

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S SPEECH
TO THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan yesterday made a speech to the British Parliament. I consider this speech to be among the most inspirational and moving I have experienced in all my years of public life. At this point I wish to insert the text of this speech, as it was printed in the New York Times, June 9, 1982, in the RECORD:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ADDRESS TO
PARLIAMENT ON PROMOTING DEMOCRACY

LONDON, June 8.—Following is the text of President Reagan's speech today to the British Parliament, as made public by White House officials:

The journey of which this visit forms a part is a long one. Already it has taken me to two great cities of the West—Rome and Paris—and to the Economic Summit at Versailles. There, once again, our sister democracies have proved that, even in a time of severe economic strain, free peoples can work together freely and voluntarily to address problems as serious as inflation, unemployment, trade and economic development in a spirit of cooperation and solidarity.

Other milestones lie ahead later this week. In Germany, we and our NATO allies will discuss measures for our joint defense and America's latest initiatives for a more peaceful, secure world through arms reductions.

Each stop of this trip is important but, among them all, this moment occupies a special place in my heart and the hearts of my countrymen—a moment of kinship and homecoming in these hallowed halls.

Feeling at home in Britain

Speaking for all Americans, I want to say how very much at home we feel in your house. Every American would, because this is one of democracy's shrines. Here the rights of free people and the processes of representation have been debated and refined.

It has been said that an institution is the lengthening shadow of a man. This institution is the lengthening shadow of all the men and women who have sat here and all those who have voted to send representatives here.

This is my second visit to Great Britain as President of the United States. My first opportunity to stand on British soil occurred almost a year and a half ago when your Prime Minister, graciously hosted a diplomatic dinner at the British Embassy in Washington. Mrs. Thatcher said then that she hoped that I was not distressed to find staring down at me from the grand staircase a portrait of His Royal Majesty, King George III.

She suggested it was best to let bygones be bygones and—in view of our two countries' remarkable friendship in succeeding years—

she added that most Englishmen today would agree with Thomas Jefferson that "a little rebellion now and then is a very good thing."

From here I will go to Bonn, and then Berlin, where there stands a grim symbol of power untamed. The Berlin Wall, that dreadful gash across the city, is in its third decade. It is the fitting signature of the regime that built it.

And a few hundred kilometers behind the Berlin Wall there is another symbol. In the center of Warsaw there is a sign that notes the distances to two capitals. In one direction it points toward Moscow. In the other it points toward Brussels, headquarters of Western Europe's tangible unity. The marker says that the distances from Warsaw to Moscow and Warsaw to Brussels are equal. The sign makes this point: Poland is not East or West. Poland is at the center of European civilization. It has contributed mightily to that civilization. It is doing so today by being magnificently unreconciled to oppression.

Poland's struggle to be Poland and to secure the basic right we often take for granted demonstrates why we dare not take those rights for granted. Gladstone, defending the Reform Bill of 1866, declared: "You cannot fight against the future. Time is on our side." It was easier to believe in the inevitable march of democracy in Gladstone's day—in that high noon of Victorian optimism.

We are approaching the end of a bloody century plagued by a terrible political invention—totalitarianism. Optimism comes less easily today, not because democracy is less vigorous but because democracy's enemies have refined their instruments of repression. Yet optimism is in order because, day by day, democracy is proving itself to be a not-at-all fragile flower.

From Stettin on the Baltic to Varna on the Black Sea, the regimes planted by totalitarianism have had more than 30 years to establish their legitimacy. But none—not one regime—has yet been able to risk free elections. Regimes planted by bayonets do not take root.

The strength of the Solidarity movement in Poland demonstrates the truth told in an underground joke in the Soviet Union. It is that the Soviet Union would remain a one-party nation even if an opposition party were permitted—because everyone would join that party.

THE THREATS TO THE WORLD

America's time as a player on the stage of world history has been brief. I think understanding this fact has always made you patient with your younger cousins. Well, not always patient. I do recall that on one occasion Sir Winston Churchill said in exasperation about one of our most distinguished diplomats, "He is the only case I know of a bull who carries his china shop with him."

Witty as Sir Winston was, he also had that special attribute of great statesmen: the gift of vision, the willingness to see the future based on the experience of the past.

It is this sense of history, this understanding of the past, that I want to talk with you about today, for it is in remembering what we share of the past that our two nations can make common cause for the future.

We have not inherited an easy world. If developments like the Industrial Revolution, which began here in England, and the gifts of science and technology have made life much easier for us, they have also made it more dangerous. There are threats now to our freedom, indeed, to our very existence, that other generations could never even have imagined.

Threat of global war

There is, first, the threat of global war. No President, no Congress, no Prime Minister, no Parliament, can spend a day entirely free of this threat. And I don't have to tell you that in today's world, the existence of nuclear weapons could mean, if not the extinction of mankind, then surely the end of civilization as we know it.

That is why negotiations on intermediate range nuclear forces now under way in Europe and the START talks—Strategic Arms Reduction Talks—which will begin later this month, are not just critical to American or Western policy; they are critical to mankind. Our commitment to early success in these negotiations is firm and unshakable and our purpose is clear: reducing the risk of war by reducing the means of waging war on both sides.

At the same time, there is a threat posed to human freedom by the enormous power of the modern state. History teaches the danger of government that overreaches: political control takes precedence over free economic growth; secret police, mindless bureaucracy—all combining to stifle individual excellence and personal freedom.

Now I am aware that among us here and throughout Europe there is legitimate disagreement over the extent to which the public sector should play a role in a nation's economy and life. But on one point all of us are united: our abhorrence of dictatorship in all its forms but most particularly totalitarianism and the terrible inhumanities it has caused in our time: the great purge, Auschwitz and Dachau, the Gulag and Cambodia.

Historians looking back at our time will note the consistent restraint and peaceful intentions of the West. They will note that it was the democracies who refused to use the threat of their nuclear monopoly in the 40's and early 50's for territorial or imperial gain. Had that nuclear monopoly been in the hands of the Communist world, the map of Europe, indeed, the world, would look very different today. And certainly they will note it was not the democracies that invaded Afghanistan or suppressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and toxin warfare in Afghanistan or Southeast Asia.

If history teaches anything, it teaches: self-delusion in the face of unpleasant facts is folly. We see around us today the marks of our terrible dilemma—predictions of doomsday, antinuclear demonstrations, an arms race in which the West must for its own protection be an unwilling participant. At the same time, we see totalitarian forces in the world who seek subversion and conflict around the globe to further their barbarous assault on the human spirit.

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

What should the West do?

What, then, is our course? Must civilization perish—in a hail of fiery atoms? Must freedom wither—in a quiet, deadening accommodation with totalitarian evil? Sir Winston Churchill refused to accept the inevitability of war or even that it was imminent. He said: "I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here today while time remains, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries."

This is precisely our mission today: to preserve freedom as well as peace. It may not be easy to see, but I believe we live now at a turning point.

In an ironic sense, Karl Marx was right. We are witnessing today a great revolutionary crisis—a crisis where the demands of the economic order are colliding directly with those of the political order. But the crisis is happening not in the free, non-Marxist West, but in the home of Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet Union.

It is the Soviet Union that runs against the tide of history by denying freedom and human dignity to its citizens. It also is in deep economic difficulty. The rate of growth in the Soviet gross national product has been steadily declining since the 50's and is less than half of what it was then. The dimensions of this failure are astounding; a country which employs one-fifth of its population in agriculture is unable to feed its own people.

Were it not for the tiny private sector tolerated in Soviet agriculture, the country might be on the brink of famine. These private plots occupy a bare 3 percent of the arable land but account for nearly one-quarter of Soviet farm output and nearly one-third of meat products and vegetables.

Overcentralized, with little or no incentives, year after year the Soviet system pours its best resource into the making of instruments of destruction. The constant shrinkage of economic growth combined with the growth of military production is putting a heavy strain on the Soviet people.

What we see here is a political structure that no longer corresponds to its economic base, a society where productive forces are hampered by political ones.

The decay of the Soviet experiment should come as no surprise to us. Wherever the comparisons have been made between free and closed societies—West Germany and East Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia, Malaysia and Vietnam—it is the democratic countries that are prosperous and responsive to the needs of their people.

And one of the simple but overwhelming facts of our time is this: of all the millions of refugees we have seen in the modern world, their flight is always away from, not toward, the Communist world. Today on the NATO line, our military forces face east to prevent a possible invasion. On the other side of the line the Soviet forces also face east—to prevent their people from leaving.

RESISTING TOTALITARIANISM

The hard evidence of totalitarian rule has caused in mankind an uprising of the intellect and will. Whether it is the growth of the new schools of economics in America or England or the appearance of the so-called new philosophers in France, there is one unifying thread running through the intellectual work of these groups: rejection of the arbitrary power of the state, the refusal

to subordinate the rights of the individual to the superstate, the realization that collectivism stifles all the best human impulses.

Since the Exodus from Egypt, historians have written of those who sacrificed and struggled for freedom: the stand at Thermopylae, the revolt of Spartacus, the storming of the Bastille, the Warsaw uprising in World War II.

More recently we have seen evidence of this same human impulse in one of the developing nations in Central America. For months and months the world news media covered the fighting in El Salvador. Day after day, we were treated to stories and film slanted toward the brave freedom fighters battling oppressive Government forces in behalf of the silent, suffering people of that tortured country.

Then one day those silent suffering people were offered a chance to vote to choose the kind of Government they wanted. Suddenly the freedom fighters in the hills were exposed for what they really are: Cuban-backed guerrillas who want power for themselves and their backers, not democracy for the people.

They threatened death to anyone who voted and destroyed hundreds of buses and trucks to keep people from getting to the polling places. But on election day, the people of El Salvador, an unprecedented 1.4 million of them, braved ambush and gunfire, trudging miles to vote for freedom.

They stood for hours in the hot sun waiting for their turn to vote. Members of our Congress who went there as observers told me of a woman wounded by rifle fire who refused to leave the line to have her wound treated until after she had voted.

A grandmother, who had been told by the guerrillas she would be killed when she returned from the polls, told the guerrillas, "You can kill me, kill my family, kill my neighbors, but you can't kill us all." The real freedom fighters of El Salvador turned out to be the people of that country, the young, the old and the in-between. Strange, but there has been little if any news coverage of that war since the election.

Other fights today

Perhaps they'll say it's because there are newer struggles now. On distant islands in the South Atlantic, young men are fighting for Britain. And, yes, voices have been raised protesting their sacrifice for lumps of rock and earth so far away. But those young men aren't fighting for mere real estate.

They fight for a cause, for the belief that armed aggression must not be allowed to succeed, and that people must participate in the decisions of government under the rule of law. If there had been firmer support for that principle some 45 years ago, perhaps our generation wouldn't have suffered the bloodletting of World War II.

In the Middle East, the guns sound once more, this time in Lebanon, a country that for too long has had to endure the tragedy of civil war, terrorism and foreign intervention and occupation. The fighting in Lebanon on the part of all parties must stop and Israel must bring its forces home. But this is not enough. We must all work to stamp out the scourge of terrorism that in the Middle East makes war an ever-present threat.

