitive enrichment and reprocessing technologies and the breeder reactor.

The link between civilian nuclear power and nuclear weapons is an inescapable fact of nature because nuclear power reactors simultaneously generate heat, which is converted into electricity, and plutonium. It is this inevitable consequence of civilian nuclear power which causes much concern about proliferation—a concern we all share. In fact, I have just briefly recessed the first of two days of hearings on nuclear safeguards research and development in our Committee on Science and Technology. The Subcommittee on Energy Research and Production, which I chair, is hearing from DOE, ACDA, the Department of State, and NRC on this technology and its implementation.

While the aforementioned link is indeed of legitimate concern, it should be made clear that it is neither inevitable, nor even probable, that a nation's civilian nuclear power program will lead to a nuclear weapons program. Japan and West Germany are but two of a number of nations which have developed peaceful uses of the atom while renouncing all intentions of developing nuclear weapons even though it is clearly within their technical capability. This lack of inevitability of such a route to nuclear weapons development is also reinforced by examining the historical record.

No nation has yet developed nuclear weapons from materials diverted from a civilian nuclear powerplant. From 1945 to today, the 5 weapons states and India exploded nuclear devices while civilian nuclear power went from being nonexistent to well over 140,000 megawatts of capacity in 22 countries. In addition, for each of the five nuclear weapons states, the explosion of their first nuclear weapon preceded the operation of their first prototype commercial powerplant.

The historical record, then, does not suggest a casual relationship between the expansion of civilian nuclear power reactors and the development of nuclear weapons. The reason for this is basic economics. It is relatively simple, and quick to produce and extract nuclear weapons grade materials in small, specialized facilities. Constructing but one civilian nuclear power reactor, however, requires the expenditure of well over \$1 billion as well as a considerable amount of time to nurture and build a complex technological infrastructure.

While the historical record does give us comfort, we must not, of course, allow it to make us overly sanguine concerning the future. Clearly, we all agree that we should do what we can to minimize the risks of proliferation. Where we disagree, of course, is on the methods and techniques which should be employed to minimize these risks.

I have long been on the record as opposing the previous Administration's misguided and bankrupt approach to nuclear energy in general, and to nuclear nonproliferation in particular. President Carter's April 1977 decision to postpone indefinitely the commercial reprocessing of spent fuel in the United States and to propose to stop work on the Nation's breeder reactor at Clinch River has been accurately characterized by the famous French scientist, scholar, and statesman, Dr. Bertrand Goldschmidt, as an "extraordinary and unique act of self-mutilation." As Dr. Goldschmidt points out in his recently published masterpiece on the political history of nuclear energy entitled "The Atomic Complex:" "an already declining American nuclear industry was to become

paralyzed in two key sectors of future development, fuel reprocessing and breeder reactors, precisely the sectors in which the United States was already between 5 and 10 years behind the Soviet Union and western Europe, in particular, France."

The Carter administration's unfortunate approach to nonproliferation was totally counterproductive. It stimulated a proliferation of nuclear suppliers worldwide while simultaneously causing us to lose significant nuclear export business and lessening our ability to influence the nuclear policy of other nations. This message has been reinforced time and time again to me during my discussions with leaders of other nations with active nuclear programs. In particular, I wanted to share with you the comments I received during discussions I participated in during June 1981 with officials in Spain, Denmark, Finland, the United Kingdom, and France. I summarized the major findings and recommendations of my trip report in a letter to President Reagan in July 1981. With your permission I would like to append this letter to my prepared remarks today and briefly note the views of the Spanish and the United Kingdom officials. Spanish officials were left in a state of quiet rage as a result of their treatment by the Carter administration in terms of nuclear nonproliferation policy. They felt that the United States had effectively blackmailed them into adopting retroactive measures with respect to their nuclear program and as a result they went to the Soviet Union and other suppliers for nuclear fuel enrichment services.

United Kingdom officials felt that the Carter nonproliferation policy convinced many nations that they could not rely on the United States. They urged that the United States distinguish between potentially real proliferation offenders and those who wish to pursue civilian nuclear power programs—a position which I wholeheartedly endorse. I believe that if this Nation is to maintain a major leadership role in the nuclear proliferation arena in the years ahead, we must adopt a genuinely selective approach which distinguishes between our friends and real proliferation risks. Cooperation, not denial, should be the main thrust of our nonproliferation policy.

Unfortunately, the NNPA enshrined into law too much of the Carter approach, based on the faulty premise that other nations would remain dependent indefinitely on U.S. nuclear assistance. A nonproliferation strategy emphasizing technology denial which reduces confidence among importing states about access to nuclear materials and services will undoubtedly speed the development abroad of indigenous fuel cycle capabilities, including reprocessing. The NNPA, while well-meaning, is flawed and in need of improvement.

I would like to conclude my remarks with what I propose should be done. As I stated earlier, I believe that the main thrust of our nonproliferation policy should be cooperation, not denial. I would recommend that the NNPA be amended to incorporate this principle by ending its retroactive effect and substituting the presumption that cooperation with the other nations should continue as long as there has been no change in the proliferation risk. I would further recommend that programmatic approvals take the place of case by case exercise of U.S. consent rights regarding transfers of spent fuel. I also believe that we must pursue vigorously the internationalization of reprocessing and waste management to discourage the

further development of indigenous national programs. Further, we must do all we can to strengthen the international safeguards system. Finally, we must as a nation, recognize our obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and vigorously pursue serious strategic arms control negotiations. Moderation of vertical proliferation would aid greatly in our efforts to control horizontal proliferation.

I believe this set of recommendations amounts to a sensible approach. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to express my views.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1981.

The President,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have just returned from an oversight trip during which I had discussions on international energy issues in Spain, Denmark, Finland, the United Kingdom, and France. My particular interest in these discussions was nuclear energy development and, more specifically, the question of U.S. nuclear nonproliferation policy. As you know, I have concluded that the Carter Administration's unfortunate approach to nonproliferation was counterproductive such that it caused a proliferation of nuclear suppliers worldwide and resulted not only in the loss of significant U.S. nuclear export business but also a lessening of the related ability of our country to influence the nuclear policy of other nations.

As you might expect, of the nations we visited those most interested in the prospects for change in U.S. nuclear nonproliferation policy were Spain and the United Kingdom. I carried with me the April letter from Under Secretary Buckley which responded to my own query as to what we could expect in terms of a shift in U.S. policy. I can assure you that Mr. Buckley's statement, "... we plan to support rather than interfere with the nuclear programs of our key allies and to focus our nonproliferation efforts on countries of real proliferation concern," was well received and seemed to provide a basis for some assurance among our friends that the unfortunate policy of recent years will be turned around. I urge you to make a statement on nonproliferation policy at the earliest possible date to begin the process of recovering the reputation of the United States as a reliable supplier with genuine concerns about nuclear weapons control.

I have attached the major nuclear findings and recommendations of my trip report which will be sent to the whole House of Representatives next month.

As you can see, if Europe is a microcosm of such views there is a positive international climate for you to make a policy pronouncement. However, its implementation will require, as the British noted, "extreme statesmanship" on your part.

I would respectfully request the opportunity to discuss these matters in detail with you and I am looking forward to working with, Mr. Buckley, and Mr. Malone in reshaping U.S. policy and its implementation. I hope that the Foreign Affairs Committees in the House and Senate will not use the events of recent weeks as a basis for suggesting an arbitrary and counterproductive tightening of export controls for nuclear shipments to our friends as well as any potential weapons threats. I hope we shall

have the opportunity to achieve a genuinely selective approach which distinguishes between our friends and such real proliferation risks as Pakistan and Iraq.

Sincerely,

MARILYN L. BOUQUARD,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy  
Research and Production. ●

#### REMARKS OF ARIEL MELCHIOR, SR., AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE COLLEGE OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● MR. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Ariel Melchior, the former publisher and owner of the Virgin Island Daily News, made at the recent commencement exercises of the College of the Virgin Islands. Mr. Melchior's remarks review the history and progress of the College of the Virgin Islands from its inception in 1962 as a 2-year college to its full accreditation as a 4-year institution of higher learning.

The College of the Virgin Islands has served as a cornerstone for the education of the young people of the islands, many of whom have gone on to participate in the developing economy of the islands.

Mr. Melchior's words serve as an inspiration to the graduating class of 1982, and I believe, deserve to be brought to my colleagues' attention for a better understanding of the Virgin Islands.

The text of Mr. Melchior's remarks follows:

#### COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY ARIEL MELCHIOR, SR.

Dr. Arthur A. Richards, Acting Governor Henry Millin, Honorable Elmo Roebuck, members of the Board of Trustees, Members of the Faculty and Administrative staff, graduating seniors, their parents, their relatives and all other members of our beloved Virgin Islands community, good evening.

I am deeply honored to have this opportunity to address the 1982 graduating class of the College of the Virgin Islands.

Since it opened its doors in 1963, this college has been a reservoir of hope for young men and women from the Virgin Islands and from across the Caribbean who have come here eager and thirsting for knowledge and academic excellence. The College of the Virgin Islands has met their needs and met them well.

When it began, and the first student walked this campus, the college was only a two year institution. But with expanding programs and increasing numbers of students, it quickly developed into a thorough four year scholastic program. Today, it is one of the premier institutions of its type in the Caribbean and in the nation.

Under the leadership of its first president, Dr. Lawrence Wanlass and its current president, Dr. Arthur A. Richards, the college of

the Virgin Islands has brought disciplined and devoted higher education to these shores. In its brief life, it has made an earnest contribution to our community.

It has been like a fountain, each year providing our community with fresh young minds, possessing new and exciting ideas. It has stood for academic excellence and intellectual honesty and maturity. It has played and will continue to play a most vital and vibrant role here.

The college has provided us with scholars when we most needed them; vision when it was required; and it has served as a cultural center, enriching our lives through theater, concerts and art exhibits.

(Its significance and importance has been recognized by the Congress of the United States. As Dr. Richards mentioned earlier, the college has been identified by federal authorities in Washington as a seat of learning. Young men and women from the Eastern Caribbean will be coming here for cultural, technical, and scientific training. This will be a major step in the life of the college and in the life of the entire Caribbean.)

We have needed this institution, and as we move further into the 1980's, we shall need it, and the quality graduates that it will provide even more.

The role that the College of the Virgin Islands will continue to play will require greater financial support from both the public and private sector.

We must make a greater financial investment in this institution. We must see to it that its monetary resources are increased and that its fiscal future is made more secure. The consequences of failing to do so could have a retarding effect on its growth.

Yes, during the last two decades, we have progressed. Of course, we have had our share of problems, but imagine for just one moment where we might be today without the presence of the College of the Virgin Islands in this community.

Graduates of the class of 1982, today in the Virgin Islands, we stand at a critical point in our development, requiring a choice between irreconcilable courses.

We stand at a political crossroad. We stand at an economic crossroad. We stand at a spiritual crossroad.

Our community is deeply troubled. It is searching for its soul. We seem to be in the midst of chaos and misunderstanding. As a people we are indifferent towards one another and the plights of our neighbors.

As we walk the streets, we can see a look of hopelessness and despair of the faces of many of our young people.

They seem to be without purpose or a reason for living. Some of them have declared that they have little or no faith in this society, their society.

They are our lifeline to the future, but large numbers of them have turned against us. They have become embittered, frustrated, and angry. We must remember that when we look at them, we are looking at ourselves.

They stand at the crossroads with us, side by side. Their fate is interwoven with the very fabric of a society that we cherish, one that we love and one which must endure.

As a community, our fate, a collective fate, is in our own hands and only a common belief in the goodness of our people, and the sacredness of our ideals will keep us from coming apart.

We find people asking themselves, in despair, why should I live through this misery. We find people asking themselves why



should I contribute to a community when so few seem to care.

But we must remember the words of the noted French philosopher, Albert Camus, who once said that the very purpose of life, itself, was to bring about change. And change we must bring about here; not later, but now; not tomorrow, but today; not with complacency, but with compassion and determination.

And even though we stand at a crossroad and our future appears uncertain, we must remember and acknowledge that our very existence we owe to those who came before us, those who shaped this society and to whom we owe a tremendous debt.

Yes, our ancestors before us stood at crossroads. They survived because they had the will to maintain a sense of themselves. They moved forward because they addressed their problems honestly. They endured because they refused to bow to the pressures of a confused society, nor to the greed that temps all men and all women in life.

During the Great Depression, when we stood at what seemed to be the very abyss of life, we pulled together. We pulled together as young and old, we pulled together regardless of race, we pulled together as people—people who had very little in the way of material goods, but who had an abundance of heart and a desire to strengthen and maintain the Virgin Islands. We pulled together then, and because of that effort we are here today.

Some might say that is unfair to the class of 1982 to present them with a society that appears so bleak and where there is little apparent hope. I disagree! There is hope, the future is not bleak. We shall endure, but first we must recognize and understand that we stand at crossroads.

The class of 1982 did not create the myriad of problems that we are faced with today. You are innocent by-standers, who, if you chose to, can walk away from it all, and live lives of relative comfort. But we know that you choose to be concerned.

Let you are misinformed, having a college degree does not mean that this community of which you are a part owes you something. Let me tell you here and now, it owes you nothing! It has provided you with an opportunity to excel in your chosen fields of endeavour, use that opportunity wisely.

Your obligation is to support your alma mater so that others who will follow you will enjoy the same advantages that you enjoy today.

The times that we live in call for young men and women who will confront the dilemmas that face this community. It is most important that you not become part of the problem, but you must become architects of the solutions.

Sitting here today are young men and women, who, if they have the will and vision, will feed the needs that we have. This class will be called upon to share its wealth of information not only with these islands, but with the region and the world.

From this class will come the leaders of tomorrow in science, engineering, medicine, law, art, agronomy, and writing.

From this class must not only come scholars but men and women of high personal integrity with a strong commitment to social justice and respect for law. Keep in mind that every right you enjoy carries with it a corresponding obligation.

To put it frankly, we need you and we need you desperately. And you will find that despite the level of your education, you will need those whom you will serve.

You will need them for moral support, you will need them for spiritual support, you will need them as allies as we all face the crossroads together.

Do not be afraid to go it alone when those around you are pursuing their fantasies. This class must not forsake the righteous cause.

This class must not stand silently on the sidelines of life while the vast majority of the less fortunate of our people are being battered about in their daily struggle to survive in an environment in which the prices of the basic necessities for living are unreasonable and unaffordable.

You must help us in our search for answers. More than one-third of our population lives in substandard and unfit housing.

We will need your expertise in the area of housing development. What we have now is inadequate. The answer, and I think that you will agree with me, is not in high-rise institutionalized apartments, but in sufficient individualized dwellings where people can develop a sense of family and a sense of pride and build their lives around a home they love and cherish.

Additionally, we cannot afford to close our eyes to the fact that there are racial tensions in this community and they are mounting daily.

There is a direct relationship between those tensions and the economic imbalance that exists here. If there is going to be sustained progress, all levels of our society must share in that progress.

Unfortunately, the resources of our growth do not seem to be distributed reasonably. Therein, lies one of the many causes for discontent. It is a situation that we all know exists and to which we should all address ourselves with candor.

Is it any wonder that many of us are confused, bewildered, frustrated and angry, given such a situation. We live in constant fear. People are afraid to walk the streets at night and murders and assaults are committed in broad daylight with impunity.

We have retreated to our homes and our businesses, and even there we are not able to enjoy the safety and comforts that flow from life.

Yes, we are troubled. Yes, the waters are not still. There are divisions between factions, between classes, between races. There are even divisions over ideas and directions. Leadership is lacking. All is not well.

However, this is not a time for us to throw our hands up in the air. It is a time for us to come together and work towards viable and practical solutions.

We must learn to grow our own food, and become self-sustaining. If the state of Israel can grow food in the desert for its own consumption, certainly we can grow food in this land of plentiful green foliage.

The same methods that were used in that hardened desert can be used here. The same type of expertise that was applied there can be applied here. But first we must begin to think in bold terms.

As a community of Islands, we must find new ways to determine our own destiny. We must not allow ourselves to be held hostage to the economic contingencies that we do not control.

There is every reason that we should be looking forward to, and planning for the day when we produce, here, many of the things that we now import.

It is hoped that many of you will decide to serve in positions of leadership in government, business, religion, education, and other fields.

The people who assume these roles must command the public trust. If they are going to represent us, they must be people of dignity, honesty, unselfishness and courage. They must be above scheming and petty bickering, they must deport themselves in an exemplary manner, discharge their sworn duty with efficiency, decorum, dedication and sincerity of purpose. They must conduct the people's business in no less a manner than they would conduct their own. They must lead, follow or get out of the way.

It is no secret that selfishness, greed, lawlessness, and wide spread disrespect are symptoms of a society that is not totally well. A society begins to deteriorate when the people leave their futures to chance and to fate.

This class, the class of 1982, must reach for new heights. It must establish formidable goals. Its members must reject deception. Each of you must give fresh meaning to life. It will not be any easy task, but for us, with our meager resources, it has never been easy.

At this crossroad, we must make an investment in our futures and the futures of those who are still unborn.

Currently, we are mortgaging the lives of future generations of Virgin Islanders to pay for the ego trips that a power hungry leadership is enjoying today.

The economic philosophy, which is in vogue today, can only lead to disaster. We must stop living beyond our means and halt the fraudulent practice of writing bad checks that the next generation will be called upon to honor. You should be concerned about this situation.

The class of 1982 can help turn things around. It must think and act in bold and daring terms. None of you can afford to be indifferent to the presence of crime just as you cannot afford to accept waste, dishonesty, and corruption in government as a way of life.

As individuals you must be self-reliant. You must be firm yet compassionate. You must be willing to endure pain when necessary and make sacrifices for the good of the community when called upon to do so.

Your formal educations will be tested each day of your lives. Do not give up. Rekindle the sparks of determination with new vigor and even greater conviction.

Remember always the great sacrifices that some of your parents and loved ones made so that you might attend school. Remember that some of them scrubbed floors and worked tirelessly so that you could receive an education.

Remember that they sometimes worked an extra job so that you could buy books, and that without them this moment would not have been possible.

You are our hope! We need you now more than ever! Together we stand at the crossroad. Together we shall confront the irreconcilable courses and together we shall go forward.

Each of you must consider what you can do for the Virgin Islands in return for what the Virgin Islands has done for you. If you are diligent and faithful, time and events will record your contributions.

It is my personal conviction that if you set standards in your life, consistent with the high standards that the college has set in its twenty year history, you shall not fail and consequently, we shall not fail.

I leave you this evening with this final thought. Live your lives in such a manner that in the twilight of your years, when all

is said and done, you may look back on your life with pride and a sense of satisfaction.

Give of yourselves each day for the betterment of the Virgin Islands. Help make it the land in which you want to live and raise a family. Inspire other generations. Leave a legacy that they will want to pass on to their children.

God bless each and every one of you. May you realize your dreams. May your accomplishments be many and may you come to know the real joy of living!

Thank you.●

# **BRIGHTON BEACH BATHS CELEBRATES 75 YEARS OF SERVICE TO BROOKLYN FAMILIES**

**HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1982*

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, this month in my district in Brooklyn, a community institution, the Brighton Beach Baths, will celebrate its 75th year of operation as a family-centered recreational facility.

In 1907 the Brighton Beach Baths began as a beach club. Then situated in the wilds of Brooklyn on 30 acres of land, it has survived and flourished as a recreational oasis in the now highly urbanized Brighton Beach section of New York City. Its membership of 6,000 probably makes it one of the largest beach clubs in the country.

The baths, as it is fondly known, has served as a home away from home to literally millions of people over the years. Some of its members have belonged to the club for over 60 years, and it is a common sight to see families spanning three and four generations enjoying its lovely open spaces, salt water air, and unsurpassed recreational facilities and programs. Open 10 months a year, the baths offers dancing, entertainment, sports, nursery, and day camp programs in addition to swimming in three pools.

The baths is ably managed by Hy Cohen, a remarkable and energetic man, who has seen to it over the years that the baths plays an active role in the civic and charitable activities of the area. Hy has made the baths accessible to numerous organizations for fundraising activities and opened its doors to provide much needed recreational opportunities for organizations like the Vacations and Community Services to the Blind, so that they could provide several days or recreation activities for the elderly blind in the community. The baths has hosted field days for children from local public schools, provided free medical screening to its members and even hosted State of Israel bond rallies.

The baths has been an integral part of the shore front community for the past 75 years and is indeed a community institution of which we can all be proud. Today I would like to take the

opportunity to salute the baths, its exceptional management, staff, and above all, its wonderful members who have made it such a marvelous place to visit and a source of enjoyment for literally thousands and thousands of New Yorkers.●

## **SOVIET PRISONERS FOR GAS PIPELINE**

**HON. LARRY McDONALD**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1982*

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the question of forced-labor utilization in the construction of the Yamal pipeline has again arisen. This time the question came up in West Germany. It will be recalled that I mentioned this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Of July 13, 1982, pages 16054 and 16055. The London Daily Telegraph of August 1, 1982, states information reaching Bonn, Germany, is that an estimated 100,000 political prisoners are working on the U.S.S.R. pipeline. Perhaps this news of forced-labor participation in the project will give pause to those Germans who are rushing to make money and not thinking about the other aspects of this matter. France has instructed its Moscow Embassy to inquire about the use of slave labor on the pipeline also, according to the Wall Street Journal of August 9, 1982. The two news items follow:

[From the Sunday Telegraph, Aug. 1, 1982]

### **SOVIET PRISONERS "FOR GAS PIPELINE"**

(By Michael Farr in Bonn)

West German conservative MPs are pressing for a Bonn investigation into claims that Russia was putting tens of thousands of political prisoners to work on the controversial Siberian-West European natural gas pipeline.

One Christian Democratic MP, Herr Heinz Landre, said that the International Society for Human Rights has estimated that 100,000 Russian prisoners sentenced to terms of hard labour were working on the construction of the 3,500-mile pipeline, which has been strongly opposed by President Reagan.