Some signs of hope

But beyond the trouble spots lies a deeper, more positive pattern. Around the world today, the democratic revolution is gathering new strength. In India, a critical test has been passed with the peaceful change of

governing political parties. In Africa, Nigeria is moving in remarkable and unmistakable ways to build and strengthen its democratic institutions. In the Caribbean and Central America, 16 of 24 countries have freely elected governments. And in the United Nations, 8 of 10 developing nations which have joined the body in the past five years are democracies.

In the Communist world as well, man's instinctive desire for freedom and self-determination surfaces again and again. To be sure, there are grim reminders of how brutally the police state attempts to snuff out this quest for self-rule: 1953 in East Germany, 1956 in Hungary, 1968 in Czechoslovakia, 1981 in Poland.

But the struggle continues in Poland, and we know there are even those who strive and suffer for freedom within the confines of the Soviet Union itself. How we conduct our selves here in the Western democracies will determine whether this trend continues.

No, democracy is not a fragile flower; still it needs cultivating. If the rest of this century is to witness the gradual growth of freedom and democratic ideals, we must take actions to assist the campaign for democracy.

Some argue that we should encourage democratic change in right-wing dictatorships, but not in Communist regimes. To accept this preposterous notion—some well-meaning people have—is to invite the argument that, once countries achieve a nuclear capability, they should be allowed an undisturbed reign of terror over their own citizens. We reject this course.

As for the Soviet view, Chairman Brezhnev repeatedly has stressed that the competition of ideas and systems must continue and that this is entirely consistent with relaxation of tensions and peace. We ask only that these systems begin by living up to their own constitutions, abiding by their own laws and complying with the international obligations they have undertaken. We ask only for a process, a direction, a basic code of decency—not for instant transformation.

DRIVE TO PROMOTE DEMOCRACY

We cannot ignore the fact that even without our encouragement, there have been and will continue to be repeated explosions against repression in dictatorships. The Soviet Union itself is not immune to this reality. Any system is inherently unstable that has no peaceful means to legitimize its leaders. In such cases, the very repressiveness of the state ultimately drives people to resist it—if necessary, by force.

While we must be cautious about forcing the pace of change, we must not hesitate to clear our ultimate objectives and to take concrete actions to move towards them. We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a lucky few but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings. So states the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights—which, among other things, guarantees free elections.

The objective I propose is quite simple to state: To foster the infrastructure of democracy—the system of a free press, unions, political parties, universities—which allows a people to choose their own way, to develop their own culture, to reconcile their own differences through peaceful means.

This is not cultural imperialism; it is providing the means for genuine self-determination and protection for diversity. Democracy already flourishes in countries with

very different cultures and historical experiences. It would be cultural condescension, or worse, to say that any people prefer dictatorship to democracy.

Who would voluntarily choose not to have the right to vote; decide to purchase government propaganda handouts instead of independent newspapers; prefer government- to worker-controlled unions; opt for land to be owned by the state instead of those who till it; want government repression of religious liberty, a single political party instead of a free choice, a rigid cultural orthodoxy instead of democratic tolerance and diversity?

Since 1917, the Soviet Union has given covert political training and assistance to Marxist-Leninists in many countries. Of course, it also has promoted the use of violence and subversion by these same forces.

A bipartisan effort

Over the past several decades, West European and other Social Democrats, Christian Democrats and Liberals have offered open assistance to fraternal political and social institutions, to bring about peaceful and democratic progress. Appropriately for a vigorous new democracy, the Federal Republic of Germany's political foundations have become a major force in this effort.

We in America now intend to take additional steps, as many of our allies have already done, toward realizing this same goal. The Chairmen and other leaders of the National Republican and Democratic Party organizations are initiating a study with the bipartisan American Political Foundation to determine how the United States can best contribute—as a nation—to the global campaign for democracy now gathering force.

They will have the cooperation of Congressional leaders of both parties, along with representatives of business, labor and other major institutions in our society. I look forward to receiving their recommendations and to working with these institutions and the Congress in the common task of strengthening democracy throughout the world.

It is time that we committed ourselves as a nation—in both the public and private sectors—to assisting democratic development.

Enlisting Others' Help

We plan to consult with leaders of other nations as well. There is a proposal before the Council of Europe to invite parliamentarians from democratic countries to a meeting next year in Strasbourg. That prestigious gathering could consider ways to help democratic political movements.

This November, in Washington, there will take place an international meeting on free elections, and next spring there will be a conference of world authorities on constitutionalism and self-government hosted by the Chief Justice of the United States.

Authorities from a number of developing and developed countries—judges, philosophers and politicians with practical experience—have agreed to explore how to turn principle into practice and further the rule of law.

At the same time, we invite the Soviet Union to consider with us how the competition of ideas and values—which it is committed to support—can be conducted on a peaceful and reciprocal basis. For example, I am prepared to offer President Brezhnev an opportunity to speak to the American people on our television if he will allow me the same opportunity with the Soviet people. We also suggest that panels of our newsmen periodically appear on each other's television to discuss major events.

The possible Soviet reaction

I do not wish to sound overly optimistic, yet the Soviet Union is not immune from the reality of what is going on in the world. It has happened in the past: a small ruling elite either mistakenly attempts to ease domestic unrest through greater repression and foreign adventure or it chooses a wiser course—it begins to allow its people a voice in their own destiny.

Even if this latter process is not realized soon, I believe the renewed strength of the democratic movement, complemented by a global campaign for freedom, will strengthen the prospects for arms control and a world at peace.

I have discussed on other occasions, including my address on May 9, the elements of Western policies toward the Soviet Union to safeguard our interests and protect the peace. What I am describing now is a plan and a hope for the long term—the march of freedom and democracy which will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history as it has left other tyrannies which stifle the freedom and muzzle the self-expression of the people.

That is why we must continue our efforts to strengthen NATO even as we move forward with our zero-option initiative in the negotiations on intermediate range forces and our proposal for a one-third reduction in strategic ballistic missile warheads.

Our military strength is a prerequisite to peace, but let it be clear we maintain this strength in the hope it will never be used. For the ultimate determinant in the struggle now going on for the world will not be bombs and rockets but a test of wills and ideas—a trial of spiritual resolve: the values we hold, the beliefs we cherish, the ideals to which we are dedicated.

REASONS TO HOPE FOR SUCCESS

The British people know that, given strong leadership, time and a little bit of hope, the forces of good ultimately rally and triumph over evil. Here among you is the cradle of self-government, the mother of parliaments. Here is the enduring greatness of the British contribution to mankind, the great civilized ideas: individual liberty, representative government and the rule of law under God.

I have often wondered about the shyness of some of us in the West about standing for these ideals that have done so much to ease the plight of man and the hardships of our imperfect world. This reluctance to use those vast resources at our command reminds me of the elderly lady whose home was bombed in the blitz; as the rescuers moved about they found a bottle of brandy she had stored behind the staircase, which was all that was left standing. Since she was barely conscious, one of the workers pulled the cork to give her a taste of it. She came around immediately and said: "Here now, put it back. That's only for emergencies."

Well, the emergency is upon us. Let us be shy no longer—let us go to our strength. Let us offer hope. Let us tell the world that a new age is not only possible but probable.

During the dark days of the Second World War, when this island was incandescent with courage, Winston Churchill exclaimed about Britain's adversaries, "What kind of a people do they think we are?"

Britain's adversaries found out what extraordinary people the British are. But all the democracies paid a terrible price for allowing the dictators to underestimate us. We dare not make that mistake again. So let us ask ourselves: What kind of people do we

think we are? And let us answer: free people, worthy of freedom and determined not only to remain so but to help others gain their freedom as well.

Sir Winston led his people to great victory in war and then lost an election just as the fruits of victory were about to be enjoyed. But he left office honorably—and, as it turned out temporarily—knowing that the liberty of his people was more important than the fate of any single leader.

History recalls his greatness in ways no dictator will ever know. And he left us a message of hope for the future, as timely now as when he first uttered it, as opposition leader in the Commons nearly 27 years ago. "When we look back on all the perils through which we have passed and at the mighty foes we have laid low and all the dark and deadly designs we have frustrated, why should we fear for our future? We have," said Sir Winston, "come safely through the worst."

The task I have set forth will long outlive our own generation. But together, we, too, have come through the worst. Let us now begin a major effort to secure the best—a crusade for freedom that will engage the faith and fortitude of the next generation. For the sake of peace and justice, let us move toward a world in which all people are at least free to determine their own destiny. ●

AT SUMMIT, PRESIDENT TO PROPOSE NATO POOL RESOURCES, SENATE VOTES SUPPORT

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, at this point in the RECORD, to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the May 1982, issue of the Atlantic Community News concerning the resolution which the Senate has included as an amendment to the defense authorization bill for 1983. This provision is identical to the language of House Concurrent Resolution 335, which I have introduced, and which now has 17 cosponsors: Mr. BEARD, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. KRAMER, Mrs. MARTIN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. TRIBLE, and Mr. VENTO.

I hope that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will be able to act promptly on this resolution, in order to further encourage the President in his forward-looking proposal to the NATO allies at the summit this month, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AT SUMMIT, PRESIDENT TO PROPOSE NATO POOL RESOURCES, SENATE VOTES SUPPORT

The Senate voted strong support for a proposal to be made at the NATO Summit in June by President Reagan, for the NATO

allies to join the United States in agreeing to more effectively pool their defense efforts and resources to create, at acceptable costs, a credible, collective conventional force for the defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area.

In an amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill of 1983, the Senate on May 13 called upon the President, in order to assure the NATO allies that the policy "has the full support of the American people, the President should work with the Congress in negotiating the implementing strategies, structures, policies and programs, and should present such agreements with the European members of the Alliance acting on a united and collective basis, and with Canada, to the Congress for approval."

With the NATO summit occurring in June, the Senate granted the request of the sponsors—Senators William Roth (R-Del), John Glenn (D-Ohio), and Sam Nunn (D-Ga)—that the amendment be brought to the floor although no committee hearings had been held. Nor had it been decided whether the jurisdiction of the matter would be in the Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee. However, because "timeliness was of the essence," a roll call vote was held, resulting in 87 votes in favor, one against the amendment.

SENATE VOTE A CLEAR SIGNAL

Senator Roth told the Senate that the Administration had indicated to him its interest in increasing arms cooperation with our allies, but had stated that "until the climate of Congress would support stronger initiatives, we hesitate in proposing such an undertaking at the NATO Summit."

The adoption of the amendment the Senator said "would be a clear signal to the President, to our allies, and to the Soviet Union that the Congress rejects unilateralism... and backed by a strong congressional resolve, the President could go to NATO with a positive and far-reaching proposal that would do much to reestablish lagging American leadership."

The amendment calls for "a cooperative defense-industrial effort" within the NATO countries that would reduce necessary defense costs, eliminate duplication, provide for sharing, equitably and efficiently burdens as well as economic benefits, including jobs, technology, and trade, of NATO defense..."

Senator Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) said he dissented from the amendment because he preferred "industrial cooperation, not industrial integration," in standardization of NATO equipment.

The date the defense bill will be brought before the House of Representatives is to be determined.●

IN HONOR OF CLEVELAND'S POLKA MUSICIANS AND BROADCASTERS FOR THEIR ETHNIC CONTRIBUTIONS ON BOTH LOCAL AND NATIONAL LEVELS

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland area prides itself on main-

taining diverse ethnic talent especially in the areas of music and dance. Today, I am proud to give special recognition to the Slovenian Society and their cultural contributions which have kept Cleveland the polka capital of the world.

Beginning on June 7, five outstanding musicians and ethnic radio personalities will be honored at Joey Miskulin's Lounge in Cleveland during Polka Week. I have thoroughly enjoyed the music of these men and their well-proclaimed bands for many years, and wish to extend my sincere admiration for their dedication and musical talent. Through their entertainment, these men have allowed millions of listeners, including myself, to enjoy their polka music, and I would like to express my appreciation for their achievements before my fellow colleagues.

Joe Stradiot, drummer and singer of the Johnny Vadnal era, has been performing for over 40 years. Having appeared with the Johnny Vadnal Orchestra on both recordings and television debuts, Joe has contributed significantly to the polka culture in Cleveland. He has been recognized as one of the best singing drummers in the entire polka world.

Walter Ostanek, known as the Canadian Polka King, has traveled to Cleveland to display his across-the-border talents. He has recorded over 300 single records and 20 albums, and has appeared on television with American polka personality, Frank Yankovic. Walter has since become the adopted polka son of Cleveland.

While keeping alive the Vadnal family tradition of contributing to the polka culture in the Cleveland area, Richard Vadnal has demonstrated his musical talents. For 30 years, Richard has been recording polkas and performing with his band providing dance and music entertainment for many appreciative polka fans.

Another polka great, Art Perko, has been displaying his superior musical abilities for over 35 years. While achieving various musical accomplishments with the same band for over 25 years, Art has become most famous for his recording of the "Peanuts Polka."

Tony Petkovsek, one of America's best known polka disc jockeys, has been broadcasting continuous daily polka shows and currently operates with over 20 years of ethnic radio news reporting expertise. One of his newest innovative ideas includes the "Homeland Polka Tours" featuring many of Cleveland's famous local bands which have been newly introduced to radio broadcast exposure. Tony has used the "Homeland Polka Tours" to encourage all nationality heritage interests in the area to seek greater recognition within the polka capital of the world, Cleveland, Ohio.

I encourage everyone who enjoys listening to talented polka musicians to

attend the festivities in Cleveland during Polka Week.

Mr. Speaker, these individuals have significantly contributed to the musical spectrum of both the Cleveland area and throughout the Nation. Whether performing in Slovenian homes, at picnics, or festivals, these talented individuals have brought a sense of pride to all Slovenians and the Cleveland community.●

STUDENTS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING IN WAYLAND, MASS.

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of alcohol related traffic fatalities continue to plague our Nation. Approximately 26,000 Americans are killed annually in drunk driving incidents. For Americans up to age 35, the leading cause of death is automobile accidents and more than half these deaths are caused by drunken drivers.

However, I am pleased to say that there is a growing recognition of the seriousness of this problem and I am particularly pleased that new and creative efforts to combat drunk driving are being tried. One very innovative approach was recently begun in Wayland, Mass., a program called students against drunk driving (SADD). The SADD program was initiated by Robert Anastas, the director of health education for the Wayland Public Schools and a noted and well respected specialist in the field of drug abuse. The program is organized to educate students about the problem of drinking and driving and has been in operation since September 1981 in Wayland. But because of the hard work of Mr. Anastas and the students at Wayland High School, similar programs have recently begun in New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida and in other Massachusetts communities. Support throughout the country has been growing.

SADD has four objectives: To help eliminate drunk driving and save lives; to conduct community alcohol awareness programs; to alert students of the dangers of alcohol and driving; and to organize a peer counseling program to help students who may have concerns about alcohol. An integral part of the program is a mandatory course given for sophomores at the high school designed to improve the students' knowledge and attitudes about alcohol and drugs and to assist students plan their behavior in order to reduce their chances of becoming involved in drunk driving situations.

Another very important part of the SADD program involves a contract en-

tered into by parents and students. Students pledge to call parents for advice or transportation at any hour from any place if they are ever in a situation where they have had too much to drink or the person driving them has had too much to drink. The parents, in turn, agree to provide transportation home, or taxi fare home, at any hour or any place with no questions asked or argument given. Discussion at a later time, of course, would be appropriate. In addition, parents agree to seek safe, sober transportation home if they or the person driving them have had too much to drink.

It is clear that the program has already had tremendously positive effects. Carl Olson, president of SADD and a sophomore at Wayland High School, has reported that the attitudes of friends at school have changed as a result of the SADD program. After attending a recent prom and beach party, Mr. Olson said that he saw no evidence of drinking.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the hard work and innovation demonstrated by Robert Anastas, Carl Olson and the many students, teachers, and parents involved with SADD in Wayland. If they have saved just one life or prevented just one crippling injury, their efforts have been well worth it. All the citizens of Massachusetts and the Nation as well owe a great deal of gratitude because of their dedication.

I hope that my colleagues will take a moment to reflect upon this fine program and will speak to their own constituents about it. Should more information be desired, Mr. Anastas can be reached in care of the Wayland Public Schools in Wayland, Mass. I am sure he would be delighted to provide whatever assistance he can. ●

STUDENT LOANS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the debate over student loans concentrates for the most part on current programs. But we need to know how we got to this point and where we want to go if debates over current programs are to make sense. It has been argued by one scholar that President Reagan inherited "a jerry-rigged structure" of student loans, "tacked together" by previous administrations. I think we must take this fact into consideration.

One possible answer to the question of how to finance education has been proposed by economist Milton Friedman. He calls it a human capital bank.

This idea and a review of the student loan issue was recently discussed in an editorial in the Detroit News. At this point I wish to insert in the

RECORD, "Student-Loan Swamp," from the Detroit News, May 30, 1982.

STUDENT-LOAN SWAMP

The continuing wrangle over federal aid to college students has generated considerable rhetoric, but few sensible solutions.

President Reagan's proposals to pare the programs and tighten eligibility standards for low-interest student loans have been widely criticized in Congress. And while the opponents' theatrics may appeal to the education constituencies, they do precious little to address the problem—a patchwork of federal aid that is complex, confusing, and, easily abused.

Dennis Doyle, director of policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute, is among those who have concluded that the Reagan administration inherited a rat's nest that requires immediate attention:

"The jerry-rigged structure tacked together by preceding Congresses and administrations was a financial disaster waiting to happen," Mr. Doyle notes. "Eligibility tests were unrealistic, the subsidized point spread so wide that it invited abuse, and the bits and pieces of the various programs so complex and confusing the ordinary person could not make sense to them."

To illustrate his point, Mr. Doyle uses the example of a New York student whose financial-aid package includes: a \$1,700 Basic Education Opportunity Grant (BEOG); a \$2,500 Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL); and a \$500 National Direct Student Loan (NDSL). In addition to this federal largess, she received \$1,800 from the state's Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) that is subsidized by Washington, and her college supplied another \$1,500 in scholarship assistance. He adds that she also qualified for—but declined—a federally funded College Work Study Program (CWSP) at the minimum wage.

These programs have proliferated to such an extent that the U.S. Department of Education employs a full-time student liaison officer whose sole duty is to interpret and explain the complex web of federal programs. Nor is it surprising that since Washington waded in to the student-aid swamp, the result has been an empire of counselors, bankers, bureaucrats, and collection agencies feeding at federal expense.

Is there a way out of the maze? Mr. Doyle thinks so and suggests the analysis offered by Milton Friedman in his 1955 book, "The Role of Government in Education," as a means of escape.

Mr. Friedman finds that financing higher education is essentially inequitable and uneven because of imperfections in capital markets. He stresses that investment in durables is sound because they can be financed over time and the capital investment is effectively self-collateralizing. The lender can recoup his investment by assuming control of the assets created by the loan. But human capital is not so easily collateralized in a free society that prohibits slavery, serfdom, or indentured servitude.

Mr. Doyle believes the effects of this capital-market paradox are immediately apparent: "Only the very best risks can find private capital to finance investment in themselves: the children of the rich and individuals—medical students being the prime example—who have been rigorously selected to enter professions with high income streams."

Thus, Mr. Doyle thinks it's time to reconsider Mr. Friedman's recommendation that a human capital bank be established to provide long-term loans at commercial rates to

all prospective students who meet the dual tests of access and equity. "Students," he says, "could learn now and pay later. The beneficiary of human capital investment would pay for the investment, just as the beneficiary of the capital investment pays for it. Market forces would allocate funds and point students toward productive human capital investment decisions."

Mr. Doyle believes that while the private sector should play a role in providing such a "bank," the federal government should be required to serve as a broker to create and manage the financial resource. Moreover, he suggests that the IRS could, through an income-tax surcharge, collect outstanding tuition advances through future earnings.

Mr. Friedman's idea of a human capital bank is admirable. But we fail to see the advantage of more government subsidies. Some limited federal role in coordinating or monitoring the loans may be advantageous. But another subsidy program would surely be counterproductive.

For the past 40 years, the federal government has pursued a policy of subsidizing borrowers at the expense of savers. For a time the practice succeeded insofar as it encouraged borrowing. But during the past few years it backfired badly, contributing in a major way to record high interest rates.

Subsidized loans are not a free lunch. The taxpayer must pick up the tab. By all means, let's make sure educational loans are available. But let's not repeat past mistakes by getting still more young people addicted to the "junk" of a government handout. ●

CONGRESSMAN MARTIN FROST WRITES HADASSAH NATIONAL BOARD

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, recently I was honored by an invitation to join the Hadassah National Board at a luncheon, and I am pleased to insert a recent letter from my office to the Hadassah National Board.

MAY 20, 1982.

JOAN SACAROB,
Chairperson, Hadassah National Board,
Washington Special Programs.

DEAR FRIENDS: As I write this message of greetings and welcome to you, Hadassah's National Board, I am uncertain whether I'll be able to put in even a brief appearance at your luncheon. Choosing from among budget alternatives is the business that keeps me occupied most of today. I am sure that you have been having similar discussions in your organization. Finding additional sources of both money and volunteer power is difficult but vital. The withdrawing of much needed, much appreciated services for lack of funding is a painful experience, one which I hope you can avoid. Hadassah's seventy years of meeting human needs is a joy to the Jewish people.

I hope your meeting here proves fruitful, and that your record of achievement continues to serve as an outstanding example of what willing hearts can accomplish.

Sincerely,

MARTIN FROST. 1

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of June 8, 1982, I had the privilege of participating in the final session of a Smithsonian Institution sponsored series of discussions on the city of Washington. The topic was the evolution of home rule, and the prospects for attaining complete home rule in the future. For the benefit of the 276 Members of this body who were elected after passage of Public Law 93-198, the home rule charter, I insert my prepared statement from this discussion. I hope it will prove enlightening to all of my colleagues:

The text of the charter follows:

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF HOME RULE TODAY

The degree of home rule granted by Congress to the city in 1973 was partial; the Home Rule Act contains many limitations and Congressional "safeguards". The final result was definitely not what some in Congress had originally intended. It was, by and large, a product of compromise, which is the nature of Congress.