Herr Landre said the prisoners, the majority of whom were serving terms for political or religious reasons, were being housed in primitive conditions in railway stock.

He urged West German politicians, bankers and businessmen involved in the multi-million project—billed the largest-ever between East and West—to take these facts into account.

### **APPEAL TO SCHMIDT**

In answer to a question from another Christian Democrat, MP, Frau Ingeborg Hoffman, the Bonn Foreign Ministry said it has not yet been able to find out definitely whether and how many political prisoners may have been put to work on the pipeline.

The Frankfurt-based human rights society said recently that civil rights activists in the Soviet Union had informed the group that the prisoners were being forced to work on the pipeline in appalling conditions.

The society said it was appealing to Chancellor Schmidt to end West German involvement in the project because of the Russian use of forced labour.

But with West German companies winning contracts for pipeline worth millions of pounds and several thousand German jobs at stake, Bonn has remained firmly committed to the deal despite American disapproval.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 9, 1982]

### **FRANCE PROBES REPORTS INVOLVING SLAVE LABOR ON SIBERIAN PIPELINE**

PARIS—France said it has instructed its Moscow embassy to investigate reports that the Soviet natural gas pipeline to Western Europe is being built with slave labor.

The International Association for Human Rights, based in West Germany, previously had warned European countries involved in the controversial project that tens of thousands of Soviet political prisoners had been pressed into slave gangs to work on the mammoth project.

The humanitarian organization has issued a list of political prisoners who, it asserted, were forced to work on the pipeline. They included dissident psychiatrist Semyon Gluzman and Ukrainian writer Zinovi Krasinski.●

## **RAY FITZGERALD: FONDLY REMEMBERED, SORELY MISSED**

**HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1982*

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, although I never met Ray Fitzgerald, I feel as though I knew him well. And, I know that he had a positive effect on me during many of my formative years.

As a sports-minded young person in Suffield, Conn., I read the Springfield, Mass. Union, a morning newspaper. Ray Fitzgerald was their main sports writer.

He kept me interested in sports, perhaps kept me thinking more positively than I might have otherwise.

I feel good about those years. And, I feel good about what Ray Fitzgerald contributed to many of us in those years. More recently, I have read his columns in the Boston Globe. I have looked forward to them.

To the end, Ray Fitzgerald remained a breath of fresh air.

We will miss him greatly, even those of us who did not have the honor of knowing him personally.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Globe, August 4, 1982]

### **RAY FITZGERALD, AT 55 . . . WONDERFUL WRITER AND MAN**

(By Neil Singelais)

Globe sports columnist Ray Fitzgerald died early yesterday in Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston after a long illness. He was 55.

During the last 16 years, the words of Ray Fitzgerald had been a fixture on the sports pages of The Globe, to which he came from



the Westfield Advertiser, in 1966. He covered virtually every sport for The Globe in that time, writing with versatility when assigned to report events and, later, with a special flair and wit when, upon the retirement of the veteran columnist Harold Kaese in 1975, he moved into the lead columnist's chair.

Said Globe sports editor Vince Doria of Mr. Fitzgerald: "Anyone who has read The Globe sports pages over the years knows what a wonderful writer Ray Fitzgerald was. He was an equally wonderful man. He was a tremendous talent, yet he never let ego get in the way. He couldn't say no to anyone. If an aspiring journalism student sought his advice, Ray would make time for that student. At the end of a bad day, you could always stop by Ray's desk, where his humor would remind you that things could be worse. I'll miss his writing greatly, but I'll miss his friendship more."

Mr. Fitzgerald came to the Globe in 1966, at the invitation of sports editor Jerry Nason, with an assist from Ernie Roberts. Roberts now executive sports editor, was rejoining The Globe that spring after six years in the Dartmouth College athletic department.

"I was still in Hanover when I received a call one morning from Nason," Roberts recalled. "Do you know a writer in Springfield named Fitzgerald? He's interested in a job with us, preferably with your afternoon sports page," said Nason.

"Sign Ray on as fast as possible," I answered. "Fitz is not only an exceptional writer but an outstanding person and asset to any paper." We both arrived the same day and found The Globe closed by a strike. "Figured," said Ray with his crooked grin. "It's April Fool's Day."

Mr. Fitzgerald's desk always drew a crowd when he was in the office. He had both humor and modesty, an unusual parlay among prominent columnists. He also had an Irish temper, most apparent when one of his lefthanded tee shots would fly into the woods at Marshfield. On vintage Fitzgerald days his lefthanded driver shortly would follow the golf ball.

Ray Fitzgerald made a habit of winning the Massachusetts Sportswriter of the Year Award, taking down the honor an unprecedented 11 times in balloting by sportswriters throughout the state.

But what set Mr. Fitzgerald apart from most of his colleagues was his ability to laugh at himself. No crusader, he lived and worked to entertain his readers while regarding himself as "just another working stiff in The Globe's sandbox."

To copy editors, all Ray Fitzgerald copy was a dream, something to be enjoyed, not worked over.

Mr. Fitzgerald was widely recognized as a master of the quick quip and the one-liner. He possessed the rare ability to apply a gentle but inoffensive needle, still he didn't hesitate to spice the humor with a dash of satire when the situation required it.

Mr. Fitzgerald's tongue-in-cheek humor never failed him. When asked several years ago to fill out a biographical sketch, his answer to a question about activities in public or social service was: "Borrowing money from the South Shore National Bank to pay for kids in college." Another blank sought information on "Miscellaneous Facts." He scribbled, "Constantly broke."

After joining The Globe's staff, Mr. Fitzgerald covered the Red Sox, Celtics and Patriots until he became a fulltime columnist in 1975. He began his newspaper career as a

writer with the Schenectady Union-Star, working there from 1949 to 1951. He then took a public relations job with the General Electric Co. for two years before resuming his journalistic career with the Springfield Union in 1953. In 1965, he left the Springfield paper to become part owner of the Westfield Advertiser, but he left that job a short time later to come to The Globe.

A graduate of Westfield High School in 1944, Mr. Fitzgerald excelled there in three sports—baseball, basketball and football. In baseball, Mr. Fitzgerald starred as a left handed pitcher-first baseman. In basketball, he attracted attention as a good-shooting guard. And in football, he did a fine job as a defensive end. His baseball ability earned for him a scholarship to Notre Dame. He was graduated from there in 1949.

In the immediate post-Notre Dame years, he and his wife, Barbara, concentrated on raising their lively family of two boys and two girls. A voracious reader, he put aside time for the books which, when money and time were so precious, filled his need to learn as much as he could about the world. In later years, when the young Fitzgeralds had gone their own ways, Ray and Barbara hit the road often, touring Ireland several times and visiting classical sites in Greece. Relaxation meant activity for Mr. Fitzgerald; a standout bowler and golfer through the years, he visited the lanes and the links often with family and friends.

Still, baseball remained his first love. In the 1950s, he played professionally for two years with Brattleboro in the Northern League before hanging up the spikes for good. Or so he thought. Some 10 years later, while he was working for the Springfield Union, the urge returned and he joined the semipro Holyoke Allies of the Two-County League for a brief time. In his first mound appearance he went the distance, and won.

His athletic talents surely were inherited in great part from his father, Raymond Fitzgerald, a minor league power hitter in the 1920s who played for teams in the Eastern and International Leagues. The elder Fitzgerald also played pro basketball during that era in the Interstate League.

Springfield (Mass.) Union executive sports editor Garry Brown, who for many years worked alongside Mr. Fitzgerald, said he remembers the late Globe columnists as "a good humor guy. We never had anyone here with such a wit. He was so enjoyable to be with."

Mr. Fitzgerald leaves his wife, Barbara S. (Gray); two sons, Kevin, of Boston, and Michael Fitzgerald of Quincy; two daughters, Karen Murphy of Southwick, and Dr. Eileen Fitzgerald of Clinton, Ark.; a brother, John; two sisters Marie Gallo and Claire Case; and his mother, Katherine (Halloran) Fitzgerald, all of Westfield; and a grandson.

A funeral Mass will be said Friday at 9 a.m. in St. Francis of Assisi Church, South Braintree. Graveside services will be held at 2 p.m. Friday in St. Mary's Cemetery, Westfield. ●

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 58

**HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1982*

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Senate for favorably voting on Senate Joint Resolu-

tion 58, the balanced budget/tax limitation constitutional amendment.

It is encouraging that two-thirds of the U.S. Senate rose above partisanship and agreed to this historic resolution. Democrats and Republicans joining together have made a solemn commitment to the American people that deficit spending must end.

It is imperative that the House move swiftly to bring the balanced budget/tax limitation amendment to the floor for full and fair debate. The Representatives of the American people have an obligation to act promptly on Senate Joint Resolution 350. This bipartisan issue affecting all Americans must be given a fair hearing by Representatives of all the people. ●

## NEW EXTRADITION LEGISLATION

**HON. BOB EDGAR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1982*

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues some excerpts from an analysis of new extradition legislation prepared by a group concerned about the rights of Filipino dissidents in the United States. In light of the fact that we will be considering the new bill—H.R. 6046—in the House soon, and in light of the upcoming visit of Philippines President Marcos, I believe that this information is valuable. Members should also be aware of the relationship of this legislation with the United States-Philippine Extradition Treaty pending in the Senate.

## NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE THE U.S.-PHILIPPINE EXTRADITION TREATY

### THE STRUGGLE AGAINST REPRESSIVE EXTRADITION LEGISLATION: THE NEW PHASE

A brief study of the origins, purposes, and provisions of the bill shows, that it carries substantial threats to constitutional rights and traditional judicial protections.

The push to revise U.S. extradition law began in 1979 and was initially sparked by the legal difficulties faced by the Carter State Department in extraditing three individuals that it was under heavy pressure to return: the Irishmen Peter McMullen and Desmond Mackin and the Arab Ziad Abu-Eain.

In May 1979, a U.S. court ruled that McMullen, a member of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) was not extraditable to Great Britain because the crime for which he was sought—assaulting British troops—was a political offense, and proceeded to grant him political asylum. More recently, Desmond Mackin, another member of the IRA, was also declared non-extraditable after a magistrate took extensive evidence on political conditions in Northern Ireland and upheld Mackin's claim that the wounding of a British soldier was a relative political offense.

Frustrated by these appeals to the political offense exception, the State Department threw all its resources at preventing Ziad

from doing the same. Its tactic was to paint the young Palestinian—who was dubiously linked to a bombing incident in the West Bank in the twice recanted testimony of an alleged accomplice—as a “terrorist” and deny any political motivation or political context for the alleged offense. While it was successful in winning Ziad’s extradition to Israel, the State Department was nevertheless frustrated by the fact that it took more than two years for the judicial process to yield Ziad.

*How H.R. 6046 makes extradition law more repressive*

An even cursory examination of H.R. 6046 reveals that beneath the liberal rhetoric, there is a radical move away from traditional U.S. extradition practice.

First, it contains a very restrictive definition of the political offense exception. Under the Hughes Bill, only “pure” political offenses like treason would qualify for the exception. “Relative” political offenses—that is, crimes of violence committed in connection with a political objective—are to be treated as common crimes. All such offenses would thus be extraditable, except under “extraordinary circumstances.”

This constitutes a dangerous abridgement of the political offense exception, which has been traditionally regarded as one of the virtues of U.S. extradition law. To give an indication of how profoundly illiberal the proposed restriction is, it should be pointed out that the House Bill would make extraditable nearly all the important leaders of liberation movements in the last 200 years—persons like George Washington, William Connolly of Ireland, Garibaldi of Italy, Simon Bolivar of Latin America, Bernardo O’Higgins of Chile, Jose Marti of Cuba, Andres Bonifacio of the Philippines, to name but a few. Elimination of the concept of relative political offense institutionalizes a bias against members of freedom and independence movements—movements which almost invariably involve widespread violence against repressive regimes.

*H.R. 6046 and the U.S.-Philippine Extradition Treaty*

With the likely passage of H.R. 6046, the State Department is now floating the line that the U.S. Philippines Extradition Treaty—with the Hughes Bill’s key provision incorporated into it—is now acceptable. As Rep. Hughes has recently revealed, “The Administration has indicated to me informally that in the event that the House version of the Extradition Reform Act passes that the proposed extradition treaty with the Philippines will not be submitted until the decisionmaking authority on the political offense question has been changed to preserve the vote of the Courts.”

However, the reality we are in fact confronted with is that H.R. 6046, though reserving nominal authority over the exception for the courts, virtually emasculates it by severely restricting its application. This makes it all the more imperative, then, to oppose the ratification of the Philippine Treaty and other treaties—particularly those with repressive regimes, since their application will be guided by new laws which shall have essentially obliterated a traditional and vital keystone of U.S. extradition practice.

More important, however, the opposition to the U.S.-Philippine Extradition Treaty has never been solely—or even principally—based on the issue of who has jurisdiction over the political offense exception. A more vital concern has been the fact that it is po-

litically unethical to have an extradition agreement with a regime which has no independent judiciary and whose judicial proceedings amount to no more than kangaroo courts employed to condemn political dissenters—a fact documented by Amnesty International, the International Commission of Jurists, the Task Force for Detainees, and other human rights agencies.

The rationale for this concern as been aptly put by Republican Congressman James Jeffords of Vermont:

Traditionally, the U.S. has negotiated extradition treaties with foreign governments that apply their laws in an equitable and consistent manner. If we did not, we would create a repressive environment in our own country for those persons who want to express openly a dissatisfaction with their country of origin.●

**PRESERVE HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL ASPECTS OF THE WIC PROGRAM**

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to protect one of our most effective programs, the special supplemental feeding program for women, infants and children—WIC—from an assault by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Sixty-two of my colleagues have joined me in seeking to maintain the WIC program’s proven success.

No one in this Congress will forget USDA’s planned alchemy to convert ketchup into a vegetable in school meal programs. This year, the same administration is considering a new proposal to weaken safeguards for low-income pregnant women and infants at risk of retardation and birth defects.

The administration’s proposals would erode the high-protein food package which supplements the diet of 2.2 million vulnerable pregnant, postpartum and breast-feeding women, infants and children who have been certified by health professionals to be at nutritional risk.

Why should we tamper with, or possibly undermine, such a tremendously successful program? The successes and cost-effectiveness of the WIC program have been amply documented by reputable governmental and private studies.

Last year, the Massachusetts State Health Department completed a study of 12,000 WIC participants which showed that the WIC program significantly decreases the mortality rate of newborns by increasing infant birthweight. Low birthweight is currently the eighth leading cause of death in the United States. A low birthweight infant is 20 times more likely to die than a normal birthweight infant.

This large-scale study follows others which have indicated the savings

reaped by the WIC program. A 1979 Harvard University School of Public Health study demonstrated that every dollar spent on WIC’s prenatal component alone results in a savings of \$3 in averted medical costs for low birthweight babies. Treating low birthweight after birth is three times more expensive than preventing it through WIC.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is now suggesting that we severely alter the WIC diet, has itself estimated a \$450-million savings in averted hospital care required to bring low birthweight babies up to normal weight in fiscal year 1980 alone. USDA further estimated that, at WIC’s fiscal year 1980 program level, the Federal savings in medicaid, SSI, and special education would be approximately \$260 million. If the program reached all eligible pregnant women, the Federal savings in aid programs would reach \$600 million to \$1.2 billion.

Why does this administration insist upon tampering with these repeatedly proven successes? To please selected segments of the food industry?

My resolution requires that, before proposing changes in the WIC food package, the Secretary of Agriculture make a finding that the proposed changes will be beneficial to the health and nutritional status of WIC participants. This finding, together with supporting evidence, must be submitted to the Congress before any such changes are made.

We in Congress cannot afford to sit idly by and watch the erosion of the WIC program by administrative fiat. Senator Hubert Humphrey and I wrote the legislation to extend this program in 1975 in response to testimony from the March of Dimes and other health groups that this country had the knowledge and skills to prevent retardation and birth defects. We now have evaluations of WIC which show clear and dramatic results in improving children’s chances for healthy development, saving lives and saving money. The WIC program represents one of those rare moments in the Congress when we design something to respond to a serious problem in the country, and the program actually works in solving the problem. In fact, its successes have far exceeded even our best hopes.

I urge you to join me in cosponsoring legislation to preserve and continue the health and nutritional benefits of the WIC program, and to send a message to the USDA that Congress will not stand for unnecessary and destructive tampering with this proven, cost-effective program.



H.J. RES. 567

Joint resolution concerning changes in regulations for the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966

Whereas the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) was created to prevent occurrence of health problems and improve the health status of pregnant, post-partum and breast-feeding women, infants and young children from families with inadequate income who are at special risk to their physical and mental health by reason of inadequate nutrition or health care, or both;

Whereas repeated evaluations of the WIC program by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Center for Disease Control, State public health departments and university schools of medicine and public health have demonstrated that participation in the WIC program has decreased infant mortality rates, decreased the incidence of low birth-weight babies (low birth-weight is directly associated with increased deafness, blindness and retardation), and decreased the incidence of anemia;

Whereas cost-benefit analysis has proved that the WIC program is one of the most effective programs initiated by the Federal Government;

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture placed in effect regulations which meet the goals of that program, the implementation date for which has been delayed until December 31, 1982; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has under consideration changes in regulations for the WIC program which would not contribute to improving the health status of WIC participants: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That:*

SECTION 1. The Secretary of Agriculture may not place in effect any rule pursuant to Section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 which would not maintain or enhance the nutritional integrity of the supplemental foods made available under the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a finding that any changes subsequent to enactment of this resolution in rules governing supplemental foods provided to WIC participants shall be beneficial to the nutritional status of those participants; and

(b) Such finding, and any supporting documentation, made pursuant to subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate at least 14 days prior to issuance of proposed rules in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture shall implement the rule effective on November 12, 1980, concerning supplemental foods made available under the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), no later than December 31, 1982.

#### COSPONSORS FOR "WIC RESOLUTION"

Mr. Barnes, Mr. Bedell, Mr. Beilenson, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Bingham, Mrs. Boggs, Mr. Boland, Mr. Bonior of Michigan, Mr. Brodhead, Mr. John L. Burton, Mr. Corrada, Mr. Dellums, Mr. Downey, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Fauntroy, Ms. Ferraro, Mr. Foglietta, Mr. Ford of Tennessee,

Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Frank, Mr. Guarini, Mr. Harkin, and Mr. Hoyer,

Also, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Kastenmeier, Mrs. Kennelly, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Lantos, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Lowry of Washington, Mr. McDade, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Matsui, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Mineta, Mr. Moffett, Mr. Oberstar, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Rodino, and Mr. Roybal,

Also, Mr. Scheuer, Mrs. Schneider, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Shamansky, Mr. Simon, Mr. Solarz, Mr. Stark, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Studds, Mr. Vento, Mr. Walgren, Mr. Washington, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Wirth, Mr. Wyden, and Mr. Yates.●

#### AN UNWARRANTED PATENT STRETCH

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of August 7, 1982, provides a forceful argument against H.R. 6444, the patent-term extension legislation. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

#### AN UNWARRANTED PATENT STRETCH

The pharmaceutical industry is about to receive an extraordinary favor from Congress: the right to extend the patent protection of new drugs up to seven years beyond the conventional period of 17. Congress has let itself be persuaded, after a hasty review, that the extension is fair and will foster innovation. But the drug industry's case is dubious.

Its chief premise is that extension will restore the time unfairly lost from patent life by having to prove to the Government that new drugs are safe and effective. But the testing of drugs in animal and clinical trials is something that any responsible company would wish to do anyway.

Besides, the complaints gloss over the common practice of "evergreening"—filing a patent application early, so as to beat any rival, but then filing new applications that modify or extend the original to postpone the time at which patent life actually starts.

For example, the original patent for the tranquilizer Valium was first filed in 1959 and gained the Food and Drug Administration's market approval in 1963. But because of a series of renewed applications, as well as a rival claim, the patent was not issued until 1968. When it expires in 1985, the drug will have enjoyed 22 years of protection.

The eight best-selling drugs in the United States in 1980 enjoyed an exceedingly healthy average patent life of 15.1 years, according to statistics kept at the Office of Technology Assessment. Even when a brand-name drug comes off patent, companies can still protect its market share by advertising; one study of off-patent drugs showed that half retained a 97 percent market share against companies selling the identical chemical under different names.

The industry contends that effective patent life time has been dropping, from 14 years for pre-1965 patents to 10 years or less for those now being issued. But the law did not intend to guarantee every inventor a clear 17 years of market monopoly. Many inventions, not just drugs, enjoy less patent

protection because of obstacles on the path to market. The drug companies complain that Government delays hold them back. But the bills that have passed both Senate and House committees grant an extension that goes far beyond any delay attributable to Government review.

The companies also contend that reduced patent life has discouraged investment in research and development. But figures from the technology assessment office show that the industry's investment in R & D has increased every year from 1965 to 1978, and has remained a strikingly constant percentage of sales. There is no proof that the windfall profits from a patent extension would in fact be plowed back into research. Even if research were in decline, Congress has many other means, like tax incentives to reverse it.

The pharmaceutical industry is efficient, profitable and healthy. It has no demonstrable need for any special break. The patent system as a whole may need reform, but that is a different issue. Monopoly rights should not be doled out to anyone with a hard-luck story, as Congress seems to believe. The proposed extension is unjustified, unsuited to the stated purpose of increasing research and offensive to the basic principle of a free economy.●

#### JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1982

● Mr. DAUB. Madam Chairman, unemployment—the Nation's most serious domestic problem—is draining our human potential and devastating the lives of millions of Americans. The Job Training Partnership Act which we have passed in the House of Representatives provides a new approach to this national problem. Years of Federal involvement and billions of dollars have not noticeably affected chronic unemployment. This does not mean that we cannot affect it; it simply means that our efforts to date have failed and it is time for a change. The Job Training Partnership Act embodies that change.