Rather than giving the city the right to self-government, the Congress delegated some of its authority and responsibility to elected city officials. In order to achieve an acceptable piece of legislation, it was necessary to maintain ultimate control over everything the city proposed, from the budget to every piece of legislation including alley closings. It forced the city to undergo a period of trial before the real goal—complete home rule—could be considered. That trial period has been running for nearly nine years, and the track record of the city will be what Congress turns to to decide if it should embark on an aggressive effort to grant complete home rule or simply be satisfied with the status quo.

There have been two major areas of concern to the Congress, and the perception of the progress the city has made in these areas will ultimately temper the will of Congress. The first is the ability of the locally elected officials to run the local government. Simply put, Members of Congress have questioned the ability of the city to make a bureaucracy serve the people, not itself. There are still questions as to how well the city can provide services to its residents and the visitors to the Nation's Capital.

The other major area of concern is the financial health of the city, and the ability of locally elected officials to keep the city above water. Recently, the financial concern has generated the most interest on Capitol Hill, since that, after all, is what will determine whether or not the city can function as something other than a step-child of the Congress.

There are, of course, other important issues, such as the effort for Statehood and the Constitutional amendment to allow representation in Congress. But I think the yardstick that will be used by Congress to measure the success of home rule will be only these two major elements—running a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

bureaucracy efficiently and maintaining financial viability.

CONGRESSIONAL PERCEPTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The attitude of Congress toward the city has changed over the past 9 years, but there are those within the institution that do not understand the unique character of Washington.

I would note that 276 Members of the House of Representatives, nearly two-thirds of the voting membership, have come to Congress since the Home Rule Act was debated and signed into law. Of that number, 73 Members are freshmen. Those of us who favor increased home rule are faced with the task of maintaining the support of those who were here in 1973, and educating and explaining the situation to newer Members.

That can prove difficult when exposure to the D.C. government is limited to what is read daily in the Washington Post about the "bungling bureaucracy". It is more difficult when a Members' water bill doesn't get out on time, or when constituents visiting the Nation's Capital get their cars booted. Unfortunately, not enough of the good things the city does get noticed.

Looking at the problem from another angle, it is difficult to explain and affirm the principle of home rule when Congress and the D.C. Committee are viewed as the court of last resort. Outside groups and individuals who fail to get things done their way at the District Building find absolutely nothing wrong with coming to Congress to get something overturned. We saw an excellent example of this last year when the Moral Majority decided to impose its dictates on the residents of the city. I am referring to the disapproval of the Sexual Assault Bill by the House last October. Despite the fact that the City Council held hearings and in final consideration of the bill made some changes, the Moral Majority did not get the bill into the format they sought. In convincing one Member of Congress to take up their cause, the bill was overturned in what the Moral Majority called their greatest victory on Capitol Hill. In fact, it has been their only victory, and one I find difficult to take pride in.

The point I am trying to make here is that given the inexperience of a large number of the Members of the House of Representatives when it comes to home rule, and given the limited negative perception of the workings of the local government, the job of educating Congress to the reality of home rule is indeed a difficult one.

RUNNING THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT

I think if one looks at the city government today compared to when Congress ran it—not very well, I might add—the progress that has been made is more than apparent. I do not say this is a result of the efforts of my friend here today, Mayor Barry, not that it is in spite of him, as some contend. I am simply saying that it is a fact; an undeniable truth.

Compare the so-called scandals and bungling of the city of Washington, that have been so adequately covered by our local press, with those of any other major city in the country. I can only think of three programs that merit some of the criticism they have received—the Summer Jobs for Youth Program; the water billing system, and management of public housing. But no other major city is totally free from fault.

On the other hand, I think the city has made real progress in many areas. In most

cases, victory has not been achieved, but the city is definitely headed in the right direction. Where there were no long range plans for development in the city or for the delivery of services, there are now viable frameworks for the future. Where there were unresponsive, perhaps even inept employees, we now find individuals who are knowledgeable and proud to be working for their own government.

And that leads to perhaps the most important change, in my mind. Where we had despair and division, we now see unity and spirit. It did not happen overnight—indeed it has taken 9 years to get where we are today. But there is an unquestionable positive attitude among residents of this city toward itself. That is something Congress could not dictate, and it is something locally elected officials could not instill. It is the kind of attitude that led to the salvation of New York City and the rebirth of our neighbor to the north, Baltimore. It is now apparent in Washington, and it merits attention.

When enough Members of Congress recognize all of this; when the spirit of the 638,000 residents of this city becomes apparent to the rest of the country, true home rule can, and I pray, will be achieved.

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE CITY

The other key consideration for the advancement of home rule is the financial health of the city. Immediately after home rule was granted, it was learned that the city's books were in such miserable condition they could not begin to be audited. As a result of this discovery, Congress created the Temporary Commission on Financial Oversight of the District of Columbia as a partnership between the Congress and the city. The goal of this partnership was to develop and implement a comprehensive financial management system, and a total of \$39 million was authorized to accomplish the goal, half from the city and half from the Federal government.

As a result of the work of the Commission, the city's books were finally audited for the first time in 1979. The results of the audit showed an accumulated deficit of \$285 million. Without question, a significant portion of that deficit was at the hands of the former leaders of the city—the Congress. In any event, things did not look to good for the city, and a lot of time went to assessing blame.

The 1980 audit, which was more comprehensive in nature, saw the deficit increase to \$388 million. The most damaging factor of this audit was the fact that in just one year, a year when locally elected officials were in full control of the city, \$105 million was added to the deficit. More than one-fourth of the total accumulated deficit, going back ten years, was directly resultant from just one year of locally controlled government. Needless to say, this did little to generate sympathy, even among Members who were normally considered strongly in favor of home rule. Those with some knowledge of local history recalled that it was financial mismanagement that led to the demise of the limited home rule granted in the 1800's. It appeared that history was about to repeat itself.

The whole situation changed, however, when the results of the 1981 audit were made known. That year ended with a surplus of \$68 million. That in and of itself is an accomplishment, but when it is coupled with the fact that the year before resulted in a deficit of \$105 million, it is nothing short of a miracle. In addition to the overall

result, the city in 1981 did not exceed Congressionally mandated spending levels for any budget category. Previous years were characterized by an almost blatant disregard for the specific funding levels enacted by the Congress. Through a series of internal controls, and possibly as a result of overall financial management improvements achieved through the efforts of the Temporary Commission on Financial Oversight, the city moved from a posture of extravagant excess to one of competent management.

I think it would be worthwhile to consider all of this information in a comparison of the operating budget of the District of Columbia, and the Federal Payment Congress provides to the city, prior to and since home rule was granted in 1973.

Between 1963 and 1973, the District of Columbia operating budget increased 219 percent, from roughly \$225 million to \$718 million. During that same period of time, the Federal Payment to the District of Columbia increased 505 percent, from \$30 million to \$181.5 million. This was when the city was under the complete control of the Congress.

Compare those statistics with the experience since home rule. From 1974 to the present, the operating budget of the District of Columbia increased 121 percent, from roughly \$778 million to \$1.7 billion. Note that the percentage increase is about half of what it was in the ten years before home rule. The Federal Payment from 1974 to the present increased 80 percent, from \$187.5 million to \$336.6 million. Thus, the Federal Payment during the ten years immediately preceding home rule increased more than 6 times faster than it has since home rule.

While everyone knows that figures can be made to reflect whatever position one wishes them to reflect, these statistics show a disturbing pattern. No wonder we in Congress have no difficulty faulting the city—we have been reluctant to provide the necessary resources to the elected officials so that the city can be run efficiently. Yet when we had complete control, there was no problem in appropriating additional funds.

The final point I would like to make concerning financial management is that in a relatively short period of time, we have seen the city move from a quasi-Federal agency, in terms of its budget, to a true municipality. If the most current audit is used as a measure, the city has successfully made the transition. The problem now is getting Congress to accept the fact that the city is no longer our fiefdom. It is difficult to consider the city's budget without falling into the pattern of reviewing the budget of a Federal agency. And it is difficult to accept the thought that we in Congress should not be second-guessing the city on budgetary decisions. Once a majority of Congress understands and accepts that concept, true home rule will be closer to reality.

THE ROLE OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Finally, I think it is important to recognize the role of the City Council in the process of home rule. For too long, some in Congress have characterized the Council as a group of neophytes whose only goal is higher elected office.

Each year since passage of the Home Rule Act, the Council has gained new expertise and understanding. Indeed, the Mayor has just signed legislation reasserting the independence of the Council.

Ideally, it was envisioned that the Council would take over the role of Congress, and I feel it is making enormous progress in that

direction. I mention this because it is a critical element to the granting of complete home rule. If it is not felt that the Council has the ability and the desire to enact appropriate legislation, there will be a reluctance to take the final step in Congress. But I have found an amazing degree of tolerance among my colleagues, and that is a good sign. For example, to take a currently "hot issue", I am surprised that there has not been an effort in Congress to force the city to institute some form of mandatory automobile insurance. At the same time, I am frustrated when I see my colleagues reject the Sexual Assault Bill, as they did last October. When the Council begins to take on the responsibility we feel it should, we turn around and overturn their efforts.

Still, by and large, the Congress has maintained a hands-off approach to local legislative initiatives, and I think that is a healthy attitude.

SUMMARY

Like it or not, the unique character of the District of Columbia puts the Congress in total control, and that control is based in the Constitution. The current degree of home rule represents the level of authority the Congress is willing to delegate to the locally elected officials.

If complete, or greater home rule is to be achieved, it must come from Congress. The major areas of concern, and therefore the areas which will be measured before any changes are considered include:

The ability of the city to control its bureaucracy and deliver services to its residents in an effective manner;

The ability of the city to achieve and sustain financial stability;

And the ability of the City Council to function in the place of Congress as the legislature for the city.

Finally, since a large portion of the House of Representatives is unaware of, or not fully educated about the concept of home rule, supporters of complete home rule, both in the city and in Congress, have an enormous job ahead of them in explaining the principle and practice of home rule. Thank you.●

THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT, H.R. 6133 REAFFIRMS OUR HERITAGE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1982

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the efforts of Congressman JOHN BREAU and the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in crafting H.R. 6133, a thoughtful and balanced approach for reauthorizing an effective Endangered Species Act. H.R. 6133 reaffirms the original intent of this statute, which Congress enacted in 1973, to insure to continued existence of threatened species, both vertebrate and invertebrate, by restoring their populations to levels at which they are no longer in jeopardy. Indeed, I want to commend my colleagues in the House of Representatives for adopting this measure yesterday by a voice vote.

America's commitment to the preservation of its environment and the life that inhabits it is not new. Progressive thinkers and concerned citizens initiated a powerful conservation movement during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt which resulted in the establishment of numerous national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges. This movement has continued to grow, and the Congress has heeded the mandate of the American people by promulgating such necessary measures as the Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. H.R. 6133 continues this vital tradition.

The Endangered Species Act, as amended by H.R. 6133, will foster a favorable climate in which a wide diversity of species can be preserved. By streamlining the listing process and requiring the Secretary of Interior to consider listing or delisting a species whenever a petition is received that contains substantial evidence of the need for such action, this legislation shall maintain the multiplicity of life forms which have played a major role in the evolution of human culture.

The existence of a variety of plant and animal species has had positive functional and esthetic effects on the quality of life on this planet. These species afford us a renewable source of food, energy, industrial chemicals, and medicines coupled with breathtaking natural beauty. As an example of their practical value, the National Cancer Institute has tested tens of thousands of higher plant species to determine if they could be developed into anti-cancer drugs. Before this program was halted by the Reagan administration's budget cutting initiatives, the NCI found that several plants showed promise in combating cancer. In another area, the jojoba plant, indigenous to the Southwestern United States, is being cultivated for the quality lubricant it produces, which is suitable for industrial use. The use of these shrubs is being touted as an alternative to killing sperm whales for their oil. With respect to the esthetic value of preserving a diversity of species, anyone who views a pristine alpine meadow can attest to the intrinsic loveliness of that habitat and the species who dwell there.

Given that the number of extinct species has grown exponentially since the beginning of this century, it is clear that we need a strong Endangered Species Act. Biologists estimate that one to three species are vanishing daily and the rate will increase to one per hour by the late 1980's. It is my firm belief that H.R. 6133, by maintaining the basic thrust of the current Endangered Species Act, will save many species threatened with extinction. While it is unfortunate that our children will never be able to see the

Stellar's sea cow, the Carolina parakeet, or the passenger pigeon, yesterday we took a decisive step forward and our action will allow future generations to enjoy the whooping crane, the hawksbill turtle, and the bald eagle, which is the symbol of our Nation, by endorsing H.R. 6133. Our children and grandchildren will applaud us for our foresight.●

LUJAN FISCAL YEAR 1983 BUDGET PROPOSAL

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, in arriving at a budget resolution for fiscal year 1983, it is imperative that we keep in the forefront of our calculations the goal of a balanced budget. Only with a balanced budget will we be able to realistically attack our current economic problems. At the same time we must consider the need as stated by the President to upgrade and modernize our Armed Forces, continue to provide for the welfare of our senior citizens, and those truly in need.

In the budget category of national defense, the Lujan proposal provides for a 5-percent increase in 1982 outlays. In the categories of income security, general science, veterans, and health, the proposal increases the 1982 expenditures by 3 percent. The categories of international affairs, jus-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tice, general purpose fiscal assistance, the levels are maintained at the 1982 levels. The categories of energy, national resources, agriculture, commerce and housing, transportation, community and regional development, educational training, General Government, allowances and offsetting receipts, the requested spending levels made by the President in his budget request are adhered to.

This method of calculating this proposal will result in a fiscal year 1983 deficit of \$45.80 billion. This is a savings of \$56.10 billion over the administration projections. This level of spending and reduced deficits will result in a balance in the budget in late fiscal year 1984 and most certainly by early fiscal year 1985.

The projected revenues in fiscal year 1983 are increased by \$20.20 billion as an automatic result of improved economic conditions due to the large reduction in the overall Federal budget.

FISCAL YEAR 1983 BUDGET—LUJAN SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

[In billions of dollars]

Function	1983	1984	1985
050—National defense:			
Budget authority.....	247.05	259.40	282.37
Outlays.....	201.30	211.36	231.92
150—International affairs:			
Budget authority.....	17.15	17.15	17.15
Outlays.....	11.40	11.40	11.40
250—General science, et cetera:			
Budget authority.....	7.80	8.03	8.03
Outlays.....	7.10	7.31	7.31
270—Energy:			
Budget authority.....	4.25	4.25	4.25
Outlays.....	4.15	3.00	3.00
300—National resources, et cetera:			
Budget authority.....	8.45	8.45	9.00

FISCAL YEAR 1983 BUDGET—AMENDMENT COMPARISON

[In billions of dollars]

Function	Reagan 1982	Reagan 1983	Jones	Latta	Rousselot	Lujan
050—National defense:						
Budget authority.....	219.0	263.35	242.85	253.85	243.45	247.05
Outlays.....	187.6	221.30	212.30	213.25	213.00	201.30
150—International affairs:						
Budget authority.....	19.0	18.15	16.15	16.20	12.05	17.15
Outlays.....	11.4	12.15	12.10	12.05	7.50	11.40
250—General science, et cetera:						
Budget authority.....	7.0	7.80	7.75	7.05	7.00	7.80
Outlays.....	6.9	7.65	7.60	7.15	6.50	7.10
270—Energy:						
Budget authority.....	4.8	4.25	5.30	3.60	4.40	4.25
Outlays.....	6.2	4.15	5.00	3.90	3.30	4.15
300—National resources, et cetera:						
Budget authority.....	10.1	8.45	9.40	9.00	9.40	8.45
Outlays.....	12.7	9.90	10.85	10.55	9.00	9.90
350—Agriculture:						
Budget authority.....	9.6	9.10	6.90	6.40	9.90	9.10
Outlays.....	12.8	9.40	10.10	9.05	9.60	9.40
370—Commerce and housing:						
Budget authority.....	6.3	3.40	8.05	7.30	5.00	3.40
Outlays.....	3.4	1.60	3.05	2.45	2.00	1.60
400—Transportation:						
Budget authority.....	21.0	18.95	22.30	21.45	21.30	18.90
Outlays.....	21.2	19.55	20.40	20.05	17.00	19.55
450—Community and regional development:						
Budget authority.....	6.6	6.75	7.00	6.85	6.70	6.75
Outlays.....	8.2	7.25	7.90	7.85	6.50	7.25
500—Educational training, et cetera:						
Budget authority.....	23.8	19.05	27.55	27.25	27.45	19.00
Outlays.....	27.9	21.90	27.55	26.80	24.00	21.90
550—Health:						
Budget authority.....	79.1	77.15	77.30	79.80	77.30	72.65
Outlays.....	73.5	77.50	80.10	76.95	74.00	75.70
600—Income security:						
Budget authority.....	250.7	257.00	286.95	259.20	286.25	241.50
Outlays.....	249.6	262.00	273.80	170.90	249.00	257.00
700—Veterans:						
Budget authority.....	24.8	25.65	24.10	24.71	23.75	25.00
Outlays.....	24.2	24.40	23.40	23.86	23.05	24.90

FISCAL YEAR 1983 BUDGET—LUJAN SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Function	1983	1984	1985
Outlays.....	9.90	9.00	9.00
350—Agriculture:			
Budget authority.....	9.10	9.10	9.10
Outlays.....	9.40	9.00	9.00
370—Commerce and housing:			
Budget authority.....	3.40	3.40	3.40
Outlays.....	1.60	1.60	1.60
400—Transportation:			
Budget authority.....	18.90	18.90	19.00
Outlays.....	19.55	18.00	18.00
450—Community and regional development:			
Budget authority.....	6.75	6.75	6.75
Outlays.....	7.25	6.50	6.50
500—Educational training, et cetera:			
Budget authority.....	19.00	19.00	19.00
Outlays.....	21.90	19.00	19.00
550—Health:			
Budget authority.....	72.65	77.97	87.97
Outlays.....	75.70	77.97	87.97
600—Income security:			
Budget authority.....	241.50	289.90	310.00
Outlays.....	257.00	274.80	290.10
700—Veterans:			
Budget authority.....	25.00	25.00	26.00
Outlays.....	24.90	25.00	26.00
750—Administration of justice:			
Budget authority.....	4.60	4.50	4.50
Outlays.....	4.60	4.50	4.50
800—General government:			
Budget authority.....	5.00	5.00	5.00
Outlays.....	5.00	5.00	5.00
850—Fiscal assistance:			
Budget authority.....	6.70	4.00	4.00
Outlays.....	6.40	2.82	2.50
900—Interest:			
Budget authority.....	106.60	90.00	90.00
Outlays.....	106.60	90.00	90.00
920—Allowances:			
Budget authority.....	—45	—50	—50
Outlays.....	—50	—50	—50
950—Office receipts:			
Budget authority.....	—41.15	—45.00	—45.00
Outlays.....	—41.15	—42.38	—45.00
Total budget:			
Budget authority.....	762.30	808.27	860.02
Outlays.....	732.10	733.38	777.30
Revenues.....	686.30	733.38	786.84
Deficit/surplus.....	—45.80	0	+ 9.54

¹ Surplus.

FISCAL YEAR 1983 BUDGET—AMENDMENT COMPARISON—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Function	Reagan 1982	Reagan 1983	Jones	Latta	Rousselot	Lujan
750—Administration of Justice:						
Budget authority.....	4.5	4.60	4.60	4.40	4.60	4.60
Outlays.....	4.6	4.70	4.65	4.50	4.10	4.60
800—General government:						
Budget authority.....	5.2	5.25	5.00	4.90	5.00	5.00
Outlays.....	5.1	5.00	4.85	4.75	4.00	5.00
850—Fiscal assistance:						
Budget authority.....	6.4	6.70	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.70
Outlays.....	6.4	6.70	6.50	6.50	1.80	6.40
900—Interest:						
Budget authority.....	99.2	113.70	115.00	112.80	92.00	106.60
Outlays.....	99.2	113.60	115.00	112.80	92.00	106.60
920—Allowances:						
Budget authority.....	-0.3	-45	-1.05	-2.95	-1.00	-45
Outlays.....	-0.4	-50	-85	-2.75	-1.00	-50
950—Office receipts:						
Budget authority.....	-31.8	-41.15	-43.65	-43.10	-43.60	-41.15
Outlays.....	-31.8	-41.15	-43.65	-43.10	-43.60	-41.15
Total budget:						
Budget authority.....	764.9	807.60	828.00	805.20	701.75	762.30
Outlays.....	728.9	767.10	780.55	767.50	701.75	732.10
Revenues.....	628.4	665.10	676.70	665.90	701.75	686.30
Deficit.....	-100.5	-102.00	-103.85	-101.60	0	-45.80
Revenue increases:						
(a) Automatic as result of improved economic conditions due to balanced budget.....	0	0	0	0	37.90	
(b) Raise taxes.....	N/A	N/A	31.70	20.90	18.85	

FEES CHARGED FOR BASIC PET CARE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is spending more than \$3 million a year to subsidize veterinary care for dogs and cats owned by people in the services.

The President is proposing that we chop billions off medical care for our fellow citizens, which makes it not only ironic but also offensive that subsidized pet care in the military remains a sacrosanct Federal program. Medicare gets the ax, but peticare marches on.

As a result of the subsidy, military personnel can get such pet care as rabies immunizations and distemper shots for their pets for two-thirds less than civilians pay. Some might say the military is going to the dogs—and the cats, and the gerbils, and the hamsters.

It is not humorous, however, when we consider that while peticare marches on, this administration has sought to cut funding for the child immunization program. Last year's continuing resolution provided \$28.3 million for child immunizations. In his September budget proposal, President Reagan proposed cutting \$3 million off that funding level—remarkably close to the sum spent to subsidize pet care.

The average fee for a variety of shots and services provided at a dozen surveyed military installations was \$3.87. Identical shots and identical

services at 15 private animal hospitals telephoned around the country came to \$11.54—triple what the military paid.

When we are telling the poor and the aged that they can pick up more of the tab for their medical care, why is Uncle Sam volunteering to pick up the tab so the colonel's dog can get his shots and heartworm check?