On September 30, the CETA manpower and training program will expire. Passage of this new legislation, H.R. 5320, represents a profound effort to eliminate what went wrong with CETA and to maintain the subprograms which succeeded. This legislation is truly a job training measure, not a public works job creation bill for local governments. A program that focuses on short-term placement of people in dead-end jobs is of less value to the individual and society than one that takes somewhat longer, but prepares the individual for jobs with a future.

The principles and values in the Job Training Partnership Act first represent a new trust in the decisions of local and State officeholders, and less

Federal involvement. Although we could have gone even further in this regard; this increased recognition in the abilities of local officials to define their own local problems and local needs is itself a long-needed improvement. In the past, local governmental units have been responsible for developing employment programs for their labor market areas without a great deal of coordination at the State level. Very little was done to develop linkages between local prime sponsors within the State; to develop a comprehensive plan to match available workers with available jobs in other parts of the State, and to retain skilled workers who have been displaced because of changing conditions in the economy.

Second, they represent a new trust in the contributions which local businessmen and women can make in this effort. Eighty-five percent of available jobs are in the private sector, and private employers already are spending \$40 to \$100 billion annually on training activities. The House of Representatives has used this opportunity to enlarge the role played by private enterprise and enlist the experienced executives who expend these dollars from the very start. The improvement of skills and abilities of our labor force is an enormous task—a task in which many sectors of our economy must play an active role. The primary role, by necessity, belongs to private enterprise and Congress must insure that Government policies do not inhibit private investment training. Since the intended outcome of training is in fact an unsubsidized job in the private sector, it is time that we involve these employers in decisions which will be meaningful to them and to our national economy years from now.

Third, they represent a recognition of the fact that our Nation's educational system can also be an effective partner in the effort to help our young people become employable. In June 1982, youth unemployment was at 19.2 percent, with black unemployment at 52.6 percent. To allow these statistics to go unnoticed would be to continue to relegate an entire generation to low productivity and dependency on the Federal system. We can make these young people productive, as I am convinced they want to be, only if we invest in them. Educational assistance is one way and job training is another. A country which invests in its human capital will yield tremendous rewards in terms of increased economic benefits. And, rather than create new, separate institutions for training, existing educational institutions can play an important role. From a local perspective, I have been well aware of a local community college, Metropolitan Community Technical College, which is actively seeking the challenge to fill this need. Vocational

education leaders in Nebraska have been to my offices telling me that they are willing and wanting to contribute in this partnership. The Job Training Partnership Act involves the education community, and I look forward to their input.

Fourth, it represents less tolerance for those who are feeding at the Federal trough, and more compassion for those who truly want to be trained for future, nonsubsidized, private employment.

Fifth, it represents a Federal program which finally is results oriented, rather than procedure oriented. Accountability is built right into the legislation. Performance standards will be set up. A program's effectiveness will be measured by the increase in earnings, the reductions in cash welfare payments or the placement of participants in private employment.

And sixth, it represents the knowledge that huge administrative overheads will no longer be tolerated by this Congress. We have restricted the percentage of Federal funds which can be utilized for this purpose to assure that the moneys get funneled for the purpose for which the program is intended—job training of disadvantaged and displaced workers.

The Job Training Partnership Act represents a new kind of Federal program; one that gives Americans a handup, rather than a handout. It represents the faith we should have in local officials and local business leaders in solving local problems, and it holds them accountable to do what they say they will do. Although further steps at improvement could still be taken, I am confident that this marks the beginning of a better, more humane approach to the serious problem of unemployment in America.●

#### PROVIDING VISION FOR GOVERNMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the need for governments to anticipate crises is universally accepted. In traditional national security planning, that is, military planning, we spend hundreds of billions of dollars for future contingencies that we hope will never happen. But for intelligence gathering or prevention of the causes of war we spend a pittance.

There are ways to improve our vision and provide the tools for seeing future problems. U.S. policymakers need these tools if they are to make intelligent judgments about the future. Unfortunately, the Reagan administration seems determined to reverse the process begun in previous administra-

tions to improve U.S. capabilities to understand and act on global resource problems.

I am pleased that some Members of Congress are acting in spite of the attitude of the administration. Our colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MAVEROULES, has introduced a House concurrent resolution which would address some of these issues, including the need for foresight in the management of national resources. Similar legislation has been introduced in the other body.

As the following essay by Dr. Russell Peterson, one of the leading advocates of a Global 2000 perspective, describes, we can hardly act too soon.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1982]

#### SEEING TOMORROW'S WORLD TODAY

(By Russell W. Peterson)

In this day and age, it is inexcusable that the US federal government does not have an organized and coordinated "foresight capability" to aid policymakers in understanding the global population, resource, and environmental trends that shape the world in which we exist.

The United States and its leaders are beset by crises which cannot be understood, much less resolved, without an appreciation of their causes beyond our borders and their consequences beyond the next decade or even the next election. Yet, if anything, since the "Global 2000 Report to the President" two years ago first documented the federal government's lack of foresight capability, the situation has deteriorated.

In its simplest terms, foresight capability is a matter of sound data, coordinated projections of global trends, analysis of their interactions, and informed policymaking. Based on the work of the 13 federal agencies and departments which went into the preparation of "Global 2000," the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the State Department concluded that "the executive agencies of the US government are not now capable to presenting the President with internally consistent projections of world trends . . . for the next two decades."

Just what does this mean for US policymaking? Misinformation and misperception.

For example, the health of the economy, at home and abroad, is currently the most politically pressing problem in the U.S. Yet at a time when our economic interdependence with other countries is greater than ever (the third world alone accounts for more than 25 percent of our overseas investment, more than 35 percent of our exports, and more than 45 percent of our imports), "Global 2000" found that the government's measure of worldwide economic health—GNP—is based on questionable assumptions. Among other things, federally used projections assumed major expansion in agricultural production as a result of stepped up fertilizer use. But they didn't consider possible changes in climate or explicit environmental impacts. They did assume unlimited water availability at constant real prices and no deterioration of the land resulting from urbanization.

I believe the government's lack of foresight capability exists at three levels—data analysis, projections coordination, and political commitment. And I am convinced that



at every level we are witnessing serious setbacks. The quality of government data, particularly the already limited global data, is being undercut dramatically by budget reductions in federal resource agencies.

Efforts to ensure consistency of assumptions and data, which go into projections for different sectors, are almost impossible without clear coordination. The only existing mechanism for coordination, the Office of Management and Budget's Statistical Policy Branch, has been eliminated. Political commitment to calling attention to issues that look across jurisdictions and beyond elections is vital. But despite its theoretical potential, the administration's "Interagency Global Issues Working Group" chaired by CEQ has thus far failed to respond substantively to even the problems of technical coordination so basic to providing useful foresight capability. I know of no instance in which the President personally has used his office to call attention to this problem.

Such setbacks are totally out of sync with growing public interest, both at home and abroad. Since the publication of "Global 2000," countries such as Japan, Canada and Mexico have begun their own Global 2000 inquiries. In the U.S., 56 separate organizations, including the National Audubon Society, the League of Women Voters, the Overseas Development Council, and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, have joined together in the new Global Tomorrow Coalition to call attention precisely to the need for understanding global interdependence. Their initial action supported unanimously has been to call out for the creation in the Executive Office of the President of "an improved capacity to coordinate and analyze data collected by federal agencies and other pertinent sources on the long-term interactions of trends in population, resources, and environment—and their relationship to social and economic development."

Clearly, this is not a question of government "planning for the world." It is the question of whether the right hand of the government knows what the left is doing. That requires central coordination and communication, backed up by commitments to improve agency resources and educate officials on a regular basis. Congress has begun to explore the issue of foresight capability—reports on government computer projections are being prepared; House hearings have examined the problem conceptually; and three bills touch upon it legislatively.

In the Senate, S. 1771 includes among its requirements an interagency Council on Global Resources, Environment, and Population, to be chaired by CEQ and funded by the member departments. It would coordinate agencies' biennial production of long-term projections of global population, resource, and environment trends; encourage their analysis, particularly in light of current policy; and report regularly to Congress on these efforts. The fact that this bill is authored by Sen. Mark Hatfield and co-sponsored by such senators as Charles Mathias, Slade Gorton, Alan Cranston, and Bill Bradley is proof of serious congressional concern about foresight capability.

The time for action is now. S. 1771 is pending before the Governmental Affairs Committee, chaired by Sen. William Roth whose experience with the problems and relations of federal, state and local governments should be helpful in focusing on the problems that permeate and plague the global community. The Governmental Af-

fairs Committee should undertake during the summer the kind of critical debate this issue and this bill warrant.

Its goal should be Senate enactment of legislation on foresight capability in 1982, signaling to both the administration and the nation that we cannot afford even in an election year to lose sight of global population, resource, and environment trends and their impacts on social and economic factors.

(Russell W. Peterson, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality during the Nixon and Ford administrations, is president of the National Audubon Society and chairs the board of directors of the Global Tomorrow Coalition.)

## THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDER OF PURPLE HEART

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, August 7, 1982, was a glorious day in the Mid Hudson Valley of New York, and for our Nation.

Two hundred years prior to that day, General George Washington, Commander-in-Chief of the Revolutionary forces, created and presented the first "Badge of Merit" for valorous service to the American cause.

This badge, a heart-shaped purple insignia, later became one of the most famous and most honored military decoration in the U.S. military . . . the order of the Purple Heart.

The "Purple Heart" was founded by General Washington while he was headquartered in Newburgh, N.Y., overlooking the majestic Hudson River, with its breathtaking view of that river winding its way through the Highland Mountains.

Last weekend, the National officers and members of the Military Order of the Purple Heart held ceremonies at Washington's Headquarters in Newburgh marking this Bicentennial occasion. It was further commemorated by the issuance of an embossed envelope by the Postal Service honoring the Purple Heart and the brave defenders of our freedom who have received this badge of merit.

At the Washington Headquarters ceremonies, I had the honor of introducing as keynote speaker our former colleague, the Secretary of the Army John O. Marsh, Jr., whose remarks were so impressive that I would like to take this opportunity to share his words of inspiration with my colleagues. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I ask that Secretary Marsh's speech be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN O. MARSH, JR., SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Two centuries ago this day, our War for Independence was in its twilight days.

Past was Valley Forge and Saratoga, behind was Cowpens, Trenton and Ticonder-

oga; over was Bunker Hill, Brandywine, and Kings Mountain.

Even Yorktown was a memory.

The American Army that encamped here—the Continental line—was the finest light infantry in the world.

In Washington's Army had marched men who stood their ground at Lexington Green and stunned the British army at Bunker Hill.

In seven years of war this Army had become a mosaic of colonial America. The battlefield and the campaign trail forged a sense of nationhood as regiments for former colonies served together and suffered together in a common cause.

Among its soldier-patriots were Rangers who had marched to Boston with Dan Morgan of Virginia—clad in buckskin, their long rifles and aimed fire made the difference at Saratoga.

The great marbleheaders, watermen from New England, who not only rowed Washington across the Delaware to attack Trenton, but with their seafaring skills had saved his Army at Manhattan.

Some had marched in sleet and snow to Valley Forge in '77, and through sheer will survived the terrible winter. A historian wrote:

"Nothing much happened in the lines at Valley Forge. Men simply set their teeth and stayed alive and thus kept alive the Army which was the active expression of their cause, quite unaware of the deep glory of what they did there."

One of those who suffered by the campfires at Valley Forge was a young officer named John Marshall who would one day become the Chief Justice of the Republic he fought to establish.

Another Valley Forge officer was a 20-year old Major from Virginia who had crossed the Delaware with Washington—was severely wounded at Trenton leading a reconnaissance unit. History knows him better as James Monroe, the Fifth President of the United States.

These were tough, lean, combat-trained veterans who had marched from Canada to Georgia and crossed the Hudson, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, Potomac, the James, the Rappahannock and the Dan. Many had felt the pain of shrapnel—some had wept bitterly as they searched a battlefield in late evening for the body of a brother or a close friend. They had known the despair of being out-numbered, out-equipped, out-clothed, barely fed and rarely paid.

Yet in the ranks of these Regiments were men who in silent formation stood on Yorktown's Surrender Field and watched Cornwallis' soldiers lay down their arms.

They were the victors.

In the hour glass of history, over seven years of war had run. The sands of time:

Had seen the lanterns hung from the steeple of Old North Church.

Saw fired the shot heard round the world—whose sound echoes into the 20th century.

Saw drafted and signed a Declaration of Independence.

Saw created an Army, a Navy and Marine Corps.

Saw forged an alliance with France.

Saw come together a fledgling Nation under the Articles of Confederation.

Here on the banks of the Hudson, in the Highlands of New York, near the Tappan Zee, close to the Palisades and the legends of Sleepy Hollow, it is hard to imagine that 200 years ago this was the bitter ground—torn between patriot and loyalist, where old

and new allegiances divided families and destroyed friendships.

For an infant nation that nearly died aborning, these grains in the hour glass of time were not sand—they were gold.

Moments of our national greatness were expressed in documents and in deeds—in the political courage of statesmen, and the sacrifices of those who bore arms for their country.

Shakespeare wrote that "all the world's a stage . . ." Across the stage of the American Revolution marched a host of Americans who changed forever the human experience.

Near the western reaches of the American frontier—hardly a backwater to the parlor society of Western Europe—Newburgh, 200 years ago was at the center of this drama.

Here had come into confluence both duty and tribute. A duty to recognize the deeds of the enlisted soldier to achieve the declaration's promises of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness, and a tribute to his valor.

The Revolution had its Valhalla of heroes and warriors—Washington, Green, Wayne, Dan Morgan, Ethan Allen, Knox, Nathan Hale and Marion, the Swamp Fox—but, in this, as in all wars, they are won by the combat soldier who bears the brunt of battle. Unsung, they were then, and still are, the anonymous heroes of freedom.

This Bicentennial Ceremony marks a tradition that began with American arms to give a place of honor to those who marched in the ranks and served with uncommon valor.

It is fitting that in an Army of a free people purple should be the color of this decoration. It is the symbol of royalty. It denoted that among the brave and courageous there is an equality that bears no relationship to rank or station.

The event we commemorate today confirms the debt we owe to really just a few people. So it has often been in times of great national trial. Washington's army in Newburgh was barely more than 12,000 soldiers. Our infant Navy and Marine Corps were only a hand full when compared to their counterparts in the great powers of the world.

Three soldiers of the Continental Line were to win this decoration. All had served for more than seven years. All were sergeants—all were from Connecticut. We should call their names this day.

Sergeant Elijah Churchill, of the 8th Connecticut and 2d Continental Light Dragoons, cited for gallantry in action at Fort St. George, Coran and Tarrytown, New York.

Sergeant William Brown, 5th and 8th Connecticut Regiments for gallantry in the night bayonet assault on Redoubt 10, Yorktown, Virginia, October 14th, 1781.

Sergeant Daniel Bissel, Jr., of the 8th, 5th and 2d Connecticut Regiments, for his successful and courageous action in a clandestine intelligence operation behind enemy lines in New York City, upon the request of the Commander-in-Chief.

A half century ago, as a part of the commemoration of the 200th anniversary of Washington's birth, this Revolutionary award was designated the Purple Heart. It has since been presented to those in the Armed Forces of our country who have received wounds in battle.

In honoring these three sergeants of Connecticut, we pay tribute to the tens of thousands of our fellow countrymen who have suffered and sacrificed for this great Nation.

Referring to the Battle of Agincourt, Shakespeare wrote:

"We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;

For he today that sheds his blood with me Shall be my brother."

Those who wear the Purple Heart belong to an American Brotherhood.

Let us remember that freedom is never free. It is one thing to declare independence, it is another to achieve it.

The last line of the Declaration is a pledge that was kept through the efforts of a comparatively few people in order that promises of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness would have meaning. That line reads:

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

This pledge was kept by a small and gallant Army whose sacrifices gave us freedom and independence.

Your Army will keep it today.

If we all so dedicate ourselves, we shall ensure that 100 years hence our countrymen will again assemble at Newburgh to honor those who bear the wounds of battle for their service to America.●

### CANADA IS THE ECONOMIC BENEFICIARY OF ACID RAIN

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, recently, information has come to my attention which casts a shadow over much of the Canadian Government's efforts to see that an acid rain control program is initiated in this country. Ever since the Congress began work on the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act, my office has been bombarded with reports, studies, and letters from Canadian Government officials outlining environmental horrors of acid rain and calling for mitigating actions.

However, these entreaties are suspect, and I am beginning to believe they are founded in economic rather than environmental concerns.

A number of electric utilities in New England are continuing with efforts to reduce oil consumption in keeping with the national goal of increasing energy independence from foreign suppliers. Many of the utilities are considering converting oil boilers to coal produced in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky. Indeed, Consolidated Edison of New York is in the process of trying to convert its Arthur Kill 2 and 3 and Ravenswood 3 units to coal. United Illuminating Co. is on schedule in the conversion of its Bridgeport Harbor 3 unit to coal, Central Maine Power Co. is considering plans to convert three small units to coal, and Boston Edison is contemplating a number of coal conversions to name a few.

Yet some of these same utilities, under the threat of new and costly

controls aimed at reducing acid rain, are now studying the feasibility of purchasing power from Canada. A number of coal conversion plans have been dropped and a few of these utilities may be forced to buy Canadian power.

The chief economic beneficiary of an acid rain control program would be Hydro-Quebec's James Bay Hydro Complex now under construction in Canada. It is my understanding that this project of approximately 5,000 megawatts would have excess capacity and the firm is aggressively marketing this capacity in the Northeastern region of the United States.

Boston Edison, for one, may consider the purchase of Canadian hydro power as a means to reduce oil consumption. The United Illuminating Co. is also expressing an interest in Canadian power. And, it is my understanding that the Maine Public Utility Commission is giving favorable response to a New England Power Pool purchase agreement for 690 mw of Canadian power from Hydro Quebec. Central Main Power Co. would receive a portion of this imported power.

Mr. Speaker, while these activities are taking place there is evidence that at least one major source of pollution in Canada, Ontario Hydro, is backing away from plans to install acid rain controls. According to a report sent to my office by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Acid Rain in the Canadian House of Commons in September 1981, entitled "Still Waters: The Chilling Reality of Acid Rain," emissions from Ontario Hydro can produce acid rain in parts of the United States. The subcommittee in its report applauded "the decision by the corporation to effect an emission reduction of more than 40 percent by 1990. We believe, however, that even greater reductions in emissions are feasible and affordable." Nonetheless, according to a statement made in the Canadian House of Commons by a Member from Hillsborough on July 22, 1982: "Earlier this week Ontario Hydro announced that it is going to shelve plans to install acid rain controls on its plants in Ontario."

This information in my mind undermines the concerns of the Canadians over the impacts of acid rain for environmental reasons. There is more to the acid rain story, Mr. Speaker, than the Canadians are telling us.●

### INHERITANCE TAX RELIEF FOR CONSERVATION FARMERS

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in order to provide an inducement, in ad-



dition to those that presently exist, and to install and maintain conservation practices which will protect the soil from the ravages of soil erosion, I am introducing legislation which would exclude from Federal estate tax 50 percent of the value of farmland on which there was no significant degradation of agricultural productivity in each of the 5 years prior to the death of the owner.

The problem our Nation faces with respect to the deterioration of our land resources is more than a passing one. It has tremendous long-term implications for our ability both to meet the food needs of people around the world and to contribute to a favorable balance of trade for the United States. Currently, soil erosion exceeds tolerable levels, that is, levels that would result in sustained productivity over the long term, on nearly 120 million acres, or more than 25 percent of our cropland. This situation exists in spite of excellent achievements in soil and water conservation over the past 50 years by our Department of Agriculture.

We have been slow to realize that all of our people share the responsibility for stewardship of our soil. Future generations are the major benefactors of our erosion control work. But there is not time to wait for future generations to solve the problem. If we fail to control erosion, future generations will pay dearly for that failure. We have expected the farmer to shoulder more than his share of the cost of soil and water conservation. Today his profits and ability to pay for soil conservation work are squeezed by increasing production costs and decreasing prices of his products. Society must help.

Existing Federal estate taxes have been a hardship on many farm families. Numerous cases have come to our attention where farms which have been owned by a family for several generations were divided and a portion sold in order to pay these taxes. This legislation would relieve a part of this burden for farmers who do a good job of protecting their soil for future generations. Mr. Speaker, these farm families are the backbone of our Nation's productivity and I urge my colleagues in this body to join ranks in providing them the support they need to carry out effective soil conservation work on their farms.●

#### THE RIGHT TO EMIGRATE

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, Tzalo and Khaya Lipchin have been waiting

almost 4 years to be reunited with their son Leonid, who lives in Brookline, Mass. His parents live 9,000 miles away in Leningrad, and they have been denied exit visas since they first applied to leave almost 4 years ago. Now 35 years old, Leonid was allowed to leave the Soviet Union in 1978 after his 16-day hunger strike embarrassed Soviet authorities into granting him an exit visa. Unfortunately, the Soviets have denied that same right to his parents.

Since March 1981, I have been in contact with Dr. Sergey Chetverikov, Counselor of the Soviet Embassy, urging that his government grant exit visas to the Lipchins so that their family may be reunited. Several times I have requested the assistance of the Counselor in facilitating the Lipchins departure. Unfortunately the Soviet Government has been unwilling to grant the Lipchins exit visas, which would be in compliance with international accords which the U.S.S.R. has signed.

I am deeply concerned with the current emigration situation of Soviet Jews and the role of the American Government in helping to alleviate this problem. The rate of emigration has dropped sharply and reports of harassment of refuseniks has increased. Clearly, the Soviet Government is trying to break the will of Soviet Jews, who have pursued their goal of emigrating from the Soviet Union to practice their religion in freedom.