My figures on military pet care came from responses to a series of questions I posed to the military services earlier this year. The military defends its provision of shots for pets on the grounds of human health—that it is helping to control animal diseases that are communicable to man. I do not dispute the need for the shots. My sheep dog, Junket, is better off for getting her shots each year. The issue, however, is why the taxpayer should be expected to subsidize pet care for anyone.

Medicare pays 44 percent of the health care costs of older Americans. The administration wants to cut that back severely. Peticare pays 66 percent of the cost of many veterinary services for military pets. The administration has no intention of changing that. Where are the administration's priorities? The House Select Committee on the Aging has estimated that if President Reagan's medicare cuts go through, senior citizens will have to pay an average of \$107 more out of their own pockets by 1987 before medicare even begins to pick up part of the bill.

I find it rather curious that the administration defends cuts in medicare as necessary to help control health care costs while it defends subsidized pet care as good for community and human health.

Army Regulation 40-905 states:

Veterinary services; i.e., immunizations, examinations, treatment and hospitalization are authorized for animals owned by personnel authorized military privileges (except those animals maintained for commercial purposes) for the prevention and control of diseases or conditions which may be transmissible to humans or those which may constitute a community health problem.

The hypocrisy is evident within the regulation. Why are diseases carried by animals that a serviceman may be breeding for profit not a "community health problem?" It is because the service knew it could not defend subsidizing care for animals being raised for profit.

If the military wants to provide veterinary care on bases that are remote from communities with private vets, that is one thing. But there is no excuse for the Government picking up any part of the tab. The pet owner should pay the full cost. And if the veterinary services are really provided out of concern for community and human health, then at remote bases they should certainly be available—unsubsidized—even if the owner breeds them for profit.

Here are the key statistics and explanations of their derivation:

The taxpayer bill for providing pet care comes to at least \$3,328,831. The Army and Air Force—the Navy has no veterinarians—wrote me that 21 percent of the time of their vets was spent on zoonoses control. Zoonoses are animal diseases transmissible to human. I derived this cost figure by taking 21 percent of the basic military compensation and veterinarian special pay provided to that proportion of veterinarians not engaged exclusively in research and development work—327

of the total of 588 military veterinarians are not in R. & D.—plus 33 percent for fringe benefits. This does not include any pet care provided for other than zoonoses control nor any services provided private pets by enlisted personnel or warrant officers assigned to aid veterinarians. It is therefore a conservative figure.

The savings enjoyed by military personnel receiving subsidized pet care totaled about \$12.6 million in 1981. The Air Force wrote me that the fees charged for private care totaled \$2.6 million in 1981. This amounted to one-third of the fees charged in the private sector, as I will explain in a moment. So, the savings to Air Force personnel came to \$5.2 million. The Army said it was unable to provide a figure on the worldwide gross from the fees charged. Since it had 1.42 times as many vets involved in pet care as did the Air Force, the savings for personnel served by Army vets would come to \$7.4 million or a grand total of \$12.6 million. Vets at Navy and Marine Corps installations are provided by the Army and Air Force.

The average fee for selected veterinary services at selected military bases is \$3.87. The bases and veterinary services were selected by the military services and the fees provided to me in

writing. The average fee charged for the identical veterinary services in the private sector came to \$11.54. The sample comprised 15 private pet hospitals. In the case of the nine installations surveyed by the Army and Navy, my staff dialed directory assistance and asked for the name of any veterinarian in the nearest community, then telephoned that vet and asked his fees for the services sampled by the Army and Navy. The Air Force provided a different sampling of services. For those, my staff surveyed six vets—one in each of the four main cities in my congressional district—one of which turned out to be far lower than any of the other vets surveyed—one in the Maryland suburbs of Washington, D.C., and one in the Virginia suburbs. There is no uniform military fee scale. As the Army explained it to me:

Prices are determined at each installation. Price determination is based on factors to compensate for shipping, breakage, and deterioration of drugs, biologicals and supplies and an amount sufficient to provide for the purchase of furnishings, the improvement of facilities, procurement of required civilian personnel and equipment necessary to maintain the current state of the art.

This is clearly interpreted with wide variations. At Fort Meade, Md., for example, there is a markup of 30 percent

on the wholesale prices of drugs and supplies other than for immunizations. At Fort Eustis, Va., however, the markup is only 10 percent.

The results of the surveys are contained in the following two tables.

FEES CHARGED FOR BASIC PET CARE—ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS AND NEARBY CIVILIAN COMMUNITIES

	Canine distemper	Feline distemper	Rabies shot
Annapolis, Md.:			
Military	\$7.00	\$4.00	\$4.00
Civilian	12.50	11.00	10.00
Camp Lejeune, N.C.:			
Military	3.50	3.50	1.50
Civilian	8.00	8.00	9.00
Cherry Point, N.C.:			
Military	5.00	5.00	2.00
Civilian	14.00	12.00	6.00
Norfolk, Va.:			
Military	5.00	3.50	2.50
Civilian	8.00	8.00	7.00
Patuxent River, Md.:			
Military	7.50	4.00	3.00
Civilian	17.00	12.00	10.00
Quantico, Va.:			
Military	5.00	5.00	5.00
Civilian	18.00	18.00	15.00
Fort Meade, Md.:			
Military	4.00	7.00	4.00
Civilian	20.00	15.00	15.00
Fort Eustis, Va.:			
Military	4.00	5.00	4.00
Civilian	12.00	12.00	7.00
Walter Reed Medical Center, D.C.:			
Military	3.00	7.50	4.00
Civilian	20.00	15.00	10.00
Average:			
Military	4.89	5.28	3.33
Civilian	14.39	12.33	9.89

FEES CHARGED FOR VETERINARY SERVICES—AIR FORCE AND SELECTED CIVILIAN VETERINARIANS

Service	Andrews AFB	Langley AFB	Dover AFB	Kensington, Md.	Arlington, Va.	Racine, Wis.	Beloit, Wis.	Kenosha, Wis.	Janesville, Wis.	Average	
										AF	Private
Rabies immunization	\$3.00	\$3	3	\$14	\$15	\$11	\$6	\$15/\$12	10.00	3.00	11.58
Combination vaccine:											
Canine distemper/adenovirus type-2/hepatitis/parainfluenza/leptospirosis	4.50	5	4	17	18	16			19.00	4.50	17.50
Canine distemper/adenovirus type-2/hepatitis/parainfluenza/leptospirosis/PV canine parvovirus	7.50	(¹)	5	17	25	16	8	20		6.25	17.20
Feline rhinotracheitis calici-panleukopenia	4.50	4	4	14	18	12	8	13	17.50	4.17	13.75
Parvo virus vaccine	4.50	3	(¹)	12	16	11	6	10	13.50	3.75	11.42
Exam for internal parasites	2.00	1	1	4	6	4	3	6	4.00	1.33	4.50
Heartworm examination	2.00	3	1	15	14	10	5	14	5.00	2.00	10.50
Health certificate	2.00	2	2	12	5	4	(²)	9	4.00	2.00	5.67
Average										3.23	11.14

¹Not offered.
²No charge.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. CLEVELAND

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1982

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues today to pay tribute to our friend and former colleague, Jim Cleveland. We are celebrating a happy occasion—the renaming of the Federal building in Concord, N.H., in Jim's honor.

There could be no more fitting trib-

ute to the service Jim has provided than to lend his name to a public building to be used by the people he represented with such devotion, time, and concern. All of us who served with Jim remember the tireless work he did as the chairman of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, and as a member of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation. For 18 years, Jim ably represented the Second Congressional District of New Hampshire, and it is certainly appropriate to recognize his accomplishments in this manner. My heartiest congratulations and best wishes go to Jim on this day of honor.

MSGR. RAYMOND TREECE RETIRES AFTER 32 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Louisville has benefited greatly from the efforts of Msgr. Raymond Treece, who, after 32 years of service, is stepping down from the leadership of Bellarmine College.

Monsignor Treece was the force behind the college first opening its

doors back in 1950 and since that time he has been instrumental in the growth and progress of the school—serving in just about every position at one time or another.

I have known Monsignor Treece for many years and am well acquainted with the characteristics which have made him such a popular figure on campus, as well as such an able administrator. His presence will be missed on campus.

The following article which appeared in the Louisville Record is worth repeating. I include the article in its entirety:

THIRTY-TWO YEARS ON THE JOB—MONSIGNOR TREECE RETIRING FROM BELLARMINA AFTER SERVING COLLEGE IN MANY CAPACITIES

(By Tom Monahan)

It was October of 1949 when Monsignors Alfred Horrigan and Raymond Treece were summoned to a meeting at the Chancery by the Late Archbishop John Floersh. Because Msgr. Horrigan was editor of the Record at the time and Msgr. Treece was the paper's business manager, they figured the archbishop wanted to talk to them about newspaper business.

When they arrived at the Chancery, Archbishop Floersh said he wanted to build a Catholic liberal arts college for men. He told the two priests he wanted them to head up the effort and to have the school open the following fall.

One year later Bellarmine College opened its doors to 210 students. Msgr. Horrigan was the school's president and Msgr. Treece was the vice-president and business manager. Msgr. Horrigan stepped down as president in 1972, but Msgr. Treece continued serving the college in numerous rolls. He will retire at the end of this month after 32 years at Bellarmine.

Msgr. Treece, 70, has filled just about every position at Bellarmine at one time or another. He's been business manager, vice president, executive vice president, acting president for a year, chairman of the Department of Theology, temporary chairman of the Department of Sociology, campus minister, substitute teacher, board member and "in the early days I even cooked hot dogs when the cook didn't show up."

Although he has spent the last 52 years involved in education, Msgr. Treece said he never intended to pursue an academic career. After ordination in 1939, Msgr. Treece was appointed associate pastor at the Cathedral of the Assumption. He said in those days part of the duties of the associate pastors at the Cathedral was to teach religious education at St. Xavier High School and Nazareth College (now Spalding College). He remained on the faculties of Nazareth and St. X until he was named Bellarmine's first vice president.

Msgr. Treece said he and Msgr. Horrigan "didn't know anything about running a college." After their meeting with Archbishop Floersh, the two priests read every book and catalogue about colleges they could get their hands on. They also visited several Catholic colleges seeking advice.

As the two priests learned how to operate a college, workmen scurried to complete the school's first building off Norris Place. Msgr. Treece said construction began before the blueprints were finished and when Bellarmine opened a month late in October the building still didn't have any doors.

When asked if he or Msgr. Horrigan ever panicked at the task of creating a college in

less than one year. Msgr. Treece replied, "We didn't know enough to be scared."

Msgr. Treece said Bellarmine experienced no real crises in its first decade of existence, but said the period after the Second Vatican Council was a rough one for the college as it was for other Catholic institutions. Bellarmine lost faculty members when men left the priesthood.

Msgr. Treece said the opening of Jefferson Community College and the University of Louisville becoming a state school cut into Bellarmine's enrollment. And the most traumatic time for the college, according to Msgr. Treece, came when the old Ursuline College and Bellarmine merged in 1968 to become a coeducational institution.

"Mergers are always traumatic," Msgr. Treece said. "Tradition and heritage become stumbling blocks."

Msgr. Treece is known for his candor. In the words of Howard Cosell, he "tells it like it is." Msgr. Treece said Bellarmine, like many other private colleges, was in bad shape in the late 1960s and early 1970s. He said the enrollment had dropped by 1,000, the budget had been cut drastically and the college was unable to generate the large financial gifts necessary to meet soaring costs.

When Msgr. Horrigan resigned in 1972, Msgr. Treece admitted he too was considering leaving.

"He moved first, and I didn't want it to look like the rats were abandoning ship," Msgr. Treece said of his decision to stay on.

Msgr. Treece was named acting president, and, by coincidence, he was the search committee member sent to Los Angeles to interview Dr. Eugene Petrik, his family and his colleagues. He said he recommended Petrik for the Bellarmine presidency because he had the perfect college wife (Helen), a dog that loved him, and a nun at Mount St. Mary's College where Petrik was vice-president "threatened to kill me if we took Petrik away."

It was a decision Msgr. Treece has not regretted.

"We were lucky enough to find Petrik who was the man able to capture the imagination of the community," Msgr. Treece said. "Petrik has brought an efficient management style to the college. We have reached the point of stability."

Petrik called Msgr. Treece "a good man, a humble man who is easy to work with." He said Msgr. Treece has been a valuable advisor and source of information and will be remembered at the college as "a lovable character."

A quick wit has been one of Msgr. Treece's trademarks. His recent speech to this year's graduates at Bellarmine is a good example.

"I am supposed to say something profound and irrelevant, and be mercifully brief," Msgr. Treece said. "I did some calculations last week and I discovered that in my academic career I must have suffered through well over a hundred graduations. I survived and so will you, so just sit back, relax and be patient. If you get bored you might watch President Petrik squirm, for he is wondering what I am going to say. That is what we call academic freedom."

Another Msgr. Treece trait is his calm under fire. He rarely lets things bother him. He said that wasn't always the case. As a young priest he suffered from hypertension until "I learned to psych myself down."

"I don't look back," Msgr. Treece said. "You make a decision and live with it—good or bad. When things start getting to you, you just have to back off for awhile and take the afternoon off."

Although Msgr. Treece's Bellarmine career is coming to an end, he's not ready for the rocking chair quite yet. In recent years he has been studying gerontology and has formed a corporation that will seek ways of building housing for the elderly.

Msgr. Treece also will be very involved in archdiocesan work with the Office of Continuing Education for Clergy and other groups. He said Archbishop Thomas C. Kelly "has a job for me" which cannot be publicized until a later date. And so while the 32-year reign at Bellarmine is over the life-long dedication to education goes on.●

LET VLADIMIR PRESTIN EMIGRATE

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, 12 long years have passed since Vladimir Prestin and his family first applied for permission to leave the Soviet Union. For Vladimir Prestin and for so many other Soviet Jews wishing only to be reunited with their loved ones, the Helsinki agreements do not exist.

From 1958 through 1970, Vladimir worked as an electronics engineer, a computer scientist and a geophysicist. Shortly after receiving his first refusal to emigrate in 1971, Vladimir was forced to resign from his position as a geophysicist, and since that time has been working at odd jobs. His application was rejected on the grounds that he possessed secret information, in spite of the fact that he worked on computers that became obsolete in 1969 and the information to which he had access was published in 1975.

Despite repeated denials over the years, KGB harassment, searches, interrogations, and seven arrests, Vladimir is in the forefront of beleaguered Jewish cultural life in the Soviet Union. He has participated in demonstrations and hunger strikes, and with his brother-in-law, Pavel Abramovich, founded the magazine "Tarbut," which deals with Jewish history and culture. In 1975, Vladimir and a group of fellow refuseniks formed a committee to organize a symposium on Jewish culture in Moscow. Participants were invited from all over the U.S.S.R. and the West to join in this cultural awareness event. But the symposium never took place since it was banned by the KGB. In March 1979, however, more than a thousand Soviet Jews participated in a weeklong seminar marking the 100th anniversary of the first Hebrew/Russian dictionary compiled by Vladimir's grandfather, Felix Shapiro. This seminar, planned largely by Prestin and Abramovich, was held in private apartments in Moscow and was comprised of lectures concerning the works of great Hebrew writers and the history of Israel.

The Prestin case has not gone unnoticed in the West. Many appeals have

been made to Soviet authorities in their behalf by U.S. officials, eminent scientists and various other organizations. Yet, 12 years after the Prestin family's first application, they still watch as their family and friends left over the years, while they are still denied the right to emigrate.

Vladimir speaks of the psychological effects of being a long-term refusenik:

... There are several levels in this isolation... what it causes us first of all, we do not believe that we are free; the main feeling of every Jew is fear. It is an illness, a serious sickness of the Jews. It makes us more phobic and it causes many psychic illnesses; we suffer from phobias and paranoia and it destroys our minds. . . . One of the results of our social isolation, especially among the refuseniks, is suspiciousness of each other. We don't only distrust the officials or the KGB, but we also do not trust each other and this destroys us more, I think, than all the efforts of the authorities. The authorities understand this, of course, and they exploit our distrust. . . . Our children cannot discuss their problems at school. They have to keep silent about what it is like to be a Jew, to grow up as one, to emigrate, etc. You see, they have to tell lies sometimes and it is very difficult to help them to live with this. . . .

Vladimir Prestin and his family are now undergoing increased hardship as the situation for Soviet Jews continues to deteriorate in the Soviet Union. I urge the Reagan administration to increase its diplomatic efforts to improve the situation of Soviet Jews, and to reassess its refusal to link human rights to grain sales and to other commercial and technological exchanges with the Soviets. And I urge my colleagues to continue their strong efforts by continuing to bring public attention to these human rights violations and the denial of human dignity that is associated with anti-Semitism. ●

A TRIBUTE TO "SACHEL"
PAIGE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a great American sports figure, Leroy Robert "Satchel" Paige passed away. His death marks the passing of one of the last of the great folk heroes of the Negro American League.

Throughout his career, "Satchel" Paige was known as the premier pitcher in baseball. But unfortunately for him, his career started in 1924 when blacks were barred from playing in the major leagues because of their color. Yet for 22 years, he performed his miraculous skills as a barnstorming pitcher. During those days, he pitched perhaps 2,500 games, completed 55 no hitters, and performed before crowds estimated at 10 million persons in the United States, the Caribbean, and

Central America. He once started 29 games in 1 month in Bismark, N. Dak., and he said later that he won 104 of the 105 games he pitched in 1934. Those are amazing statistics when one considers the stamina of today's ball-players.

It was not until 1948, a year after Jackie Robinson had broken the color line in the major leagues, and "Satchel" Paige was over 40 and in the twilight of his career, that he received his opportunity to play major league baseball. He became a rookie in July of 1948 for the Cleveland Indians. Many believed that Bill Veck, the Cleveland owner was making a mockery of the game by introducing such an elderly rookie as merely a drawing card. And he did draw crowds, 72,434 in his first start against the Washington Senators, which he won 5 to 3. But Paige was more than just a drawing card and proved himself by posting a 6 and 1 record that year and helping the Cleveland Indians to their first pennant in years. He also made a brief appearance in relief during the world series.

But the real tragedy was that, as for many blacks of his day, he was prevented from participating in the mainstream of his profession merely because of his color and despite his proven ability. On numerous occasions, he had the opportunity in exhibition games to prove that ability against the greatest the game had to offer. He outpitched "Dizzy" Dean, 1-0. He struck out Roger Hornsby five times in one game. And Joe Dimaggio called him "the best I've ever faced, and the fastest."

It was not until 1971 that organized baseball decided to pay fitting tribute to this great baseball player when a special committee to honor Negro league players elected him to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

"Satchel" Paige was also known for his homespun humor and philosophy. Some of his more famous maxims were, "Avoid fried meats, which angry up the blood," and "If your stomach disputes you, lie down and pacify it with cool thoughts." But probably the saying he is best known for is, "Don't look back; something might be gaining on you."

Well, "Satchel" Paige, nobody is going to ever gain on you again. It is only you who will gain on the history and folklore of America. We are going to miss you. ●

AMERICA NEEDS A STRONG
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed addition-

al deep cuts in funding levels of the Export-Import Bank. As you know, in fiscal year 1981, the Bank was authorized to spend \$5.5 billion in direct lending. During the current fiscal year, funding was reduced—in accordance with the administration's request to cut spending—to \$4.4 billion. The administration's current budget proposal calls for \$3.8 billion for the Bank's direct loan program in fiscal year 1983. This is a reduction of 13 percent from the 1982 level, and a cut of 30 percent from the 1981 funding level.

In an effort to maintain the Export-Import Bank as a strong weapon in our export trade arsenal, I have cosponsored House Resolution 456 which expresses the sense of the House "that the President should recognize the crucial role of the Export-Import Bank and provide full and sufficient borrowing authority to allow the Export-Import Bank to provide competitive financing which will enable U.S. companies to compete in the world markets on an equal footing with foreign competitors."

Recently, I received an excellent letter from a good friend of mine, Mr. William R. Esser, who is president of the Electronics Division of the Genisco Technology Corp., located in Rancho Dominguez, Calif. In his letter he expresses his views on the need to have a strong Export-Import Bank. He details how the Boeing Commercial Airplane Co. is placed at a severe disadvantage by foreign governments supporting their aircraft industries by subsidized financing, and how important it is for us to offset this in part by adequate Export-Import Bank funding. I would like to share Bill Esser's letter with my colleagues.

The letter follows:

GENISCO ELECTRONICS DIVISION,

May 26, 1982.

Subject: Eximbank and Boeing Commercial Airplane Company.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON,

U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear GLENN: I would like to appraise you of a concern that many of us have with respect to a very serious set of conditions that well may effect the economic posture of not only California, but your District and the Nation as well.

Apparently the Boeing Airplane Company is no longer able to compete effectively in the world market place of commercial aircraft. Due to a consortium of Western European Countries, the Airbus (A300) has a totally unfair advantage in the world market place. This is not caused by a superior product in the Airbus, but is caused by unfair and subsidized world financing agreements. Namely, that a foreign airlines can borrow money at much more favorable circumstances from European money sources than they can from the Eximbank.

That is problem number one; problem number two is that if the Eximbank is not continued to be authorized, the Boeing Airplane Company will not have any chance

whatsoever of competing in the world market for commercial aircraft. It seems to me that it is unrealistic to remove a vehicle such as the Eximbank that is providing a viable service to the foreign market place and is not costing the U.S. Taxpayers one dime.

The bottom line is simply this, if Boeing Airplane Company is not able to compete effectively in the world market place, potentially 622,000 jobs nationwide will be effected. California accounts for One Billion Dollars in sales of systems, sub-systems, and component parts to the Boeing Company in present annual sales on their commercial aircraft. In your district alone, eight (8) major companies and 25 minority held companies can and will be effected if Boeing cannot continue in a favorable competitive environment in the commercial airplane market place.

For your further edification, I am enclosing some information that tells the Boeing story in more detail. For myself, as well as Genisco Technology Corporation, we urge you to support the continuation of the Eximbank and just as importantly, that more favorable funding in terms be revised with respect to their policies in granting loans to worldwide commercial airplane customers.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM R. ESSER,
President, Electronics Division. ●

POSTAL WORKERS HARD- WORKING PROFESSIONALS

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Federal Express Co., for its decision to discontinue recent television commercials which did an injustice to the nearly 700,000 dedicated postal workers in this country.