Over the past decade, the United States played an integral role in opening the doors of the Soviet Union for thousands of Jews seeking to emigrate. As discussions on various issues of mutual concern continue, it is essential that we reaffirm to the Soviets the American commitment to human rights and that adherence to the Helsinki accords is vital to an improvement in the relations between our nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is known that an active concern on the part of the U.S. Government is important in assisting individuals like Leonid Lipchin who is seeking to be reunited with his retired father and ailing mother. We must express our concern for the welfare of individuals wishing to emigrate, and support the basic human right of Soviet Jews to emigrate. I commend Leonid Lipchin for his efforts to reunite his family, and I hope my colleagues will continue to press the Soviet Union to honor the international agreements it has signed which guarantees the right to emigrate.●

#### PARRIS JOINS WITH PRINCE WILLIAM RESIDENTS IN EXTENDING ROYAL INVITATION

#### HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would today like to commend the Board of County Supervisors, the governing body of Prince William County, Va., on their congratulatory and thoughtful recognition of the birth of Prince William, the Prince of Wales.

I deeply share the kind words of their letter to Prince Charles and Princess Diana. In it, they write:

The Board of County Supervisors is thrilled that you have chosen to name your son Prince William, and we hope that as he grows to manhood, he will always feel a close friendship to the United States, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and particularly, Prince William County.

These remarks are very significant, for it is believed that Prince William County, Va., is the only county in the United States bearing that name. This distinction is also shared by at least 50 area organizations and business firms. In addition, many of the 146,000 inhabitants of Prince William County are of English descent.

I am particularly proud of Prince William County, the only county in Virginia that stretches from the mountains in the West to the Coastal Plain in the East. Discovered by Capt. John Smith in 1608, it is rich in cultural heritage and is the site of many historical landmarks. Its residents benefit from a national forest and park, a chamber of commerce, a tourism council, and symphony orchestra which is celebrating its 10th anniversary this season. Presently underway is the Prince William summer festival, and the Prince William County fair which is scheduled to open August 14.

Mr. Speaker, because this is a great occasion for the residents of Prince William County and the Nation, I join with the Board of County Supervisors in extending a standing invitation to the royal couple and their new son, to visit Prince William County whenever their travels bring them to the United States. I believe such a visit would be a prodigious and joyful event that could be shared by all.

For my colleagues use and information, I would like to insert at this time into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the contents of the letter from the Board for Prince William County of Virginia.

The letter follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,  
COUNTY OF PRINCE WILLIAM,  
Manassas, Va., July 14, 1982.

His Royal Highness Prince and Princess of Wales,

Buckingham Palace, London SW1 England

DEAR PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES: On behalf of the citizens of Prince William County, Virginia, United States of America, congratulations on the birth of your son, Prince William. The Governing Body of Prince William County, the Board of County Supervisors, is thrilled that you have chosen to name your son Prince William. We hope that as he grows to manhood, that he will always feel a close friendship to the United States, the Commonwealth of Virginia and particularly, Prince William County.

Prince William County is located in the Washington Metropolitan area, approximately 30 miles southwest of our Nation's Capital. The County has 345 square miles and is inhabited by 146,000 people, many of whom are of English descent. The County seat is Manassas.

Captain John Smith discovered Prince William County in 1608, although, there is some evidence that the Spanish were in this area as early as 1565. There were various divisions of land into counties between 1653 and 1759 affecting Prince William County and the latter year, Prince William became an independent county with boundaries that exist today. Prince William County is the only county in Virginia that stretches from the mountains in the west to the coastal plain in the east.

The citizens of Prince William County are quite excited that you have chosen the name Prince William for your son. On behalf of the Board of County Supervisors and the citizens of Prince William County, we wish for your son good health, a long, productive and happy life filled with every success. When your travels bring you to the United States of America we hope that you and your son will visit Prince William County.

Yours Sincerely,

KATHLEEN K. SEEFELDT,  
Chairman,  
Board of Supervisors.

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Royal Highness, the Duke and Duchess of Wales, have given birth to a son and named him Prince William; and

Whereas, the citizens of Prince William County, Virginia, United States of America and its governing body, the Board of County Supervisors, are thrilled with the birth of the Prince and with the selection of William as his name; and

Whereas, it is the desire of the governing body of Prince William County, Virginia, United States of America, to note the birth of Prince William and to congratulate his parents, Prince Charles and Princess Diana; and

Whereas, it is the desire of the Board of County Supervisors to extend a standing invitation to the Duke and Duchess of Wales and their son, Prince William, to visit Prince William County whenever their travels bring them to the United States; and

Whereas, it is the hope of Prince William County, Virginia that Prince William will always feel a close kinship with the County and visit it whenever he can; and

Whereas, the Board of Supervisors sends its fond greetings to his parents, Prince William and the people of England and commend them all on the birth of Prince William;

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County, Virginia, United States of America that this resolution be read among the official minutes of the meeting on July 6, 1982 and that the Chairman of the Board is hereby authorized and directed to communicate with the Royal Highness, the Duke and Duchess of Wales, commending them on the birth of their son Prince William.●

#### NOT GUILTY BY REASON OF INSANITY

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, just after the jury's verdict of "not guilty by reason of insanity" in the John Hinckley trial, I received an excellent letter from one of my constituents, Randall W. Shaffer of Paducah, Ky. Mr. Shaffer's letter is indicative of the cries of outrage that were heard throughout the entire country with regard to this defense plea. As the Congress works with changes in the laws dealing with the insanity defense, I would like to share Mr. Shaffer's comments with my colleagues. The letter follows:

PADUCAH, KY., June 22, 1982.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,  
Rayburn Office Building,  
Washington D.C.

DEAR CARROLL: I've just heard the jury's verdict of "not guilty by reason of insanity" given John Hinckley for the terrible crimes he has committed.

I was shocked, stunned and then upset. The very idea of the possibility of him being turned loose on innocent victims again frightens me. What have we come to in this country? How can we call this the "land of the free" when soon we will all be prisoners in our own homes, afraid to get out for fear of being killed by a so-called insane person?

I wonder if Jim Brady would rather be shot by a sane person instead. Sane or insane, what's the difference? They kill just as deadly and should be locked up.

Please, I realize this is written in haste, but maybe it's time we acted with haste to protect ourselves from all the rationalities that so-called "puritans" and "save those who can't help themselves, do-gooders" promote.

Please use your influence to do whatever is necessary to deal with these matters. If what I'm suggesting is unconstitutional, call for an amendment; if a law needs to be written or changed, do it; whatever, get this thing turned around.

I'm sorry, but I had to yell at someone. But, you or I may be a Jim Brady or one of the others some day.

Most sincerely,

RANDALL W. SHAFFER.●

#### BUDGET REDUCTION

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend in California I met with constituents to discuss pending legislation. Particular concern was focused on my views of the tax bill which will raise \$100 billion in taxes over the next 3 years. I explained to my constituents that, in my opinion, the recession will not be solved through tax increases, and that I would not vote for the tax bill without some assurance that Congress can uphold the budget reductions approved earlier this summer.

Unfortunately, I am not confident of the ability of the House to do so, or even to abide by the budget process. This lack of resolve was strikingly illustrated last week by the passage of H.R. 6862, the reconciliation bill of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The first concurrent fiscal year 1983 budget resolution instructed this committee to achieve savings of \$376 million in fiscal year 1983. These savings were to be achieved through the imposition of a 4 percent COLA cap on Federal annuities, and through other administrative changes in the civil service retirement system. Instead of being submitted to the Budget Committee to be combined with the other committees' reconciliation bills, H.R. 6862 was granted a rule so that the bill could be voted on separately.

The bill the committee reported achieved only \$32 million of the mandated \$376 million in savings for fiscal year 1983—a shortfall of \$244 million. It did not cap COLA's, and provided for outlay reductions of only \$113 million for fiscal year 1983-85, or only 3.5 percent of the \$3.2 billion savings that the committee was instructed to achieve. This was the first major test of the budget process, yet partisan political considerations were clearly more important to the committee than the integrity of this process.

Unfortunately, the bill passed by a vote of 268-128. A motion to return the bill to committee with instructions to achieve the mandated savings failed by a vote of 160-236. How can we convince the financial markets of our sincerity in reducing Federal spending when at the first major test of the budget process, our resolve crumbles? How can we justify a tax increase when we cannot even hold to the spending levels we approved 2 months ago?

Good arguments were made both for and against capping COLA's for Federal retirees, and my votes for the motion to recommit and against H.R.



6862 were difficult for me personally. But COLA's were not the issue in this case. The issue is the budget process and congressional commitment to it. These are not normal economic times. Unless we have the courage to stand by the budget process—imperfect as it may be—we are never going to reduce spending. I continue to feel that the financial recovery of this country is our first priority, and that healthy economy cannot but improve the lot of all Americans, particularly retirees living on fixed incomes for whom inflation is the cruelest punishment.

Of course the final determination will rest with the Appropriations Committee. Yet the passage of H.R. 6862 signals that Congress will make only superficial efforts to control spending, and will not have the courage to uphold them when difficult political choices arise. If the budgetary capitulations embodied by the passage of H.R. 6862 continue, I predict a rough road for the tax bill.●

#### A CONGRESSIONAL WELCOME FOR CYCLISTS TO END WORLD HUNGER

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1982*

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I was pleased to join a number of my colleagues on the Capitol steps in welcoming to Washington, teams of Cyclists to End World Hunger. These marathon participants, who departed from Atlanta, Ft. Lauderdale, and Denver, arrived in Washington yesterday and will soon begin the final leg of their journey to the United Nations in New York. The cyclists crossed 15 States, met with State and local officials, and brought their message about the need to intensify our commitment to alleviating hunger to millions of citizens.

The riders, in addition to raising a considerable sum of money to directly assist those suffering from hunger, compiled over 10,000 signatures from individuals alining themselves with efforts to end hunger. Those names, together with the more than 3,000 signatures collected during a bike marathon last year, were placed in the "Presidential Book," a document, presented today to my colleagues and I, which contains the names of more than 2.2 million individuals firmly committed to working to resolve the critical problem of hunger and malnutrition.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Commission on World Hunger, of which I was a member, recognized that raising public awareness about hunger and generating the political will to resolve that problem, is the primary prerequisite if our Nation is to develop new

comprehensive antihunger policies. I commend these dedicated cyclists, and the many individuals and private organizations who helped to make the bike marathon possible, for their important contribution to raising the consciousness of the public and policymakers about the urgent need to resolve the world hunger problem.●

#### PAY AS YOU GO BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1982

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, August 10, 1982*

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Pay as You Go Balanced Budget Act of 1982. The legislation is a statutory form of the "Pay As You Go" process which I offered to the House in May during consideration of the first budget resolution for 1983. It is my hope and my intention that the House will consider this legislation as a rational and preferable alternative to the proposed balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and at the appropriate time, I will offer this legislation as a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed cynical and ineffective amendment would simultaneously abuse the amendatory process and attempt to deceive the people of the United States who vigorously—and understandably—want Congress to take action to reduce the deficit and balance the budget.

The constitutional amendment will not achieve those goals, as some of its chief proponents have openly confessed:

"Frankly, it doesn't do a thing."—Majority Leader Senator HOWARD BAKER.

"I don't think it would have any practical effect."—Finance Chairman Senator ROBERT DOLE.

"I think that the whole exercise on this constitutional amendment is the ultimate confession of failure on the part of the Congress of the United States . . . This is a matter that should not really be in the fundamental law of this land."—Senator JOHN G. TOWER.

Yet Congress need not fail to enact legislation which will realistically and surely move us toward a balanced budget immediately, instead of declaring our constitutional intention to reach that goal at some indeterminate time in the future.

The pay-as-you-go budget procedure is a proven means for radically reducing the deficit in 1983 and 1984, and balancing the budget by 1985, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The pay-as-you-go budget plan would, in fact, achieve a balanced budget before the proposed amendment would even be ratified. Pay as you go is the means of balancing the budget in the mid-1980's; the constitu-

tional con, as the Washington Post has termed the proposed amendment, is a vague promise to try by the mid-1990's.

Pay as you go was considered by the House during the budget debate in May. It received 181 votes, including 80 percent of the Democrats voting, and the highest proportion of votes of any budget plan presented that week.

Yet pay as you go is not a Democratic, nor a Republican, plan. Nor is it conservative or liberal.

Pay as you go requires that whenever Congress decides to increase spending above the 1982 baseline amount for any program, we simultaneously agree to raise an equivalent amount in revenues or cut back spending elsewhere.

If we follow this straightforward process, as 39 States currently do, the CBO projects a \$27.5 billion surplus by 1985.

By contrast, the current budget resolution, supported strongly by those who now call upon us to pass the constitutional amendment, would raise \$225 billion in new taxes, add perhaps \$600 billion to the national debt, and still come nowhere close to balancing the budget.

In addition, implementation of pay as you go would save about \$100 billion on interest payments on the debt over the next 3 years as a result of deficit reductions. This is the kind of budget program that will persuade the business and investment communities that we in Congress are serious about achieving a balanced budget. Simply passing an amendment declaring our commitment to a balanced budget will fool no one in the financial community.

It is obvious that merely mandating a balanced budget is not enough. If Congress cannot find the courage to enact a budget balancing process like pay as you go, how could we ever find the backbone to construct a balanced budget itself?

I urge you to consider the Pay as You Go Balanced Budget Act of 1982 and support its enactment in lieu of any ill-advised and ineffectual tampering with our Constitution. I believe it provides what the American people, and the majority of the Congress, truly want: Not a balanced budget amendment, but a balanced budget.

John Chancellor, the distinguished NBC News commentator, recently compared the attractiveness of the "pay-as-you-go" balanced budget process to the ineffectual constitutional amendment. I would like to place Mr. Chancellor's commentary in the RECORD at this point:

JOHN CHANCELLOR, NBC NEWS

A lot of people including the President are beating the drum this week for a constitutional amendment that some day, maybe, would sort of require a balanced budget.

There's a better way: a plan floating around the Congress that would balance the budget in three years. Guaranteed.

It's the "Pay As You Go" budget proposal, offered to the House of Representatives by George Miller, Democrat of California, and ingenious and practical plan.

Here's how it would work: first, it would freeze government spending at its present level. So if the Congress wanted to spend more on defense, it would have to spend less on something else, such as spending on social programs. Or if the Congress wanted to spend more on defense and social programs, it would have to reduce non-defense spending. All within a frozen total budget. If the Congress wanted to spend more than that, it would be forced to bite the bullet and raise taxes. Fiscally sound, if politically dangerous.

The beauty of this is that it would make Members of Congress directly accountable for the money they spend. Everybody would have to stand up and be counted. And, with spending frozen, the natural growth of the economy would increase tax revenues and balance the budget.

The Congressional Budget Office confirms that the plan would lower the deficit by fiscal 1984, and produce a glorious surplus of 27 billion dollars in 1985. Think of that.

Congressman Miller's "Pay As You Go" budget plan was defeated in the House last May, voted down by most Republicans and a few Democrats. Senator Christopher Dodd is going to ask the Senate to approve it instead of the constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

"Pay As You Go" is a better way than tinkering with the Constitution. Let's see what the Senate does with it.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Senate did not take heed of Mr. Chancellor's comments, and as a result passed an amendment which even the Republican leaders of the Senate confess publicly to be a fraud and an abuse of the constitutional amendatory process. Let the House not follow suit in such a cynical and meaningless fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the RECORD a column by Washington Post syndicated columnist Mark Shields on the pay-as-you-go budget process. Mr. Shields is well known and highly respected for his insightful and barded commentary on political activities in Congress. I would hope that each member of the House would review this column before voting on the balanced budget question.

[From the Washington Post, June 25, 1982]

A BUDGET WITH A BACKBONE

(By Mark Shields)

During the recent congressional budget fight, there occurred a verifiable sighting of something the Democrats have been frantically in search of since being run out of office in 1980: an authentic new idea. It was California Rep. George Miller's "pay-as-you-go" budget plan, which won the support of four-fifths of voting House Democrats, but not House passage.

Upon closer scrutiny, some of those House Democrats might not have been so enthusiastic about the budget plan with the attractive label. Miller, a fourth-term liberal with an independent streak, proposed that Congress freeze all federal spending at the 1982 level and only allow itself to increase any

spending program—Medicare or MX—by first coming up with the revenues to pay for that increase. Those new revenues could be obtained either by cutting other existing programs or by increasing taxes. Those are the only two options. No more rigged projections of rosy revenue increases in 1988, thank you. Miller allows for no exemptions from the freeze. Social security, too, would be subject to the pay-as-you-go formula.

Unlike the administration's 1981 tax-cut plan, which promised instant and ouchless prosperity by next Tuesday, the Miller plan offers some political pain, especially for his congressional and party colleagues. No longer would members of Congress—of both parties—be able to finance their favorite untouchable programs through the federal deficit. Congress would be required to make real choices among competing interests and constituencies. Republicans who have simultaneously favored big defense spending boosts and big tax cuts would be exposed, just as quickly as those "no-choice" Democrats who have appeared constitutionally incapable of saying no to any appropriations scheme remotely mentioning "old" or "small." What Miller is suggesting is nothing less than a congressional vertebrae transplant, without benefit of anaesthetic.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, alone of all the budget proposals, the pay-as-you-go plan would have produced a federal budget surplus of \$27 billion by 1985. Furthermore, as its sponsor conceded, the plan would "put politics back on the floor of the House. I want to find out what Republicans—and Democrats—are really willing to pay for," says Miller.

To the criticism that pay-as-you-go would not allow for any future economic stimulus through planned public deficits, the California responds. "A \$4 billion program may mean something when the debt is \$10 billion, but not when our annual deficit is \$140 billion."

Mr. Speaker, reducing our Federal deficit, ending our mindless reliance on the debt, and balancing the Federal budget are the major goals of this Congress. If we fail to take serious actions to achieve these popularly supported goals, all of our other efforts to revive the economy are bound to fail.

The American people expect more of this Congress than partisan brick-throwing. They want answers. And to provide those answers demands a new budget process.

The people we represent, Mr. Speaker, do not expect miracles from the Congress. But they do expect the truth. We owe them an honest response to their reasonable demand for a balanced budget, and the pay as you go balanced budget process is a workable, understandable, and effective means of reducing our debt and revitalizing our economy.

The text of the act follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) (1) notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1982, or any amendment thereto or any conference report thereon if—

(A) the adoption of such concurrent resolution as reported;

(B) the adoption of such amendment; or

(C) the adoption of the concurrent resolution in the form recommended in such conference report, would cause—

(i) the appropriate level of total budget outlays set forth in such concurrent resolution for such fiscal year to exceed the appropriate level of total budget outlays set forth for the preceding fiscal year in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that preceding fiscal year; or

(ii) the recommended level of Federal revenues set forth in such concurrent resolution for such fiscal year to be less than the recommended level of Federal revenues for the fiscal year preceding that fiscal year set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that preceding fiscal year.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a concurrent resolution on the budget for a fiscal year may—

(A) provide for an amount of budget outlays for such fiscal year in excess of the appropriate level of total budget outlays for the fiscal year preceding that fiscal year set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that preceding fiscal year if the concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year also—

(i) provides for an amount of revenues for such fiscal year in addition to an amount of revenues equal to the recommended level of Federal revenues for the fiscal year preceding that fiscal year set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such preceding fiscal year, which is not less than such amount of excess budget outlays; and

(ii) identifies the source of such additional amount of revenues and proposed changes in law to achieve such additional amount of revenues; or

(B) provide for a reduction in the recommended level of Federal revenues for such fiscal year below the recommended level of Federal revenues for the preceding fiscal year set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that preceding fiscal year if the concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year also—

(i) provides for a reduction in budget outlays for such fiscal year below the appropriate level of total budget outlays for the fiscal year preceding such fiscal year set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such preceding fiscal year, in an amount not less than the amount of the reduction in revenues for such fiscal year; and

(ii) identifies the program or activity in which such reduction in budget outlays is to be made and proposes changes in law to accomplish such reduction in budget outlays.

(3) Any additional amount of revenues contained in a concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to paragraph 2 (A) (i) shall only include additional revenues which will result from proposed changes in law. Any reduction in budget outlays contained in a concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to paragraph 2 (B) (i) shall only include reductions in budget outlays which will result from proposed changes in law.

(b) Subsection (a) may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Members of each House of Congress, duly chosen and sworn.

Sec. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in sub-



section (b), the Budget transmitted pursuant to section 201 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for the ensuing fiscal year shall not contain—

(1) an estimate of total budget outlays for such ensuing fiscal year which exceeds the appropriate level of total budget outlays for the fiscal year in progress set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year in progress; or

(2) an estimate of total revenues for such ensuing fiscal year which is less than the recommended level of revenues for the fiscal year in progress set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year in progress.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Budget transmitted pursuant to section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for the ensuing fiscal year may—

(1) contain an estimate of budget outlays for such ensuing fiscal year in excess of the appropriate level of total budget outlays for the fiscal year in progress set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year in progress if such Budget also—

(A) contains an estimate of revenues for such ensuing fiscal year in addition to an amount of revenues equal to the recommended level of Federal revenues for the fiscal year in progress set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year in progress, which is not less than the amount of such excess budget outlays; and

(B) identifies the source of such additional estimated revenues and proposes changes in law to achieve such additional estimated revenues; or

(2) contain an estimate of a reduction in revenues for such ensuing fiscal year below the recommended level of Federal revenues for the fiscal year in progress set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year in progress if such Budget also—

(A) contains an estimate of a reduction in budget outlays for such ensuing fiscal year below the appropriate level of total budget outlays for the fiscal year in progress set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for such fiscal year in progress, in an amount not less than the amount of the reduction in revenues for such ensuing fiscal year; and

(B) identifies the program or activity for which such estimated reduction in budget outlays is proposed and proposes changes in law to achieve such estimated reduction in budget outlays.

(c) Any additional estimated revenues which, pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A), are contained in the Budget transmitted pursuant to section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, shall only include additional estimated revenues which will result from proposed changes in law. Any estimated reduction in budget outlays, which, pursuant to subsection (b)(2)(A), are contained in any such Budget shall only include estimated reductions in budget outlays which will result from proposed changes in law.

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "budget outlays" has the same meaning as in section 3(1) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974; and

(2) the term "concurrent resolution on the budget" has the same meaning as in section 3 (4) of such Act.

SEC. 4. (a) The provisions of the first section and section 3 of this Act are enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.●

## LET'S "OPEN UP THE SKIES" AT UNISPACE '82

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last month the Pugwash Conference had its 25th anniversary meeting. Pugwash, probably the most respected nongovernment association of scientists, has its origins in the most sensitive scientists our society has known. While scientific ideas in the past have threatened the structure of civilization and reshaped our understanding of religion, Albert Einstein's discoveries posed a new threat, that of destroying the world. Painfully aware of this, Einstein spoke out of his concerns which lead to the founding of the Pugwash Conference in 1957. The conference has promoted important concepts involving nuclear testing, arms limitation and verification, and other proposals for addressing the problems we face in the nuclear age.

If Einstein were alive today I think he would have mixed feelings about how the products of the nuclear age are responding to the threat of nuclear war. On the one hand, he would be alarmed at the capability we have developed to destroy the world many times over; our nuclear arsenal has never been so great. But he would be pleased to see the heated public debate going on in more public arenas than ever before; the nuclear freeze resolution will be on the ballot in seven States this fall. And the nuclear freeze proposal voted on by the House last week lost by only two votes. The discussion is becoming more serious both on a political level as well as on a technical level.

One proposal I am pleased to see attention given to is a proposal offered by my colleague the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN). This proposal, which has been of great interest to me since I first heard about it, would begin the dismantlement of the mystique and secrecy that surrounds the two nuclear superpowers, the United States and the U.S.S.R. The proposal is for an international peacekeeping satellite which would be part of a

larger United Nations satellite monitoring agency. "Peacesat", as it has been referred to, would serve to monitor military activities over the globe and aid in arms control verification. I plan to promote this concept at the upcoming Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (Unispace '82) in Vienna this week. Although the two superpowers will try to avoid discussion of this issue, many developing nations as well as Western European nations will want to discuss this peacekeeping satellite which is sometimes referred to as the "French proposal".

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that one of the most serious threats to world peace is uncertainty and the fear that uncertainty leads to. Fear provokes aggression. I often wonder what such a great nation as ours has to fear so much that we need the capability of destroying the world. This may be naive, but I think we should promote what our country stands for, and not just concentrate on destroying what is different from us. I hope the public outcry will lead us to listen to ourselves and to our own fears. A constructive step toward eliminating some of the uncertainty would be the adoption of a peacekeeping satellite.

Mr. Speaker, the following article discusses how fear is a fuel for nuclear arms buildup, and that the unknown is often a cause for fear. A peacekeeping satellite would alleviate some of this problem by "opening up the skies" to the world and help in the monitoring and decisionmaking in arms limitation activities.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1982]

### MORE SPIES IN THE SKY

(By Floria Lewis)

PUGWASH, NOVA SCOTIA, July 17.—There has been a strange cycle of public indifference and militant activity against the danger of nuclear arms since the first two were dropped. Distressed at failure to understand, Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein issued a dramatic manifesto in 1955.

That led to a meeting of top scientists from East and West at the boyhood home of Cyrus Eaton, the late U.S. industrialist, in 1957. So was founded the Pugwash Conference.

For its 25th anniversary, the conference is here again. The two signatories of the Russell-Einstein document still alive, Linus Pauling and Joseph Rotblat, noted that all those years, marches and U.N. conferences later, the threat is greater than ever.

And people are stirring again. The peace movement has never had broader support. Once again, East-West relations are cold and angry. The U.S. and the Soviets are talking in Geneva about breaking the arms race, and sustaining it at home.

Time is running out on even the chance of arms control, the scientists say, because science itself has made possible new weapons so much more accurate, so much faster, so much harder to detect that agreements may become meaningless.

There isn't much point in calling for trust. If there were trust, there would be no need for verifiable agreements, no excuse for having atomic weapons at all.

Nor has public pressure yet brought tangible response. The words are there, but who knows what they mean. Soviet Chairman Leonid Brezhnev announced a unilateral freeze on deployment of SS-20's (after the program was virtually complete). A few months later, the United States said a number of additional Soviet missiles had been deployed facing Western Europe. Moscow said that this was a lie.

There has been no explanation. The same problem weakens the call for an American pledge of "no first use" of any atomic weapon, which Mr. Brezhnev has proclaimed. How can you tell, until it's too late?

Mr. Pauling, a twinkly-eyed veteran of declarations for disarmament supported by fellow Nobel laureates, urged a unilateral freeze on all nuclear arms by both the United States and the Soviets until they get around to a binding treaty. But nobody has defined the proposal. The United States would presumably abandon not only MX, all cruise missiles and Pershings in Europe, but planned Trident submarines and Minuteman improvements. What would the Russians do?

It is the underlying fear of discarding the nuclear shield that makes it so hard to blunt the nuclear sword. The numbers game of balancing off missile for missile to set a level of security is clearly nonsense in a world that stocks 50,000 warheads with more than a million times the power of the Hiroshima bomb.

Any yet, the awesomeness of the bomb has maintained nuclear ceasefire in a world that hasn't stopped fighting since 1945. This morning's news reported on three full-scale wars (in Lebanon, Iraq and Somalia), two long, bloody guerrilla campaigns (in Northern Ireland and the Basque country) and a shattering new spy scandal in Britain. Peace is not at hand. Declarations aren't settlements.

The dilemma of fear remains. In an early attempt to confront it, President Eisenhower proposed an "open skies" program so the United States and Soviets could see for themselves what the other was doing. Moscow refused. It happened anyway, with satellites and electronic intelligence. But nobody is reassured.

So the issue comes back to information, a way to know and judge what is being prepared, in order to weigh the self-serving official counter-declarations.

One of the most hopeful ideas engaging some of the Pugwash scientists is what Australia's Sir Mark Oliphant calls "technological spying" by the middle powers. A lot of countries are now advanced enough to compete with the United States and Russia in monitoring preparations for war if they pool scientific and economic resources, though none could do it alone.

A group including delegates from Canada, Australia, France, Britain, Germany, Japan, Austria, Sweden, among others, is to meet in October to work on further details, already set out in an experts' report to the U.N. The European satellite launcher Ariane would put their own spies in the sky.

The U.S. has opposed the idea on the grounds that ambiguous intelligence could be politically abused to confound the world even more. Given experience, Washington has a point if it's to be a U.N. operation. But the countries capable of participating could set up their own structure. An objective

(which doesn't mean neutral) verification of superpower agreements and menacing moves would go a long way toward easing the question of what to believe. Then unilateral restraints could be monitored and the argument of balance better judged. It's something concrete to do quickly, worth more than talk. ●

## AGE IS ACTIVITY

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, age has long been a topic of interest and concern in every culture and society. We respect our elder citizens because of their age, but we sometimes overlook the fact that most are active and productive members of society.

I am submitting an article from the newsletter of the Vacations and Community Services for the Blind, in which they honor one active centenarian of my district.

Maximo Gomez, a member of the Hunts Point Aged Program, located at 750 Failla Street, and a long time VCB client, reached his 102nd birthday late in 1981. It is true that 102 is quite old, but Maximo still comes twice weekly to the Failla Street Center, joins discussions, exercises, and, in fact, whatever may be happening at the Center.

It gives the Bronx Advisory Board of VCB tremendous pleasure to honor Maximo Gomez at a June 17 wine and cheese party at the Snuff Mill of the New York Botanical Gardens. Maximo is honored not only because of his age, but because of his incredible will to live and live completely. His failing vision and occasional bouts with pneumonia cannot keep him down.

Congratulations, Maximo, for showing everyone how to live.

And thank you for showing us that "age is activity." ●

## THE IMPORTANCE OF HOUSE PASSAGE OF H.R. 5540

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a bill that will be coming to the House floor for consideration in the very near future, the Defense Industrial Base Revitalization Act (H.R. 5540). As we begin one of the largest military buildups in our history, passage of this legislation could prove to be one of the most significant actions of the 97th Congress. In his recent book, "The Defense Industry," Jacques Gansler, whose association with the defense industrial base spans 25 years, including service as a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense wrote:

The defense industry's ability to rapidly expand production is an essential part of

the overall defense posture. There are many reasons for believing that this capability has been eroding badly in the U.S. over the last few decades, owing to the nature of the equipment as well as the problems within the defense industrial base. \* \* \* Surprisingly, the U.S. government has taken no steps to address this problem. Brief studies that have been done have shown that current programs are largely ineffective and expensive. \* \* \* The major cause of economic inefficiency in the defense industry is the rapid decline in the number of suppliers at these lower (the subcontractor) levels, which reduces competition and causes extraordinary price increases.

The industrial decline that plagues America is the foremost threat to our national security. H.R. 5540 takes an important step toward addressing this problem through creation of a program to revitalize thousands of small- and medium-sized businesses that contribute to defense production. Under the provisions of this bill, these firms would be eligible to enter into arrangements with the Federal Government for Government loan guarantees, purchase agreements, price guarantees, and arrangements for direct loans to modernize their equipment, which will greatly increase our domestic capability to produce critical and strategic materials and hardware for national defense.

In addition, the bill establishes a program to train, retrain, and upgrade workers' skills in occupations in short supply needed by defense-related industries. This continuous capability to upgrade worker skills is essential in the high-paced technological world of defense production.

This legislation has received enthusiastic support from a broad variety of organizations, including labor unions, business groups, trade associations, and vocational, and higher education organizations. An excellent summary article on this bill which appeared in the July 5 edition of Nation's Cities Weekly follows for your information, along with a letter sent to Members of Congress by the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO. As you will note, among other things, a recent Department of Defense internal memo from Deputy Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci and a letter from Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger highlight the need for an effective program to address the problems of our ailing defense industrial base.

[From Nation's Cities Weekly, July 5, 1982]

## TRAINING, REVIVAL AID URGED FOR DEFENSE-LINED ECONOMY

(By Frank Shafroth)

A bill is moving quietly through Congress to piggyback onto the nation's defense readiness efforts a \$6.75 billion, five-year program to revitalize smaller industries.

Included in the proposal is \$250 million a year for job training aid through state agencies and \$100 million a year for professional training through higher education institutions.



Though city governments would have no direct role in obtaining funds or running any of these programs, analysts believe that the program would benefit those that have been victimized by economic woes because of outmoded manufacturing and industrial bases. The state-supported training would be aimed at labor surplus areas.

States would have to share the training costs—10 percent in the first year, increasing to 50 percent.

Over the five years, \$5 billion would be authorized for loans and loan guarantees, price guarantees and purchase agreements with small and medium sized businesses in a number of priority industries. The industries would be designated by the Defense and Commerce departments, and the eligible businesses would be those that currently manufacture and supply defense materials and components, or are likely to do so in time of emergency or war.

Proponents of the bill [HR 5540] say the program would help modernize the nation's defense industrial base, ease manpower shortages in critical jobs by training new workers and help industries keep pace with technological changes.

It is sponsored by Rep. James J. Blanchard (D-Mich.) and has a bipartisan list of 70 cosponsors. The legislation awaits House floor action after being cleared by the Banking Committee and the Education and Labor Committee.

Though the bill does not say which federal agency would spend the money, it says the president should set up a cooperative effort among the Defense, Commerce and Interior departments and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The proposals would amend the 1950 Defense Production Act, which gives the president basic authority for peacetime stockpiling of materials and civil defense programs as well as the authority to mobilize a wartime economy.

The administration opposes the bill because of its cost, according to a letter from Budget Director David A. Stockman to Rep. J. William Stanton (R-Ohio), ranking minority member of the Banking Committee and a cosponsor of the bill. Instead, Stockman urged a simple 5 year extension of the Defense Production Act.

However, supporters of the proposal have published high-level internal administration memos suggesting strong support for efforts to shore up the defense-related industrial base and to reduce dependence on foreign sources of equipment.

This includes a March 6 memo from Deputy Defense Secretary Frank A. Carlucci III to the department's leadership warning of the consequences of continued deterioration of the industrial base and a March 20 letter from Secretary Caspar A. Weinberger to Stockman.

In that letter, Weinberger told the budget director that even with an optimistic view of President Reagan's economic recovery program, the recovery will take "several years and may not provide sufficient incentives for expansion of the industries which are subject to predatory pricing from unstable foreign sources and are critical to the production of national security systems."

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT,  
AFL-CIO,

Washington, D.C., July 15, 1982.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO strongly endorses H.R. 5540, the Defense Industrial Base Revitalization Act, which is scheduled

for a Floor vote in the near future. This bill, which enjoys bipartisan support in the House, will provide a key element in revitalizing our industrial base, which is crucial to our nation's economic future. The revitalization program set forth in this legislation not only would improve productivity and lessen our dependence on foreign imports, but also would strengthen our security and provide hundreds of thousands of job opportunities at a time when the nation's unemployment rate is at its highest level since World War II.

Of Particular interest to us are the bill's training provisions, to be administered at the state and local level, to train and upgrade workers' skills in areas currently in short supply and needed by defense-related industries. In the next few years, hundreds of thousands of high skill jobs will be created in skill shortage occupations—machinists, computer technicians, tool and die makers, mechanics, etc.—jobs that have application to the civilian economy as well as for defense. The training program will provide workers with the skills needed for those jobs, particularly via retraining workers laid off in depressed industries such as auto and steel. The training program is crafted to complement, not duplicate, existing job training and apprenticeship programs, and will encourage participation of women and minorities.

We understand that Representative Erlenborn intends to offer an amendment to strip the Davis-Bacon provision included in the bill. This prevailing wage standard, which has been in effect since 1935, is one of the nation's most important labor provisions that protects workers in the construction industry and insures the highest quality of work on federal construction projects. We urge you to vote against this and any other weakening amendments.

We strongly urge you to support H.R. 5540, which addresses many of our country's underlying economic problems—obsolete machinery, shortages of skilled labor in crucial industries, and a severely deteriorating industrial base. Enactment of this legislation will be an important first step in revitalizing the American economy.

Sincerely,

BRIAN TURNER,  
Director of Legislation.●

## ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest antidotes to overwork, or just about any other malady affecting those of us on Capitol Hill is the special tour of the Capitol dome. Recently, members of my staff and I took advantage of this opportunity and made the long walk to the top of the dome. It was an exhilarating and moving experience.

My staff and I were directed through the winding passageways and over the climbing catwalks by Mr. Kevin O'Connor, one of the extremely capable, knowledgeable, and personable members of the Architect's staff. In addition to informing us of the background and history of the art and

construction of the dome, Mr. O'Connor conveyed a sense of his own enthusiasm and pride in this symbolic centerpiece of American democracy, the U.S. Capitol. I am very grateful and appreciative of Mr. O'Connor's warm personality and outgoing manner.

Although this is not the first time I have taken this special tour, it left me with the same sense of awe and excitement that I experienced on my first visit. My staff were also encouraged and renewed after getting a closer and more detailed look at an important aspect of their own history.

I encourage my colleagues to make the trip to the top. It is a great experience, and a trip well worth the time. In addition, it is a terrific view of a terrific city.●

STRATHMORE PAPER CO.  
HONORED

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform my colleagues today of an important event in the First District of Massachusetts. The Strathmore Paper Co. of Westfield, Mass., was a recent winner of the prestigious American Paper Institute and National Forest Products Association Award for the most effective air pollution control program in the paper industry in 1981. This award is one of six given by a panel of environmental and energy experts from outside the industry for significant environmental achievements.

Strathmore won this award for its innovative use of technology at its Woronoco No. 2 plant to reduce emissions. The company's dry flue gas desulfurization installation, the first in North America, enables Strathmore to burn high sulfur coal with lower emission levels than were achieved earlier with low sulfur oil. Moreover, the company has saved \$1.5 million by burning 70 tons of coal a day at the plant rather than thousands of gallons of costly fuel oil.

Strathmore's achievement is especially significant since it was the first company in New England to switch back to coal burning. Its accomplishment will thus inspire other companies in New England and across the United States to help decrease our country's dependence on imported oil by switching their plants from use of costly foreign oil to plentiful American coal, without many of the environmental problems previously associated with the use of coal.

Mr. Speaker, this example shows what can happen when American industry uses American know-how to solve a problem. I heartily commend

the Strathmore Paper Co. for its concern for the beautiful environment of western Massachusetts and for its imagination and hard work in effectively harnessing coal in this new way. I trust that its example will inspire others to explore new ways of solving our energy problems while protecting the environment. My congratulations go to Strathmore president John Gallup and to all the officers and employees of the Strathmore Paper Co. on the occasion of this well-deserved award.

Thank you Mr. Speaker. ●

## TAX BILL KNOCKS REAGAN OFF COURSE

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Los Angeles Times carried an article by the Times Board of Economists entitled "Tax Bill Knocks Reagan Off Course." It is an articulate explanation of economic reality, one which draws an analogy between supply-side economics and a three-legged stool. To be sturdily used, the stool must consist of personal tax cuts, business tax cuts, and Government spending cuts. I commend the article to my colleagues' attention as a graphic presentation of what occurs when one of the legs is removed.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, August 10, 1982]

### TAX BILL KNOCKS REAGAN OFF COURSE

The bipartisan coalition, in effect since 1954, that believed that business tax cuts were good for investment and hence for the economy appears to have been shattered beyond repair by the Senate tax bill.

In testimony before Congress concerning the 1981 tax package, most leading Democratic economists testified that the problem with the Reagan tax bill was that it was skewed far too heavily to individuals, leaving too little for capital formation. Indeed, the Reagan tax package gave business only 21 percent of the total cut over the 1982-86 period compared to the 33 percent that business received during the first five years of the Kennedy-Johnson tax cuts.

Now, however, the imbalance is much more pronounced. Senate Finance Committee figures show that by 1986 about 64 percent of the business tax cuts will be wiped out, while over the 1982-86 period business will receive only 12 percent of the total tax cuts. The combined tax legislation of 1981 and the 1982 has created the most skewed tax bill in history.

If one word could be used to characterize this tax cut, it would be antisaving. Not only will the increase in business taxes reduce corporate saving and cash flow, but the withholding on interest and dividends, the reduction of pension funding, the corporate minimum tax and the disallowance of municipal bond proceeds for "private" capital formation will all contribute to reduced saving in future years.

The tax bill will have virtually no effect on the economy for 1983 for three reasons. First, the effect of tax changes on investment always lags a year or more. Second, investment decisions are generally not affected by changes in the tax laws in either direction in the middle of recessions when operating rates are 70 percent or lower. Third, the decrease in the budget deficit is offset by the decrease in corporate saving. Net saving is unchanged, and thus on balance so are interest rates.

The net effect of the Reagan programs so far—including the increase in interest rates—has been to reduce capital spending by about \$15 billion in 1982. The tax incentives incorporated in the 1981 act raised fixed business investment by about \$10 billion per year; that is, \$10 billion in 1982, \$20 billion in 1983, and so on until the bill was fully implemented in 1986. However, the increase in interest rates reduced capital spending by about \$25 billion. Now, the Senate has passed a tax increase that takes away about 60 percent of the benefits originally embodied in the 1981 tax legislation, yet without reducing interest rates.

### NEGATIVE EFFECT BY INCREASES

Furthermore, the figures quoted above for changes in investment hold during times of equilibrium, but not in the middle of recessions. Thus, the negative effect of these tax increases will become more apparent once the economy does start to recover and interest rates move down. In the past, it has been under these conditions that the benefits of lower corporate taxes have always induced greater investment. However, with most of the tax benefits wiped out, we will have only a moderate increase in investment during the period of recovery. Ironically, it will not be until the Democrats come back into power and vote more business tax cuts that the increase in investment will lead the economy back to higher productivity growth.

Assuming no further changes in the bill, the net effect of this tax increase by 1986 will be to lower investment by about \$30 billion with no offsetting decline in interest rates. Gross national product will total roughly \$4.2 trillion in 1986, so the tax increase will reduce investment by 0.7 percent; with the normal multiplier effect of 2, GNP will be about 1.4 percent lower by 1986. At current levels, each reduction of one percentage point in GNP increases the deficit by about \$10 billion, so about half the tax increase will disappear because of slower economic growth.

The conclusion would be quite different if government spending were to be cut, because national saving would then increase, monetary policy would ease, and interest rates would decline, thereby stimulating economic growth. But we certainly cannot expect such expansionary effects to occur when any increase in public-sector saving is fully offset by reduction in the private sector. That is why a tax increase designed almost exclusively to diminish private-sector saving is peculiarly inappropriate at a time when the total national saving rate is already at a postwar low.

The only parts of the tax bill that do not have harmful implications for saving are two very minor parts: the increase in the floor for medical and casualty deductions and the increase in excise taxes. The deductions for medical expenses and casualty losses were originally put into the code for reasons of equity: Someone who had suffered extraordinary expenses should receive some partial offset in the form of lower

taxes. For the most part, however, these deductions gravitated into methods of reducing taxes even for routine medical expenses and casualty losses. This tax can be raised without destroying any incentives to save, and from an economic point of view can be considered the opposite of a rebate.

Previous studies have shown that, while most of a rebate is saved during the first quarter, most of it has been spent by the end of the year. In the same manner, we would expect these tax increases to come out of consumption rather than saving. As a result, total national saving will increase and interest rates should thereby be reduced. However, the magnitudes are very small—only about \$4 billion per year once the tax increases are completely phased in—and hence unlikely to make much of a dent in interest rates.

### COST-OF-LIVING PAYMENTS

The analysis of the excise tax is slightly more complicated because it has an added dimension—one of inflation. The tax increases are once again very small, but are duly reflected in the consumer price index for cigarettes, telephone calls, airplane travel, and various boat and fishing equipment. Once again the amount involved is only about \$5 billion per year. However, the CPI will rise proportionately by this amount, and hence all cost-of-living payments in both the private and public sector will increase apace. Since about half of government expenditures are either formally or informally linked to the cost of living, about \$2.5 billion of that increase in revenue will be reflected in higher government expenditures. The other \$2.5 billion will serve to increase saving and lower inflation.

It is more difficult to quantify the effect of the 10 percent withholding on interest and dividend income. The fact that the government gets the money a little sooner only changes the rate of return by about 0.1 percent; besides, most large taxpayers with large interest and dividend income are already required to file quarterly. It is instead more a question of the nuisance value, even though exempting most small savers from the withholding requirement reduces that problem. The net effect will be to drive savers into tax-sheltered investment, possibly even creating a net loss of revenue to the Treasury.

The amount of tax collected by the IRS could be increased substantially if institutions paying interest and dividend income—and any other source of income not subject to withholding—were more vigilant about issuing Form 1099 for all such income; issuance has heretofore been very lax. In addition, the IRS has been inept in matching 1099 information with the proper 1040 forms. Thus a breakdown in information transmission has occurred at both ends.

It would have been much more sensible to fix the defects in the existing system than to move to a withholding pattern that is likely to drive an increasing number of taxpayers into tax-free or tax-sheltered investments. However, in any case the amounts are small compared to the damage done by the business tax increases.

Properly structured, supply-side economics can be likened to a three-legged stool: personal tax cuts, business tax cuts and government spending cuts. Remove one of the three legs and the entire stool collapses. Until now, the reason for failure of the Reagan programs had been that the overall level of government spending in real terms grew faster in fiscal 1982 than it did during



the average of the last 20 years. However, I had thought that the other two legs of the stool would still remain in place.

It now appears that the second leg of business tax cuts has also been knocked to the ground. Reagan and the Republicans have thus reduced themselves to formulating economic policy on a one-legged stool. I can only intensify my speculation that it will prove to be both an economic and a political disaster. ●

## SECTION 936 NEEDS REFORM, NOT REVENUE

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, among the revenue-raising proposals to be considered this week by the House and Senate conferees on H.R. 4961, the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, is one that would drastically cut back the tax incentives mainland corporations receive for investing in new plants and creating new jobs in Puerto Rico. This Senate Finance Committee proposal, if enacted, would have a devastating effect on the economy of Puerto Rico, already suffering from an unemployment rate of 23 percent. Also, this provision of H.R. 4961 is in direct contradiction with the administration's efforts to provide tax and other incentives for investment in the Caribbean Basin countries in order to bolster their economies and foster political stability.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is explored in a cogent article in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, August 9, 1982, by former Under Secretary of the Treasury Norman B. Ture. In his article, "Puerto Rico: Hostage to U.S. Tax Reform," Dr. Ture explains that the conferees are considering also a modification of the Senate Finance Committee proposal that has been presented by the Treasury Department. But Treasury's proposal, says Dr. Ture, would also largely erode the tax incentives for investment in Puerto Rico.

What is most alarming, though, is Dr. Ture's assertion that still other suggestions for dealing with IRS section 936—suggestions that would preserve incentives for investment in Puerto Rico and raise even more tax revenues than would be raised under the original Senate Finance Committee proposal—are not being given due consideration by the administration or the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the economy of Puerto Rico and its people, and in the strategic interest of the United States in preserving a healthy Puerto Rico as an American outpost in the Caribbean, I ask the House and Senate to give due consideration to all proposals for modifying the tax incentives provided by IRS section 936, known in Puerto Rico as

Operation Bootstrap. I also ask unanimous consent that, the thoughtful article, "Puerto Rico: Hostage to U.S. Tax Reform," by Dr. Norman B. Ture be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 9, 1982]

### PUERTO RICO: HOSTAGE TO U.S. TAX REFORM (By Norman B. Ture)

All obscure provision of the Senate-passed tax-increase bill would, if enacted, heavily damage American policy in the Caribbean and cripple our efforts to promote economic development there through private initiative.

This provision would in effect cancel Puerto Rico's "Operation Bootstrap," a set of tax provisions, accommodated by a provision in the U.S. Internal Revenue Code, which creates significant incentives for U.S. companies to set up affiliates and to produce in Puerto Rico. The Senate provision would deal a stunning blow to Puerto Rico's economy, already reeling from the U.S. recession and from the setback to new investment resulting from the IRS's tax-audit policies and its litigation against several major U.S. firms with affiliates in Puerto Rico.

#### A FAILURE BEFORE IT BEGINS

The legislation would be construed throughout the Caribbean as a lack of firm commitment by the U.S. to fostering private-sector initiatives as the vehicle for economic development. The Reagan administration's Caribbean Basin Initiative, in which Puerto Rico was to be the linchpin, would fail before it began. Puerto Rico could no longer serve as a model for the region; it could no longer demonstrate what can be achieved when the private sector takes the lead in promoting economic progress.

The effects of the Senate action in overturning this important foreign policy initiative vastly outweigh any gains in the form of tax-policy niceties. The elimination of an alleged "tax abuse" and the supposed pick-up of a small amount of tax revenue would be purchased at the extraordinary price of forgone economic advances and political stability in Puerto Rico and throughout the Caribbean.

The "tax abuse" to which the Senate provision is directed is difficult to identify, even in the terms of the most zealous old school tax reformers. The principal charge against the offending Internal Revenue Code Section 936 is that it affords U.S. mainland companies with Puerto Rican affiliates too much U.S. tax forgiveness, considering the number of jobs these companies provide in Puerto Rico. The tax revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury is alleged to be well over \$40,000 per created job. The same number of jobs, the critics maintain, could be provided at a lower cost by direct federal outlays such as those under CETA. The "abuse," then, turns out to be the charge that the tax incentive is inefficient.

There is far less in this charge than meets the eye. The estimated tax revenue loss to the Treasury presupposes that in the absence of the tax credit, there would be the same amount of investment, employment, output and income in Puerto Rico (or that there would be an equal amount of investment, employment, output and income added in mainland U.S. operation) as there is under the present powerful incentives afforded by very nearly full tax exemption. This obviously is not true.

Even the most severe critics of Section 936 concede that a very substantial amount of U.S.-company investment in Puerto Rico is in response to the highly favorable tax treatment. Repeal or serious curtailment of Section 936 would result in prompt major disinvestments by U.S. companies in Puerto Rico and in the flight of capital to non-U.S. tax-haven jurisdictions. The revenue "loss" attributed to Section 936 is very largely fictitious; so, too, therefore, is the revenue "gain" from the Senate action or any significant cutback on the tax benefits for Puerto Rican-produced income. The revenue loss per job created in Puerto Rico is nowhere near the extraordinary figure that is bandied about; it is, in fact, much closer to zero.

Even if one were to accept the revenue loss estimate upon which the Senate's proposal appears to depend, it doesn't follow that Section 936 is inefficient. The large amount of tax dollars per job reflects large capital returns per job which, in turn, reflect large capital investment per job. In the course of its development since Operation Bootstrap got underway in the late 1940s, the Puerto Rican economy has progressed from emphasis on agriculture and low-productivity, labor-intensive industries to capital-intensive, technologically advanced industries. This change has been associated with a rapid advance in the skill, productivity and real wage rates of an increasing number of Puerto Rican workers. If that's not what economic policy aims to achieve, if that's not the very essence of economic progress, if that's not what economic development is all about, what is?

Indeed, isn't that just what we're looking for in the mainland U.S. as the achievement of the Reagan program? A large (putative) tax revenue loss per worker should, if anything, be taken as a measure of the success of Section 936 in making Operation Bootstrap an effective device for economic development initiated by the private sector.

It appears that the administration has some reservations about the Senate's proposed cutbacks of Section 936. The Treasury has offered a proposal that it claims would deal adequately with the uncertainties arising from the IRS's current audit policies and litigation stance, while raising substantial tax revenues. In fact, the Treasury proposal would erode much of the tax incentives for investment in Puerto Rico.

#### TREASURY'S VENGEFUL PURSUIT

The administration's concern about the adverse effects of the Senate bill on the Puerto Rican economy has not been substantial enough to persuade the Treasury to forgo its vengeful pursuit of a relative handful of high-technology companies in favor of tax changes that would restore economic stability to Puerto Rico by continuing the demonstrably successful incentives of Section 936. Several suggestions for modifying Section 936, recently presented to the Treasury, the White House and the Senate and House conferees on the tax bill, would accomplish that result while providing a significant increase in U.S. tax revenues—substantially more than the amount estimated as raised by the Senate bill. These suggestions have been shunted aside by the administration.

One must hope that the conferees will give them careful consideration and will reject both the Senate and the Treasury proposals. If they do so, there may still be a reasonable chance for the Reagan administration to realize a successful Caribbean

Basin Initiative, led by a thriving Puerto Rico.●

# REAGAN'S EL SALVADOR CERTIFICATION IS CONTRARY TO THE FACTS

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly protest President Reagan's recent certification that El Salvador has complied with economic and human rights reforms. I have cosponsored legislation introduced by my good friend from Massachusetts, Representative GERRY STUDDS, declaring that certification null and void.

The Americas Watch Committee and the American Civil Liberties Union have published a remarkable report on the current situation in El Salvador which clearly refutes the administration's dubious claim that the Salvadoran Government has met the standards included in the certification process. Calling the administration's certification a "misrepresentation of the Salvadoran reality," the report points out:

No serious examination of conditions in El Salvador and of U.S. law can lead to the conclusion that any of the requirements for certification have been satisfied.

The first requirement, that the Government of El Salvador has made a "concerted effort to comply with internationally recognized human rights" has not been met—it has been flaunted. The Government and its security forces remain involved in a pattern of systematic human rights abuses, including violations of the rights to personal liberty, humane treatment, free speech, free assembly, due process of law, and fair trial. El Salvador remains under a state of siege imposed on March 6, 1980. Decrees remain in effect which permit arbitrary and limitless detention and torture.

The second requirement of certification, that the Salvadoran Government achieve "substantial control over all elements of its own armed forces so as to bring to an end the indiscriminate torture and murder of Salvadoran citizens by these forces" also cannot be reasonably certified. An estimated 34,000 civilians have been murdered in El Salvador for political reasons since 1979. Since Reagan's first certification, over 3,000 civilians have been killed, according to the Legal Aid Office of the Archdiocese in El Salvador.

In March an election was held, as required to be under the certification, yet its legitimacy is now in doubt as evidence of electoral fraud is uncovered. The elections did not alter the armed forces dominance of policy. Nor did it result in the hoped-for moderation of the Salvadoran Government. Rather, it invested great power in the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

hands of one of El Salvador's most brutal human rights violators, Roberto D'Aubisson. Meanwhile, there has been no movement whatsoever toward negotiations with all parties to the conflict, violating an explicit requirement for certification.

The agrarian reform program is in shambles. The Americas Watch/ACLU report notes:

While pledging to restore the land reform, (the Government) has abrogated the law that affected El Salvador's most valuable lands under Phase II of the reform and has sent a signal to land owners that it opposes the redistribution of land to El Salvador's tenant farmers and share-croppers.

Nine thousand and six hundred peasants have been evicted from their land, and some 140,000 intended beneficiaries are still without provisional titles.

For the families of the Americans killed in El Salvador, the most distressing aspect of certification concerns the investigation of those deaths. We have seen a highly dubious investigation plagued with uncertainties and delays. Five suspects await trial, yet abundant evidence collected by the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights and other groups suggest that responsibility goes well beyond the five individuals charged. Our own Government has displayed an astounding attitude of unresponsiveness and delay which seems to border on complicity with Salvadoran authorities. Last month, I initiated a letter to four Federal agencies demanding the release of pertinent documents under the Freedom of Information Act. I am still waiting for two of those agencies to respond.

Facing a situation more dangerous and unstable than ever, President Reagan has once again sought to escalate United States military involvement in El Salvador by ignoring the facts and falsely certifying compliance with human rights and economic reforms. The result of this policy will be increased instability as we hand Moscow a victory it could not otherwise contemplate. As the former Ambassador to El Salvador, Robert White, recently wrote in the New York Times:

Each time the Salvadoran military invades a poor neighborhood in San Salvador with United States-furnished weapons, hundreds of recruits and sympathizers are recruited into the revolutionary movement.

Ambassador White correctly noted that by ignoring the aspirations of liberty that countless Salvadoran's hold, and by attributing their desire for change to Marx and Lenin while siding with the military elite, the United States assumes the role of counterrevolutionary power and abandons to Cuba and communism the sponsorship of change.

The President's certification on El Salvador marks the absolute failure of his policies there and throughout Cen-

August 10, 1982

tral America. I urge my colleagues to reject the attempts to continue allying us with the forces of repression, and to support legislation to prohibit further U.S. assistance to El Salvador by declaring the certification null and void.

## RELIEF OF THEDA JUNE DAVIS

**HON. ELDON RUDD**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a private bill to correct an injustice that has been done to a constituent of mine while working for a program funded and supervised by the Federal Government.

Mrs. Theda June Davis of Phoenix, Ariz. is a schoolteacher who was hired by a federally funded job training program known as SER-jobs for progress in 1970-71.

During the course of her employment, Mrs. Davis was passed over for promotion. She filed a claim against jobs for progress for discrimination based on sex, and was successful in that claim. In addition, she was awarded some \$35,000 compensatory damages by a Federal court.

While jobs for progress is a fully federally funded grant program, it cannot, by law, use its funds to pay claims. The Federal Government supervises this program, funds this program, makes all the rules for this program. Yet, Mrs. Davis, who has been wronged by this program, cannot be compensated at this time. The bill that I am introducing would not right the wrong that has been committed, but it will compensate Mrs. Davis for her hardship, and carry out the lawful award given her by a Federal court for damage done to her by a Federal program.

H.R. 6966

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Theda June Davis of Phoenix, Arizona, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$35,499.25 plus interest thereon calculated at the rate of 6 percent per year from December 1, 1976, to April 3, 1980, and at the rate of 10 percent per year from April 4, 1980, to the date the sum is paid. Such sum is the amount of a court judgment in favor of Theda June Davis against a non-profit Arizona corporation based upon a finding of sex-based discrimination. The Arizona corporation is totally funded by federal grants from the Department of Labor.*

Sec. 2. No part of the amount provided for in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim described in the first section, and the payment or receipt in excess of 10 percent of



the amount provided for in the first section shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of the provisions of this section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed \$1,000.●

# FISHERMEN WARN CONGRESS TO BE CAREFUL OF LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on a number of previous occasions, I have warned my colleagues of the problems that the U.S. fishing industry might face if the United States were to sign the Law of the Sea Treaty. In reply, at least one treaty supporter has suggested that my concerns are fanciful and that the opposition of the U.S. fishing industry to the treaty is manufactured rather than genuine.

Recently, the New England Fisheries Development Foundation, Inc., submitted (unsolicited) some comments on the treaty and its potential interaction with existing U.S. law regarding the fishing industry. Mr. Kenelm Coons, the executive director, and Mr. Ralph Gillis, the general counsel, provided my office with a copy of these comments. Because the document is too long to print in the RECORD in its entirety, I have included only the two introductory paragraphs and the concluding pages here. I would be happy to supply a copy of the entire document to any Member who is interested in reading it.

## LAW OF THE SEA HEARINGS

On behalf of the New England Fisheries Development Foundation, Inc., (Foundation), the following comments are raised for your consideration at the ongoing Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries' hearings to evaluate the status of the United States position in the law of the sea negotiations. These comments are presented neither in support of, nor in opposition to the United States signing the Convention on the Law of the Sea (Convention). Whether to sign the Convention involves questions of law and policy beyond the scope of this letter. The Foundation's comments are intended only to bring forward points of possible significance for persons reviewing our national law of the sea policy.

The Foundation is a trade association consisting of over 100 seafood companies, cooperatives and local associations in the New England fishing and seafood business. The Foundation draws its membership from the maritime communities of New England, and has its office in Boston, Massachusetts. Its primary activity is fish and seafood marketing, for both domestic and export markets, as well as research and development

projects. As a trade association, the Foundation is able to undertake projects that its ordinary members cannot.

In conclusion, the Foundation notes that the FCMA states that Congress has found the fishery resource to be a contributor to the food supply, economy, and health of the nation and a source of recreation. 18 USC 1801(a)(1). The Convention does not mention coastal state interests in fishery conservation and management as being at all associated with recreation. And yet, Congress found in the FCMA that commercial and recreational fishing was a major source of employment. 18 USC 1801(a)(3).

It was the intent of Congress, expressed in the FCMA, that the fisheries be conserved and maintained to achieve optimum yields on a continuing basis. 18 USC 1801(a)(5). And the Convention in Articles 61 and 62 complements the objective of developing and maintaining optimum sustainable yield. But the criteria for use of the optimum sustainable yield set out by Congress in the FCMA include primarily domestic interests to be secured under a "national" conservation and management plan (18 USC 1801(a)(6)) and a "national" program for development of under- and non-utilized species "for citizens to benefit from the employment, food supply, and revenue" (18 USC 1801(b)(7)). Thus, the idea of the fishery conservation zone, since its 1976 inception, has been to promote domestic commercial and recreational fishing, as well as to obtain optimum yield from each fishery for domestic use, pursuant to the establishment of the zone as an area where the United States is to assume exclusive fishery management authority. 18 USC 1801(b).

In evaluating the national law of the sea policy toward the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Foundation suggests that consideration be given to the effect of the Convention's Articles 56, 61, 62, 63, 64, and 70, both in vesting a legal right in other states to fish the surplus catch within the EEZ, and in setting out criteria which provide how the priority of states to fish in the EEZ will be set. The effect of these articles at a minimum could well be to delay or cause unnecessary pressure on fishery or other negotiations with which the United States is involved. In addition, the Convention's compulsory conciliation mechanism has the potential for built in delays which could be implemented adversely to the best interests of the United States, which is not to ignore the possibly undesirable exposure which compulsory conciliation and mandatory arbitration could install against even-as-yet undetermined interests of the United States.

The concern of the Foundation is that the immediate effect of adverse results from application of the Convention to matters involving the United States would impact directly on the fishing industry, especially in New England. Therefore, the Foundation asks that any decision to change the applicability of the FCMA by ratification of the Convention be carefully reasoned and made to assure the protection of United States interests at many levels and from a variety of perspectives, but including the needs of the New England fishing and seafood industries.

Respectfully submitted.

KENELM W. COONS,  
Executive Director.  
RALPH J. GILLIS,  
General Counsel.●

## WITHHOLDING FLIMFLAM

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, the interest and dividend withholding proposal is as much "flimflam" today as it was when the Wall Street Journal criticized the President's original proposal this January. If anything, the provisions included in the Senate tax bill are even more complex and burdensome than the original proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this is not and should not be a partisan or ideological issue. Interest and dividend withholding has been opposed by a wide range of Members from both parties. A nearly unanimous House rejected withholding 401 to 4 under President Carter and it should do so again under President Reagan.

Interest and dividend withholding simply makes no sense when we can achieve the same compliance goal through other, less burdensome, means such as better processing of existing 1099 forms on interest and dividend earnings.

I invite my colleagues to join me in cosigning the following letter to the House Rules Committee asking for a separate vote on this issue when the conference report on the tax bill comes back to the full House. Members who wish to cosign the letter should call my office at 5-5456.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 29, 1982]

## WITHHOLDING FLIMFLAM

In an effort to puff up revenue projections for the February 8 budget message, the Treasury Department is proposing a 5 percent withholding tax on dividend and interest income. The proposal makes no economic sense, and hasn't a ghost's chance of passage through Congress, something the Treasury must surely have known.

After all, we've been down this track many times before. Similar withholding tax proposals have been rebuffed in Congress in 1942, 1943, 1950, 1951 and 1962. On an appropriations rider in August 1980, the House of Representatives voted by 401-to-four to prevent the Internal Revenue Service from even studying the idea of a withholding tax on interest and dividends. This year's proposal is opposed by powerful members of the President's own party, including Representative Barber B. Conable Jr., ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee, who says the committee won't approve the measure.

And with good reason. For fairly minimal gains in revenues—Treasury is estimating an extra \$2 billion for fiscal 1983, less afterwards—a withholding tax would impose heavy paperwork burdens on banks, savings and loans and brokerages, among others. In a study commissioned before the American Bankers Association, the accounting firm Arthur Young & Co. estimated that the Carter administration's 1980 withholding proposals would cost a bank with \$100 mil-

lion in deposits roughly \$200,000 in startup costs and \$80,000 in annual operating costs.

A withholding tax on interest and dividends, moreover, would lower the effective yield on savings and stock ownership. And many of the withholding payments would most likely be drawn from interest-bearing accounts. At a time of enormous fear of "crowding out" by government borrowing in the capital markets, it makes no sense to reduce the deficit by reducing personal saving.

The IRS says it needs a withholding tax to prevent underreporting of interest and dividend income. But what it really means is that its computer programs and management are so sloppy that it can't match interest and dividend reports filed by corporations and banks with individual tax returns. The answer is for the IRS to put its own house in order, rather than to transfer an enormous administrative burden to the private sector.

Since the withholding measure has little hope of passage, its major purpose is to allow the Treasury to pretend that it will be collecting \$2 billion more next year than it actually will. The window dressing wasn't worth the cost in budget credibility.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. RICHARD BOLLING,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee, the  
Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will soon be asked to approve a rule for the consideration of the Conference Report on H.R. 4961, a minor House-passed tax bill to which the Senate has appended many substantive changes in U.S. tax law. We ask that you approve a rule allowing a separate vote or motion to strike from the Conference Report any provisions requiring withholding on interest and dividend earnings.

We realize that this is an unusual request but we believe that this is a most unusual situation in which the facts warrant a separate vote on this issue. First, the House was never given an opportunity to consider and vote on the individual issues contained in the Senate tax bill. Second, only two years ago an overwhelming bipartisan majority of the House voted 401-4 to reject a similar proposal made by the Carter administration. Third, by properly processing existing 1099 forms the IRS can achieve the same compliance objective without burdening millions of taxpayers, financial institutions, and businesses. Fourth, the imposition of interest and dividend withholding would act as a disincentive to savings and investment and would impede economic recovery. Fifth, the original Senate vote to impose interest and dividend withholding was very close, 47-50.

For these reasons, and on behalf of the many millions of our constituents who will otherwise be adversely affected by interest and dividend withholding, we ask that you approve a rule permitting a separate vote on this important issue.

Sincerely,

STEWART MCKINNEY.  
FRANK HORTON.  
CLARENCE E. MILLER.  
NORMAN E. D'AMOURS.  
FERNAND ST GERMAIN.  
DOUG BARNARD, Jr.●

## JOB TRAINING HELP NEEDED FOR TRADE WAR VICTIMS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Japan Economic Institute of America recently circularized the Congress with an economic monograph that acknowledged that 2 million American jobs have been lost to imports in recent years.

The essay on trade failed to note that many of these goods were unfairly traded, but I will make that notation.

Unfair trade is the way the world works in these days of economic war on a pacifistic and still complacent America, which is the largest market in the world for everything made in the world.

Furthermore, that these goods worth 2 million American jobs can be unfairly traded—traded in violation of international agreements and law—is a policy of the U.S. Government from administration to administration.

Therefore, these 2 million jobs were lost as a matter of Government policy.

And those injured as a direct result of Government policy ought to be helped, also by the Government and also as a matter of policy.

By the way, these lost jobs equal about 20 percent of our present unemployment rate.

In this connection, the debate on the Job Training Partnership Act (H.R. 5320) mentioned 1.2 million workers in declining industries. Declining industries generally are those targeted for penetration by one of our trading partners or another.

In one recent decline, an American automobile manufacturer closed a plant in New Jersey not long ago—closed it permanently.

After 18 months, 56 percent of the workers who did not choose to retire were still unemployed.

The trade adjustment programs are insufficient and they are used far too sparingly.

So, the Government is injuring people and it isn't helping them.

And that is wrong!

So, the \$1 billion the Training Act seeks to direct toward displaced workers speaks strongly in its favor. I think we ought to be doing more in this regard, and that events will compel us to do more. But getting this bill out of the House is a start and it will be \$1 billion more than we have now—if the Senate will accept it and if the administration will let it become law.

In addition, the act seems to be free of the potential for manipulation and abuse that gave the CETA program so much trouble. And that, too, is in its favor.●

## LET US GET ON WITH THE BUSINESS OF REAUTHORIZING A STRONG, FLEXIBLE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, the Energy and Commerce Committee overwhelmingly adopted an amendment I offered to reform and streamline the prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) program of the Clean Air Act.

Enacted in 1977, the PSD program budgets the amount clean air is allowed to deteriorate in our Nation's parks, wilderness areas and other areas of our Nation whose air is cleaner than the national ambient health standards.

The PSD amendment adopted by the committee was the product of a fair and open debate, as reflected by the consensus support behind it.

Yet, after a 3-month hiatus on the consideration of any clean air amendments, the Energy and Commerce Committee will soon be asked once again to reconsider the PSD section of the Clean Air Act.

Committee members will be asked to support amendments designed to remove new national parks, wilderness areas and other national treasures—less than 4 percent of the continental United States—from the protections of their clean air budget under the PSD.

The PSD program has been criticized as being too complex. My amendment responded to those legitimate concerns by making specific changes to reduce that complexity.

The 25-to-13 vote to adopt this amendment suggests it is an acceptable compromise that addresses head-on the concerns many of us share about the existing PSD program, while preserving the emphasis on keeping our clean air areas clean and protecting our national parks and other treasures.

My amendment reduced the need for complicated modeling of air quality impacts that both States and industry have complained are complicated and unworkable. The amendment streamlines the PSD permitting process and reduces the number of sources that come under PSD permitting review. For national parks, wilderness areas and other national treasures the PSD budget protections remain. For all other PSD areas, however, States may elect to "opt-out" of the PSD budget protection, thereby allowing pollution up to the level of the national ambient health standards.

This Congress knows that the American people want us to live within budgets. Given this budget-conscious



mood, it is ironic that once again the Energy and Commerce Committee will markup amendments intended to undercut the clean air budget and reconciliation process known as the prevention of significant deterioration program.

Mr. Speaker, an important part of the business of this Congress is to reauthorize a strong, flexible Clean Air Act.

Let us quit covering old ground and move on to the many other important issues that must be resolved before the committee can report out a clean air bill. ●

## COURT WATCH PROJECT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I believe that judges typically are too lenient on the criminals who come before them, and I hope the Court Watch Project, in today's parlance, raises judicial consciousness on the need to match the penalty to the crime.

The following article is well worth reading:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 5, 1982]

COURT WATCH GROUP PUTS PRESSURE ON

"LENIENT" JUDGES

(By Ruth Marcus)

The sentences raise eyebrows:

A Wisconsin judge gave three years probation to a man convicted of sexually assaulting a 5-year-old girl because, he said, the girl was a "sexually promiscuous young lady."

A California judge reduced a first-degree murder conviction to second degree because he said the slayer did not act in a "premeditated and deliberate" way when he stabbed his victim 130 times.

A Pennsylvania judge put an armed robber—out on bail for a previous conviction when he committed the crime—on probation for five years, because prisons are "inhumane and degrading."

Such court decisions prompted the Washington Legal Foundation, one of a new breed of conservative "public interest" law firms, to launch the Court Watch Project, asking its 80,000 members across the country to monitor judges and report any who appeared to be giving criminals slap-on-the-wrist sentences.

"We have hit a nerve," said WLF head Daniel Popeo of the project, which began last year. "We got bags and sacks of letters and support."

Complaints and newspaper clippings about judges who are soft on crime are now pouring into the group's headquarters here at the rate of "10 a day, six days a week," he said.

"There is a tremendous breakdown in the public's mind of the effectiveness of the criminal justice system," Popeo said. Court Watch was needed, he said, to counteract the "tremendous pro-criminal lobby" made up of liberal organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union, which he calls the American Criminal Lovers Union.

After reading Court Watch reports, the Washington Legal Foundation selects the most egregious cases, and writes letters asking the judges involved to justify their actions. It has written more than 500 letters so far.

The campaign would bear special significance for judges who are elected rather than appointed. According to the National Center for State Courts, about 30 states elect lower state court judges, the judges who sentence in most criminal cases. But the threat is equally as weighty for those judges who are appointed for set terms.

One letter was fired off Monday to a Missouri judge who made headlines when he sentenced a university professor who had killed his wife with a hammer to 60 days in jail.

Another sentence in which a Massachusetts judge freed on bail a doctor accused of raping two women patients, even though he had been convicted earlier of raping a nurse, drew a sharp response. "The court's action can accurately be labeled an outrage," the foundation charged in a letter.

In a local case, the foundation asked D.C. Superior Court Judge Henry H. Kennedy Jr., who sentenced a man to 18 to 54 months in jail after he pleaded guilty to killing a 20-month-old girl, "By what strange reasoning or process did you arrive at such a lenient sentence?"

"In our view, the sentence dangerously approaches the level of judicially sanctioning child abuse and infanticide," the group said. "The Washington Legal Foundation believes that if you are unable or are unwilling to mete out appropriate sentences for violent crimes, you should seriously consider resigning from the bench."

If the group doesn't receive a satisfactory response from a judge, it files a complaint with the state judicial review commission. Six complaints are currently pending, and the foundation is about to lodge another five.

Apparently, however, when the Washington Legal Foundation talks, many judges listen.

"I have tried many murder cases, and this is the first time I've ever reduced a first-degree murder conviction in my 10 years on the Superior Court," California Judge Peter S. Smith told the group, noting that he was appointed to the bench by former governor Ronald Reagan and has "a reputation as a hard sentencer."

Legal Foundation lawyers believe their letters make a difference. "In the next case, that judge is going to be a little more sensitive to the victim and the public, and that's a beneficial effect," said lawyer Nicholas E. Calio.

In an expansion move, the foundation is about to expand the Court Watch program. It has printed 50,000 copies of a "Court Watch Manual" to send to various groups detailing how to set up local court-monitoring programs.

The manual suggests activities for "concerned citizens" who want "to hold judges, parole boards, prosecutors and other criminal justice personnel accountable for their actions." Such groups are already active in California and Illinois.

Recommendations include monitoring court proceedings, recall drives; letters to newspapers complaining about lenient judges or parole boards; demonstrations in front of courthouses; newspaper advertisements criticizing a judge's handling of a case, and a "worst judge" award to those too lenient with criminals and who disregard the rights of victims.

Some critics say the Court Watch project represents a dangerous attack on judicial independence.

"I never thought it was proper for judges to sentence out of fear," Vermont Supreme Court Chief Justice Albert W. Barney, chairman of the Conference of Chief Justices, said of the project. "If that's the way they're going to do business it's somewhat extortionate."

Barney noted that judges are often hamstrung by pre-existing legal rules or errors by police that keep evidence from being introduced, and are unable to explain seemingly lenient sentences because of confidentiality requirements.

"The judge gets blamed for all of these things," he said, "I don't really think that it's very satisfactory to key in on whether a sentence appears to the outsider to be lenient."

John Shattuck of the American Civil Liberties Union, argued that "judges need to be kept apart from lobbyists."

"Maybe members of Congress have to take the heat," Shattuck said, "but judges should be making their decisions based on the evidence before them, and not on letters coming in from any political group of whatever stripe."

"We've never received a nasty letter from a judge," Popeo countered. "We feel we are really protecting the judicial establishment from the attacks of the ACLU and the rest of the criminal defense lobby." ●

## INSANITY DEFENSE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, a Washington jury found John Hinckley "not guilty by reason of insanity" of shooting President Reagan and three other men last March. I believe that we must take a very hard look at what the insanity defense has become. A man should not shoot the President in front of millions of people on television and then be eligible to be released in as little as 50 days because of the insanity defense.

Now is the time for reform. In many areas of the Nation, criminals are escaping punishment by use of the insanity defense. In Michigan, during the 1970's, 223 criminals escaped punishment by claiming they were insane. Of these 223, 124 were released after only a 60-day hospital stay. This is the type of thing that has to end.

Recently, a Georgia man was twice released from hospitals after two juries found him insane. After he left the hospital the last time, he walked into a hotel lounge and killed his wife and two bystanders.

The insanity defense appeals particularly to defendants with no other defense. Hinckley was able to hire three psychiatrists to try to justify his actions to a jury. Then the jury of laymen was forced to make a decision

on Hinckley's sanity on which expert psychiatrists could not agree.

I believe that a good solution would be legislation similar to that enacted by several States which creates a verdict of "guilty but mentally ill." This verdict would result in criminals being sent to prison after treatment for mental illness rather than being released into the public. Today, I am introducing a bill that would create such a verdict in Federal cases.

There is something very wrong when a man can shoot the President and three other men and then escape punishment by hiring three psychiatrists to say that he was insane. The worst part is that he could soon hire other experts to say that he is now sane and should be released.●

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION SUPPORT FOR MALMSTROM AFB

#### HON. RON MARLENEE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the House will consider H.R. 6214, the military construction authorization bill. I support this legislation as a much needed step toward upgrading our military facilities.

I am particularly concerned with the present condition of our housing on our military bases. Many of our bases are struggling to provide adequate housing for our military personnel, and this includes one base in my district, Malmstrom Air Force Base. In fact, 82 percent of the Strategic Air Command's existing dormitory spaces do not meet current Air Force standards. Our Nation must invest in this area and make substantial quality of life improvements as an incentive for our military personnel.

I am gratified, and appreciative, of the actions by the Committee on Armed Services to include \$5.1 million to upgrade unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing at Malmstrom as well as its actions to include funds for a heat plant there.

This Nation cannot continue to allow housing at our military bases to deteriorate as it has been and I join with the military personnel at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls, Mont., in thanks for the actions of the House Armed Services Committee.●

#### BUFFALO'S UKRAINIANS KEEP MEMORY, DREAM OF FREEDOM FOR HOMELAND

#### HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, Ukrainian-Americans during the month of August will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the establishment of their community in the Buffalo, N.Y., area.

The Buffalo Chapter of the Ukrainian Congress of America is the vehicle by which their heritage and appreciation of freedom are communicated to our community and beyond. Mrs. Dasha Procyk, who was a 4-year captive of the Nazi's Auschwitz concentration camp during World War II, is the president of Buffalo's local chapter. Mrs. Procyk spoke of local Ukrainian-American groups as striving to "teach their children a love for their homeland and at the same time a love for their American heritage and an appreciation of the freedoms they have here."

Ukrainian dreams of freedom were trounced when the revolt against czarist Russia failed. To this day the policy of "Russification" continues in Ukraine with a ban on the teaching of the Ukrainian language, the imprisonment of dissidents, religious persecutions, mass postwar deportations, and manmade famines.

The Buffalo Chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has "adopted" jailed dissidents and sent food to their homeland in an effort to alleviate human suffering.

The following appeared August 2, 1982, in the Buffalo Courier Express: "Buffalo's Ukrainians Keep Memory, Dream of Freedom for Homeland":

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, Aug. 2, 1982]

#### BUFFALO'S UKRAINIANS KEEP MEMORY, DREAM OF FREEDOM FOR HOMELAND (By Bill Osinski)

It was only a local ethnic fair, but the organizers committed the diplomatic blunder of putting a flag with a hammer and sickle over the Ukrainian booth.

Dasha Procyk told the festival people there would be no Ukrainian booth until the flag of the Soviet Union was replaced with a blue-and-yellow one symbolizing the independent Ukraine.

"To us, the cause is maybe a little more burning than to other captive nations," said Mrs. Procyk, president of the Buffalo Chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and a member of that organization's national board. "But the Ukrainians were the first victims of Russian expansion and the most forgotten, so we have to be the loudest."

This month about 30,000 Ukrainian-Americans in the Buffalo area mark the 100th anniversary of the establishment of their community here. To many of them, it is more than an ethnic milestone: it is a chance to demonstrate a national identity of a home-

land that most of the world recognizes only as the westernmost cave of the Russian bear.

To Ukrainians, the Ukraine is part of the Soviet Union only on political maps. It was from their homeland that the Cossacks rebelled against the czar in the 18th century, and that Ukrainian patriots mounted an army of hundreds of thousands to fight both the Communists and Fascists in World War II.

Now that the Ukraine has once again been absorbed by Russia—this time into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—it falls to the Ukrainians in the United States to keep alive the concept that the Ukraine is a distinct land, with its own religious, social and political tradition.

"We feel we must speak for those who cannot speak on their own behalf," Mrs. Procyk said. "We have a sacred duty."

Even those who are three or four generations removed from their homeland feel, to some degree, that same responsibility, she said.

"Some people think once you emigrate, you should forget," said Mrs. Procyk. "I am an American, but an American who doesn't know what is going on in the world isn't a good American."

On the local level, Ukrainian food and folk arts will be the featured attractions at the 10th Annual Ukrainian Day Celebration, to be held Aug. 15 at St. Basil the Great Church on Walden Avenue.

On the international political level, the Ukrainians are perhaps the most active bloc in the National Captive Nations Committee, an advocacy group for the national groups—not 31—that are under Soviet domination, she said.

By federal law, since 1959 the third week in July has been designated as Captive Nations Week in the United States. Mrs. Procyk participated in a ceremony in the White House Rose Garden last month as part of the 1982 commemoration of the Captive Nations cause.

Representatives of the various nations believe they have a strong friend in President Reagan, she said, but most of the strength of their cause comes from personal convictions.

For Mrs. Procyk, those convictions were forged during four years she spent as a captive in a Nazi concentration camp.

"My foremost thought was, 'Does anybody care, does anybody know I'm here?'" she said. Her own antipathy toward the Soviets was hardened, she said, when the Soviets took control of her camp, Auschwitz, and treated the Ukrainians almost as poorly as the Nazis had.

Because she could speak Russian, she could understand the talk among the soldiers of eventually marching to London and Washington, D.C., she said.

Marian Boraczok uses artistic language to make his statement on the Ukrainian spirit.

He had been trained in the Ukraine and Poland as an artist, but when he came to America the only work he could find was in the steel mills of Lackawanna. He remembers reporting for his first day of work at the mill in a ski outfit. But the end of the day his hands were blistered from pushing a coal-laden wheelbarrow, and the seat of his pants had been eaten away by chemical fumes.

"That was like in the hell," Boraczok said of his first impressions of working in his new country. "All the time I was thinking I was in my beautiful country."



Boraczok continued to work in the mills for 18 years, but his mind's eye continued to be filled with visions of his homeland.

His artistic works, done in oils, wood sculptures and ceramics, consist almost entirely of Ukrainian folk themes, from impressionistic paintings of country life to the traditional Ukrainian ceramic plates and Easter eggs.

Boraczok helped start a scout troop for Ukrainian youths and participated in the fund-raising drive to get a summer camp for the troop in the late 1950s.

He also used his free time to come to the community center that the Ukrainians had purchased on Genesee Street and to paint most of the frescoes that practically cover the walls of the center's main hall.

But the heart of Boraczok's contribution to his community is a large room in the center in which he displays his collection of Ukrainian art and lesser memorabilia.

Because the center does not have a separate staff for the room, Boraczok's collection can be viewed only by appointment with Boraczok. The eclectic collection includes some non-Ukrainian items, but most it is Boraczok's statement on the national identity of his homeland.

There are tributes to Ukrainian artists and patriots, mannequins dressed in traditional costumes, and pieces of old Ukrainian currency. The room also holds things that have mostly personal value, such as the threadbare piece of Ukrainian embroidery that an immigrant woman carried on an odyssey through three continents, and a photo of a weeping Ukrainian woman, whom Boraczok later discovered was the mother of a Buffalo man.

"Here is my blood," Boraczok said in explaining why he maintains the collection. "I want people from the third and fourth generation to come here and say 'I am proud to be Ukrainian.'"

Monsignor Paul Iwachiw, pastor of St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Church, said most Ukrainian-Americans believe they have a duty to act as "ambassadors before the world of freedom of religion, because they know their brothers in the Ukraine don't have it."

The Soviet government allows some external expressions of national identity—such as language and folk arts—to all the republics, he said. But expressions of religion that go against the essential atheistic nature of communism are harshly repressed, he said.

This is one reason why people from lands such as the Ukraine are among the most ardent supporters of the American way of life, he said.

"Yes, we have crime here in America, but it is not the same kind of crime as we saw in Europe (the parts of Europe dominated by communism), where a man did not have the right to call himself who he is," Msgr. Iwachiw said.

"We want to be not a dead body but alive," he said, referring to Ukrainians both in their homeland and abroad.

To illustrate the determination of this spirit, Msgr. Iwachiw translated from a letter he received from a friend in the Ukraine, a man who is forced to perform his priestly functions only in secret gatherings:

"We are washed by waves of atheism in a sea of falsehoods, but we do not drown; we are knocked down to the ground, but we are not conquered." ●

## A TRIBUTE TO DR. W. LLOYD JOHNS

### HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in tribute to an outstanding educator in my district, Dr. W. Lloyd Johns, president of California State University, Sacramento.

I join with alumni, friends, faculty, students, and staff at "Sac-State" University who will be celebrating Dr. Johns' continued service at a special reception on Sunday, August 29. As president of the State capital campus of the California State University system since 1978, Dr. Johns presides over an \$80 million annual budget, with a faculty and staff of 2,000 and a student population of 23,000.

He is an educator with over 30 years' experience in classroom teaching and administration at all levels, including elementary, secondary, and postsecondary. But Dr. Johns' interests and activities extend far beyond his profession. He is a recognized management consultant, and accomplished public speaker with a fine sense of humor, a published author, and a professional musician.

The Sacramento area and the entire State of California is indeed fortunate to continue to enjoy his service and benefit from his leadership.

I am sure my colleagues—and particularly my colleagues from the State of California—will join me in extending appreciation and best wishes to Dr. W. Lloyd Johns for his outstanding contributions to higher education. ●

## AMERICAN JEWS WHO OPPOSE THE ISRAELI INVASION

### HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, many varieties of groups have courageously spoken out against the Israeli invasion in the interest of world peace. They do not condemn the Israeli people. However, they do condemn the leaders of the Israeli Government who have promoted this invasion and victimized so many innocent people.

On my recent congressional tour of the Middle East, I found many Israelis who also oppose the invasion of Lebanon. These people want to live in harmony with their Arab brothers and sisters.

Can we do less as an American Government? Why are we so mysteriously silent when it is our weapons that are responsible for this devastation of a country and her peoples?

The following inserts are messages from two groups of Americans who

care about the people of the Middle East.

## STATEMENT OF WASHINGTON AREA JEWS OPPOSED TO THE ISRAELI INVASION OF LEBANON

As American Jews, we are deeply saddened by Israel's invasion of Lebanon. The death and destruction wrought by the Begin/Sharon government are a betrayal of the vision of Israel's founders and the historical commitment of Jewish people to human rights.

Israel's long-term security is jeopardized, not enhanced, by poisoning the political atmosphere of the Middle East with excessive and senseless violence against civilians.

The violence against Israeli citizens must also be ended so that Israelis can be freed from their legitimate fears—but this must be accomplished by political and diplomatic means, not by subjecting other civilians to even more terrible devastation.

The dream of a peaceful homeland will never be realized so long as Israel denies the legitimate national aspirations of the Palestinian people.

We call on the Israeli government to withdraw from Lebanon, to respect the territorial integrity of all her neighbors and to let the Lebanese decide the fate of their country.

We join hands with the thousands of Israelis who are demanding: Peace Now.

This statement has been endorsed by over one hundred Jewish citizens of the Washington area as well as the "Washington Area Jews Opposed to the Israeli Invasion of Lebanon" and the "New Jewish Agenda". Among the signatories are Rabbi Harold White of Temple Sinai in Washington, Ken Giles of "New Jewish Agenda" and journalist I. F. Stone.

Denise Abrams, Andrea Barron, Samuel D. Beck, Sarah Bencich, Barbara Bick, David Bine, Alan Bloom, Jonathan H. Bloom, Horst Brand, Geraldine Brittain, Mark P. Cohen, Sarah L. Cohen, Gabrielle S. Edgcomb, Addie Efron, Ev Ehrlich, Joan Eisenberg, Fred Feinstein, Kenneth Feldman, Rachel Fershko, Robert Pink.

Judith Freeman, Jill Gay, Lynne Gelzer, Laura Ginsburg, Deb Goldman, John Goodman, Dan Gordon, Gloria Green, Larry Greenfield, Dr. John Gregor, Casey Gurewitz, Helen Gurewitz, Linda Hassberg, Richard Healy, Gloria Helfand, Alex Hershaft, Max Holland, Daniel Hooper, Helen Hoops, Todd Kaplan.

William Kaplan, Bob Kasen, Jack Kasofsky, Carolyn Kazdin, Peter Kornbluh, Sharon Levy, Barbara Lewis, Silvia Lichtenstein, E. James Lieberman, Robert A. Manning, Michael S. Marcus, Carl Mayer, David Melnick, Bill Montross, James M. Morowitz, Amy Oppenheimer, Florence Orbach, Mark N. Paster, Steven Pearlman, Ray Pinkson.

Ruth Pinkson, Nancy D. Polikoff, Rich Pollock, Joe Rail, Barbara Raskin, Marcus Raskin, Sheldon L. Richman, Moe Rodenstein, Lori Rolnick, Ken Rothschild, Matt Rothschild, Meyer Samals, Selma Samals, Margerie Schuman, David Schwartzman, Judith Seckler, Jerome Segal, Dana A. Seidenberg, Helen Sharnoff, Phil Sharnoff.

Ellen Siegel, M. Silverton, Wendy Simmons, G. C. Simon, Deborah Slavin, Deborah Smith, Curtis Seltzer, Patricia Weiss, Stanley Weiss, Barry Wells, Ross E. Wells, Ruth L. Wells, Bernard Welt, Ronald Wynne, Suzan Wynne, Adria Zeldin, Leslie Zeldin, Adrien Zubin.

(Telegram)

AUGUST 4, 1982.

President RONALD REAGAN,  
Hon. GEORGE SHULTZ,  
Secretary of State,  
Hon. WILLIAM CLARK  
Director of the National Security Council.

Israel's latest offensive coupled with Beirut's serious food shortage caused by Israeli troops blocking supplies of water, food, and medical supplies to the city is beyond the bounds of human decency.

That a half million civilians should be held hostage to Israel's seeking revenge on 6,000 PLO members indicates an insensitivity to world opinion on the part of Israel which exceeds our ability to comprehend. Common humanity demands immediate action.

Because of Israel's special relationship to the United States, it is imperative that the Administration publicly make clear its concern over Israel's siege in a manner that cannot be misunderstood: We should tell Israel that if the siege is not lifted it is our intention to supply food by means of the Sixth Fleet.

JAMES H. COSTEN,

Moderator,

WILLIAM P. THOMPSON,

Stated Clerk,

United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.●

## INTEGRATION OF THE CENTAUR INTO THE SPACE SHUTTLE

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a good colleague of mine has recently inserted a statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains several substantive errors. I sincerely believe that my colleague is quite concerned about the Space Shuttle system and the type of upper stage which will be used in the Shuttle. I am impressed by the sincerity of his concern. Unfortunately, my colleague's statement is confusing because it is in total variance with other statements he has made on this exact same subject. As the ranking minority member of the Space Shuttle, Science, and Applications Subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee, my colleague vociferously criticized the administration for including the interim upper stage—IUS—for two important NASA science missions.

There are errors in my colleague's extended remarks that must be set straight.

In spite of the fact that the Boeing Co. has built and delivered eight IUS units at a cost in excess of \$700 million for a solid fuel upper stage for the military and civilian spacecraft.\* \* \*

On this point my distinguished colleagues is correct. The IUS was initial-

ly supposed to cost the taxpayer \$150 million and now is costing the taxpayer \$700 million \* \* \* a 500-percent cost increase.

Congress has passed legislation (urgent supplemental) forcing NASA to pay the losing contractor \$150 million over the next 2 years.

The money which will be expended for the Centaur system over the next 2 years will mean that the taxpayer will not have to pay for the IUS vehicle for the Galileo and International Solar-Polar missions. Additionally, the Centaur is a high-energy upper stage and its inclusion into the Shuttle will save the taxpayer an investment of in excess of \$1 billion that would be required to develop a brand-new high-energy upper stage. Such an expenditure would only be necessary if the Centaur is not used for these missions "To build and develop a system that does the same thing."

The Centaur does not do the same thing as the IUS. The Centaur has in excess of twice the lift capability of the IUS. The Centaur also provides an operational flexibility not provided by the IUS which will be of greater value to our intelligence community, scientists, and commercial users.

This was the same system that was rejected by NASA because its design allegedly made it far too dangerous to put aboard the Space Shuttle.

NASA does not maintain that the Centaur poses a safety problem to the Space Shuttle. In fact, the ability of the Centaur to expel its propellants makes it less of a safety concern than the IUS solid propellant could cause the Shuttle to have to operate an abort maneuver with increased weight in the Shuttle bay.

Now I have learned that the switchover back to the Centaur upper stage will cost an additional \$1.4 billion.

This statement is incorrect. It appears my colleague was multiplying when he should have been subtracting.

This is for a system that is untried and untested. If NASA had been allowed to use the Boeing IUS for the planetary flights to Jupiter and the Solar Polar Mission flight, the IUS would have been tested a dozen times before. Now NASA is faced with flying half-billion-dollar spacecrafts on Centaur Upper Stages that have never been flown before.

The Centaur upper stage has flown before. In fact, the last 44 Centaur flights have been 100 percent successful. I am sorry to note that it is the IUS vehicle that has never flown before. The first IUS flight will be an operational flight. A failure on a flight such as this would not only destroy a similarly expensive space payload but would leave the Galileo and ISPM missions without a backup were it not for the now planned integration of Centaur into the Space Shuttle.

Deciding on what system to use for a booster rocket should not be determined by politicians, but should be left to the discretion of the technical experts.

If this is true, one might ask my colleague why he has reintroduced this matter into the political realm. As for the "Technical Experts," I would urge my colleague to dial his telephone, call NASA and ask them what they think because I agree with them. Let us examine what the "Technical Experts" have said on this issue.

Letter from Verne Orr, Secretary of the Air Force and Hans Mark, Deputy Administrator of NASA to Chairman FURQUA of House Committee on Science and Technology:

NASA should undertake the adaptation of the Centaur to be used in the Shuttle to support the near-term Galileo mission and the projected mid-term high energy requirements of NASA, DOD, and commercial users.

Report to the Congress from the Defense Department and NASA entitled, "Upper Stage Alternatives for the Shuttle Era":

An IUS Galileo, combined spacecraft mission, case 5 in Section 5.3.1.3, utilizing the IUS on a Delta-VEGA trajectory was also analyzed with development of preliminary cost figures. Based on preliminary mission analysis, this option provided, at best, major compromise to the mission which would have to be subjected to detailed review by the scientific community. Further mission analysis, while possible, to identify other mission options would involve much more detailed weight and CG location for a Galileo combined spacecraft with kick stage would represent a load to the generic IUS which is greater than design limits. This fact would require, as a minimum, structural modifications to stiffen that upper stage. The implications of such a modification and the cost and schedule consequences as well as risks are not well understood at this time. In summary, while it is apparent that a mission with a combined Galileo spacecraft can be accomplished with upper stage performance characteristics equivalent to an IUS, it is not clear that such a mission could be accomplished without major science compromises as well as high costs and schedule risks which would make a single launch in 1985 undesirable.

Consequently, as this portion provided for extremely high technical risk and a low mission accomplishment reliability factor, the assessment and cost analysis was discontinued.

I hope that my good colleague from New Jersey will join me and his other colleagues in Congress who agreed with his earlier view that this decision has turned out as it should have. Integration of the Centaur into the Space Shuttle will save the taxpayer millions if not billions of dollars. It will provide an increase in capability and will make the Galileo mission, as well as many future missions, much more certain and much more effective.●



IN HONOR OF JAMES A. COLE

HON. EUGENE V. ATKINSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate one of my constituents, the Honorable James A. Cole, who celebrated his 75th birthday on the 28th of July 1982. Mr. Cole was born in and has been a life long resident of Wexford, Pa., where his family is one of the oldest and most revered in the community.

He holds degrees from Duquesne University in both accounting and law.

Mr. Cole's life has been dedicated to community service. His contributions and accomplishments are many and varied. The following are but a few of his significant achievements:

Forty-four years as a district justice and justice of the peace;

Over 50 years service as a notary public;

Forty years employment with Duquesne Light Co. of Pittsburgh. During the last 15 years with the company, he was president of Local 149 I.B.E.W., as well as president of the joint board of all the Duquesne Light Co. locals. In addition he was an officer in both Duquesne Light Co. Credit Union and Pittsburgh Officers Credit Union for many years;

Mr. Cole spent more than 30 years as a director of Farmer's Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Pennsylvania and was its president for the past 10 years—an office he continues to hold;

Mr. Cole has been an active member of the Wexford Volunteer Fire Co. and is now a life member. This service covers more than 50 years with the fire company.

Mr. Cole is still an active member of Perry Highway Lions Club. He has just completed a third term—not consecutive—as president of this group. He has also served as district officer in International, Pennsylvania, District 14B of the Lions Club.

Mr. Cole has been and is a life long member of St. Alphonsus Roman Catholic Church. He has been an active participant in many congregational duties. In addition, he now serves as eucharistic minister.

The Honorable Mr. Cole has performed outstanding community service. He has profound respect for law and the office he served as justice of the peace. He never allowed personal feelings, friendships, nor favoritism to interfere with due process of the law.

Though he is retired from office, he continues to do what comes naturally to him—serve his fellow man.●

TRIBUTE TO GIUSEPPE PREZZOLINI

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the late Giuseppe Prezzolini an internationally known author, journalist, and scholar who passed away recently. My good friend Dr. Peter Sammartino, founder-president and chancellor of Fairleigh Dickinson University was especially close to Professor Prezzolini especially during the latter's tenure at Columbia University. Dr. Sammartino together with Sister Margherita, a renowned authority on Italian-American culture and history issued a statement paying tribute to Professor Prezzolini which I would like to place into the RECORD at this point.

## PREZZOLINI, A WORLD CITIZEN

MORRISTOWN, N.J.—Giuseppe Prezzolini passed away in Lugano, Switzerland, a few days ago. He was a highly productive scholar and journalist whose intellectual alertness lasted to the very end. What he has been and will remain, as a scholar and a man, lives in countless books and articles written in several languages and which have been since translated into many more languages.

A Nobel Prize candidate, Giuseppe Prezzolini was the founder and first editor of *La Voce* (1908-1914). He may be called "an impresario of culture," as he said of himself. He has been instrumental in bringing foreign literatures to Italy, interpreting them to his audience, and then sharing with the rest of the world the rich outpouring of Italian literary and cultural achievements. These accomplishments were the direct result of his spadework and unceasing labors in the cause of introducing modern thought to the literary and artistic community.

Of himself Prezzolini wrote in 1922 (*Amici*, Vallecchi, p. 8):

I am not a writer, I have no originality as a philosopher, and I mistrust those who would like to do over the universe. But it seems that I possess a certain clarity of ideas, the capacity to grasp the character of a man or of a movement, the strength of soul to refuse to be seduced by friendships or to be upset by hatreds in evaluating merits and in measuring defects. At a certain point in my life, having buried the romantic turmoils and aspirations. I decided to become the "useful man" for others; to clarify certain ideas to Italians, to indicate their inferiorities in order to overcome them, to characterize foreign people and foreign movements, to translate from different languages, to reveal promising young men, to point out hidden greatness; that is what one calls work of culture. It is very much like building ditches, plowing the soil, planting trees, pruning, sowing, weeding, trimming, and all the operations of a good agriculturalist. Yes, I have always wanted to be useful. I don't say I have always succeeded, but that was my intention. I have always put myself at the service of a man who needed to be known, of an idea that needed conquering, of a propaganda that needed dissemination. This was the principal char-

acter of the *Voce* but it is in a way the character of all my works.

Prezzolini—Columbia University Professor Emeritus of Italian—was an internationally-known author, journalist, scholar, critic, teacher who, while directing the Literary and Information Department of the Bureau for Intellectual Cooperation funded by the League of Nations in Paris, was invited to become director of Casa Italiana in 1930.

A man of culture made for study, but also for action and responsibility, Prezzolini won the trust of the University and its administrators and was much appreciated by colleagues and students. At the outbreak of World War II he became an American citizen and for another decade continued to teach, to study, and to write at Columbia University.

Intellectual stimulation, moral integrity and the spiritual values exemplified in his own life were characteristics of Prezzolini's teaching, not only at Columbia University, but throughout his life. His writings, whether scholarly or journalistic, are delightful because of his clear, precise, well-balanced style. He has a great variety of interests and his pen ranges from German mysticism to an erudite history of spaghetti, with biography, criticism, philosophy, scholarship, reportage, allegory, religion, and psychology filling the gap.

For the past 20 years he lived in Italy and Switzerland, where he continued his literary scholarship and journalistic endeavors. He recently prepared the manuscript for a sequel to his most popular book: "God is a Risk" (*Dio è un rischio*), which will soon be published. His lucidity and keenness of mind can well be attested to by the hundreds of interviews which appeared in newspapers and magazines throughout the world, and by the many radio and TV programs on which he appeared during the celebrations honoring him on his 100th birthday.

In July 1971, in recognition of his contribution to Italian culture, the President of the Republic of Italy bestowed on him the Italian government's highest honor, and in January 1982, he received the Penna d'Oro Award from President Sandro Pertini.

Prezzolini will live on in his works which include over 60 books, with an additional 50 new editions, as well as over 70 anthologies, volumes of correspondence and translations. He wrote for over 175 newspapers and magazines to which he contributed articles during the past century in Italy, France, Germany, India, Yugoslavia, Holland, Switzerland, Venezuela, Spain, England, Sweden, Belgium, and the United States.

Prezzolini's impressive contribution to the growth, spread, and development of Italian thought and literature will never be forgotten, for he has been the catalyst whose skillful blending of literary and philosophical developments with Italian genius brought forth a new Italian renaissance in the early years of the twentieth century.

Dr. Peter Sammartino, Founder-President and Chancellor of Fairleigh Dickinson University remembers Professor Prezzolini at Columbia University: "It was the period of the greatest ebullience and of the most important thrust forward, intellectually, of Italian Studies. Never in the history of American universities had so much been accomplished in a relatively short time. The Casa Italiana, one of the most beautiful buildings on any campus, shone as a beacon light of Italian culture in America."

An inscription carved on the facade of Casa Italiana of Columbia University reads:

"Italy Mother of Arts Thy Hand Was Once Our Guardian and Is Still Our Guide" (Lord Byron's *Childe Harold*, 4.47). It will always be applied by countless Columbia University graduates to Prezzolini: "Whose hand was once our guardian and is still our guide." ●

# TENN-TOM INVESTIGATION

## HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1982

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House information contained in news reports filed by WSMV-TV in Nashville concerning allegations of criminal activity relating to the Tennessee-Tombigbee navigation project in Mississippi and Alabama. This Corps of Engineers project, which has been the subject of considerable controversy in the past, will need fiscal year 1983 funding this year. I anticipate offering an amendment affecting Tenn-Tom's funding, and I believe Members should be aware of the information reported in Nashville before they decide how to vote on this project.

I also believe that the reports emanating from Nashville deserve congressional attention. Therefore, I have requested that the House Public Works and Transportation Committee to investigate this issue. Excerpts from last week's news reports and my letter requesting an investigation follow:

[WSMV-TV News, Aug. 2, 1982]

Channel Four News has learned a federal grand jury in Nashville is investigating possible charges of fraud in the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway . . .

The waterway is planned to connect 234 miles of canals, locks, dams, and lakes. But it is this stretch in upper Northeast Mississippi that is the subject of this story. The Corps of Engineers calls this the greatest single construction feat of the Tenn-Tom . . . A manmade canyon 27 miles long through what's called the Tennessee divide, and it is a bigger earth-moving job than the digging of the Panama Canal. But a Nashville grand jury suspects that one of the projects contractors may have cheated the taxpayer out of millions of dollars.

The contract to cut through the first part of the divide was awarded in 1976. . . The contract's title was "Divide Cut Section 4-A—its price was \$21 million. But with the contract more than half done the original contractor went broke and the job was given to a subcontractor already doing the work—Paul Bosco and Sons from Detroit.

Bosco finished the job in January of 1979. And by the time it was finished the cost had skyrocketed from the original \$21 million to \$39 million. Since then two Bosco foremen have been indicted for allegedly lying to the Nashville grand jury investigating divide cut section 4-A. . .

The cost overruns Apparently raised a red flag to the Army's Internal Audit Agency because they came here to what used to be the offices of the Corps of Engineers in Iuka, Mississippi to get records of the Bosco contract. They studied these records from

March through August of 1980. They discovered this single change order alone—Modification No. 3—added \$12 million to the cost of the contract.

The auditors, along with the Army's Criminal Investigation Division and the FBI began questioning foremen, engineers, and officials involved in the Bosco contract. Two of the people they questioned told Channel Four the Army suspected Bosco had overcharged the Corps for the equipment it used and possibly tried to slow the project down.

Last summer the US Department of Justice joined the probe and a Nashville grand jury here began questioning some of the same people who had been grilled by the Army and the FBI. Two of the people are scheduled to be tried here in September for allegedly lying to the grand jury—Former Bosco foremen Lewis Cass and Robert Douglas Holt, both of Mississippi.

In the indictments of the two men, the grand jury states it was conducting an investigation to determine whether violations of the mail false claims, false statements, and other criminal statutes of the United States had been committed in connection with the divide cut Section 4-A of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. . . .

[WSMV-TV News, Aug. 3, 1982]

Alabama Representative Tom Bevill is chairman of the committee responsible for oversight on water projects like Tenn-Tom. But Bevill said he did not know about the grand jury probe until Channel Four told him about it last week.

He said no congressional investigation is needed because the Department of Justice is taking care of it. Bevill said the Corps of Engineers, which is building the Tenn-Tom, is cooperating with the Justice Department 100 per cent. But he claimed even if indictments and conviction result from the grand jury probe, the project will still be finished. . . .

[WSMV-TV News, Aug. 4, 1982]

The contract, being worked by Paul Bosco and Sons, specified the earth would be sandy, like this. But instead, according to the Corps, Bosco ran into wet, mucky soil like this—soil that is harder to move.

According to the Corps, Bosco had the right to demand extra time to finish the job, but the Corps did not want to extend the deadline. So Area Engineer said the Corps decided to pay Bosco more money so he could meet his original deadline. The Corps did not know how much the so-called changed conditions would cost. So Bosco started working around the clock and no price was agreed upon in advance.

The work was put on a cost plus basis. Bosco told the Corps what the work cost him plus a certain percentage profit. Corps Engineer said the Corps avoids cost plus situations wherever possible because they put all the risk on the government.

The final cost of the Bosco contract was \$18 million more than the original price. And the federal grand jury here in Nashville apparently suspects the Corps took a risk and lost.

The grand jury indicted two former Bosco foremen for perjury in answers to questions about the Bosco contract. One indictment read: "Lewis Cass knew that he told certain heavy equipment operators to slow down because they were in cost plus.

Paul Bosco himself is now working in Dallas. He told Channel Four he feels he is being targeted by authorities. He would make no further comment except to say

someday he will have a story of his own to tell. . . .

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1982.

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD,  
Chairman, House Public Works and Transportation Committee Rayburn House Office Building.

DEAR JIM: I have recently learned of allegations of criminal activity relating to the Army Corps of Engineers Tennessee-Tombigbee project. I believe that this information merits the attention of our committee, and I am writing to request that the committee conduct a further investigation of this matter.

Let me briefly outline the allegations that have been made public thus far. Last night, Nashville television station WSMV reported that a federal grand jury has been investigating one of the contractors of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project over the past year. The investigation specifically concerns the divide-cut portion of the project in northeast Mississippi. The investigation focused on a portion of the divide-cut for which the original contract in 1976 was \$21 million. In 1979 the original contractor went bankrupt before completing its obligations and the contract was given to a subcontractor, Paul Bosco, Co. of Detroit.

With Bosco doing the work, costs on this portion of the project gradually escalated to \$39 million. It is this \$18 million escalation under the new contractor that the allegations specifically concern. Two men working for Bosco have been indicted for allegedly lying to the grand jury. It is my understanding that the questions they were asked by the grand jury involved whether they had deliberately slowed work and deceived the Corps in order to escalate their "cost plus" contract. The investigation is still continuing, and either the investigation or the trial of the two men, set for September, may turn up new facts.

I believe this episode could have implications for the whole project and perhaps even for the whole Corps of Engineers program. The suspicion that a contractor may have hidden as much as \$18 million in fraud from the Corps is extremely serious. Presumably, the alleged fraud may have gone undiscovered without the eventual involvement of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Justice Department which brought an investigation to the grand jury. Given the Corps' close working relationship with Congress and our committee and congressional reliance on the Corps for facts and oversight on projects, I feel that we have a responsibility to look into this matter further.

As you know, the Tennessee-Tombigbee is the largest and most expensive project the Corps has ever undertaken. I and many other colleagues have opposed the project in the past on its merits, but I believe that both supporters and opponents of the project are shocked by allegations of criminal activity connected with this federal project. As the Public Works Committee moves along with further activity on the authorization of projects and examination of the Corps program, I believe it is essential that we address the questions which are raised by the activities of the Nashville grand jury. I hope that you agree that a committee investigation is appropriate and that we can discuss this matter further at your convenience.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. EDGAR. ●