This advertisement depicted two postal clerks as lazy, insensitive, and unresponsive to a customer's requests—a myth that should have been exposed for what it is long ago. A myth.

The truth is that this country's postal workers are hard-working professionals who process over 100 billion individual pieces of mail each year. On the average, each employee handles over 150,000 pieces. And that is no picnic. The closest competition they have comes from Japan where each postal employee handles on the average about 100,000 pieces of mail yearly. Great Britain's workers, on the average, only handle 60,000 pieces of mail each in the same time period. Our postal workers have a productivity record that bests any other in the world.

Humorous advertisements are usually successful because they catch the viewer's attention. But humor at the expense of hundreds of thousands of valuable employees is not funny.

All three major television networks listened to an overwhelming volume of

public criticism, recognized the unfairness of these ads, and stopped running them. I am pleased that Federal Express saw the light. Now I call on the firm to apologize to over a half million good and decent working men and women. They did nothing to deserve these disgusting insults. ●

IN HONOR OF THE HONORABLE
JAMES C. CLEVELAND

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1982

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to the Honorable James C. Cleveland on the occasion of the renaming of the Federal Building in Concord, N.H., on his behalf. As a former colleague, I was fortunate in serving in Congress with Mr. Cleveland.

Since the age of 21, Mr. Cleveland has been an exemplary public servant. He became active in politics with his acceptance of the Merrimack County GOP chairmanship in 1950. Mr. Cleveland was a New Hampshire State senator, representing the Seventh District from 1950-62. In 1962, Mr. Cleveland won the Second District congressional seat of New Hampshire.

Mr. Cleveland remained in every succeeding session of the U.S. Congress until his retirement in January of 1981. During his tenure, he had membership on numerous committees and subcommittees. His 18-year record on Capitol Hill is admirable and filled with countless accomplishments. One such achievement was his chairmanship of the House Republican task force on congressional reform. In this position, Mr. Cleveland demonstrated his skill as a legislator and a leader.

Upon retirement in early 1981, Mr. Cleveland returned to New Hampshire with his wife, and their five children. He is presently a practicing attorney. He is active in various social service organizations, and occupies his leisure time with such interests as farming and fishing.

When in Congress, Mr. Cleveland handled the responsibilities of his office with unwavering dedication, honesty, and hard work. It is with pleasure that I congratulate him on the renaming of the Federal Building in his honor. ●

TRAINING DISPLACED INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, our economy is on the skids. Unemployment is

at its highest levels since the Great Depression of the 1930's. In my own district, the unemployment rate is averaging 14.6 percent across six counties. More than 48,000 of my constituents are without jobs. If you think the Reagan economic recovery program is working, you should ask one of the more than 10 million Americans who is not.

There is a formidable agenda that we must address to repair and to rebuild this country. Nothing would distinguish us from current ineffective policies than taking action to insure that our industrial labor force develops the skills needed to help America regain its competitive edge in the 1980's.

Thousands of Americans in recent years have lost their jobs in our basic industries such as steel, autos, and textiles because of import penetration and our failure to respond to changing production techniques and market demands. Now these people are without the means to reequip themselves to find new employment in different lines of work. Increasingly, they are without hope as they are forced to sell their belongings and to join the welfare rolls.

In my mind, no investment is more frugal, and no investment is more practical, than our investment in America's resource—our people.

Despite growing unemployment lines, skill shortages are predicted for the new jobs being created. The future calls for machinists to make the tools and hardware for new modes of production. The future calls for engineers, drafters, laser technicians, computer analysts, and assemblers in the electronics industry. The future calls for skilled workers to design, produce, install, operate, and maintain the robots to be used on our assembly lines. We must address this mismatch of skill and job openings, if we are to boost productivity and provide work for our people now and in the years to come.

On May 25, I introduced legislation along with 20 of my colleagues to guarantee future funding for employment training programs for displaced industrial workers. Our bill amends the Trade Act of 1974 to transform what remains of the trade adjustment assistance (TRA) program into a training program.

The training to be provided in this legislation will be financed by foreign manufacturers in the form of existing customs duties already levied on foreign imports shipped here for marketing. Last year, nearly \$8 billion was collected from customs duties—more than \$1 billion from duties in imported vehicles alone. The Congressional Budget Office estimates only \$627 million in fiscal year 1983, \$315 million in fiscal year 1984, and \$30 million in

fiscal year 1985 will need to be transferred to the trade adjustment assistance trust fund. Putting displaced industrial workers back to work will reestablish them as consumers in our economy and as taxpayers who can help reduce the burden of soaring deficits.

Finally, no new governmental bureaucracy or redtape will be involved in providing this training. The displaced industrial worker will be free to shop around and choose the training best suited to his or her needs among the already available training programs or those to be developed by the PIC—private industry councils—prescribed in the pending training bills proposed by President Reagan, Senators QUAYLE and KENNEDY, and Congressmen HAWKINS and JEFFORDS. Those bills envision close consultation among local business, labor, and governmental leaders in the development of meaningful training programs. The Pease bill will allow the worker to choose among the training opportunities offered, subject to the approval of the local employment office.

Rather than anecdotes and glib rationalizations, we offer this legislation as a thoughtful, affordable approach to redressing the suffering of our Nation's displaced industrial workers.●

GILMAN FIGHTS MAIL FRAUD

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the House Select Committee on Aging has held numerous hearings on the subject of frauds perpetrated against the elderly. We have found tragic examples where senior citizens have invested their entire savings in phony commodities contracts, to purchase land that was underwater or worthless, or to purchase a wide panoply of cures for arthritis and cancer. We have heard from seniors who have been taken by phony franchise or distributorship rackets, and from the elderly who have lost sizable investments in work-at-home schemes. In addition, we have heard testimony about the fraud in Government programs such as Medicare and Medicaid much of which is perpetrated through the U.S. mails.

Our committee is convinced that something must be done about this growing problem, and something must be done soon. We have analyzed the resources of the Federal Government and have several legislative ideas to help the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Food and Drug Administration to deal with these problems. However, it is our conclusion that the most effective thing that we

can do to stop these frauds is to strengthen the authority of the U.S. Postal Service. The Postal Service does a marvelous job given the limitations on its authority. The Chief Postal Inspector was the prototype of the inspectors general that we have created in every other department to fight fraud and yet we have failed to give the Chief Postal Inspector the subpoena power that we have given each of the other IG's.

I am very pleased to report that our bill to accomplish this purpose has been cosponsored by over 300 Members of the House and as S. 1407 has passed the Senate. I am also extremely proud to report that among the strongest advocates of this bill, which would do so much to stem the tide of fraud and abuse, is the Honorable BENJAMIN GILMAN from New York, the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization. There are few Members in the House who are more respected. I know BEN has been very concerned with the interests of the Nation's elderly. He is a recognized expert in many fields including the complicated area of foreign affairs. I am happy to have him as a prime cosponsor of H.R. 3973, indeed I have just learned that he introduced a similar bill 2 years ago. Congressman GILMAN deserves our commendation for his good efforts and I would therefore like to insert in the RECORD Mr. GILMAN's remarks at the May 20 legislative hearing on H.R. 3973.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3973, LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN THE POSTAL SERVICE'S AUTHORITY TO COMBAT MAIL FRAUD

Mr. Chairman, I want to join you in welcoming our distinguished colleagues and panel testifying this morning in support of H.R. 3973, legislation to strengthen the Postal Service's authority to combat mail fraud. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Congressman Pepper, Congress' recognized champion of our Nation's senior citizens, for introducing this measure, of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor. I congratulate also, our distinguished colleague, Senator Pryor of Arkansas, for taking the initiative to sponsor a similar bill in the Senate. I understand that measure was passed by the Senate last evening. I commend you also, Mr. Chairman, for providing our Subcommittee with the opportunity to review appropriate proposals to strengthen the resources we can bring to bear against mail fraud.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Republican on our Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization, I have long recognized the need to improve efforts to combat mail fraud. In 1977, I introduced legislation which was designed also to help crackdown on fraudulent mail offerings. My concern in large measure, was generated by the fact that all too often the target of these schemes and misleading advertisements is our Nation's senior citizens. Indeed, Congressman Pepper indicated that a comprehensive series of hearings held before the Select Committee on Aging, which he chairs revealed that over 60 percent of those vic-

timized by mail order quackery artists peddling phony health remedies, land fraud, and work-at-home schemes were senior citizens.

H.R. 3973 would go a long way to stemming the rising tide of mail fraud, an epidemic which is estimated to involve hundreds of millions of dollars annually in consumer losses. This measure would: (1) permit the Chief Postal Inspector to seek access to any books or records related to an investigation he undertakes; (2) enable the Postal Service to more quickly obtain from an offeror, a suspicious product; and (3) provide for civil penalties of up to \$10,000 per day for anyone who continues to engage in fraudulent schemes after a cease and desist order has been issued, in addition to any criminal penalties which may apply.

Mr. Chairman, while we recognize that the vast majority of our Nation's mail order marketing firms are legitimate and responsible operations, we cannot permit a comparatively small number of firms and individuals to engage boldly in crooked schemes to defraud the public. I am confident that these will be productive hearings, and I look forward to our Subcommittee taking expeditious and favorable action on this measure.●

THE ACC: INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of a bill that invests in America's future. H.R. 4861 establishes the American Conservation Corps (ACC), and represents the first key step in attacking two key problems: America's declining infrastructure and rising rate of youth unemployment.

There is simply no doubt that there is a great backlog of conservation, rehabilitation, and improvement work to be done. A mere partial listing of the projects awaiting the energy and enthusiasm of the ACC gives one an exciting vision of a revitalized America—roads and bridges must be maintained. Strip mined land must be reclaimed. Energy must be conserved and renewable resources enhanced. Damage from flood, erosion, drought, and storm must be attended. There are historical sites to be preserved, recreational areas to be developed, and forests to be rejuvenated. Both the rangelands in need of rehabilitation and the urban centers in need of revitalization point to the importance of assembling the ACC today.

Yet, creation of the ACC is most important because it represents an investment in America's most valuable and singularly precious resource, our youth. The high rate of youth unemployment—especially among minorities—is shocking. It is our single greatest waste of productive and moral resources. The ACC is targeted to increase the employment opportunities

for young men and women, especially those who are economically, socially, physically, or educationally disadvantaged.

The ACC is much more than a mere jobs or "make work" program. In fact, the American infrastructure is begging for the hammers, hoes, rakes—and the young men and women—capable of strengthening it. Moreover, the ACC, as created by H.R. 4861, is designed to enhance the long-term occupational potential of our youth by requiring that such considerations be written into the plans of each project.

It is imperative that we never allow our youth to become demoralized or dispirited by the lack of meaningful and productive work. Creation of the ACC is not intended to present an American panacea—but rather a first step on the road to productive revitalization and complete economic enfranchisement. America's future productive and moral strength depends upon not allowing our resources to erode nor our youth to remain fallow. Establishing the ACC is exactly the investment in America that we need to make today. ●

WHY WE NEED NUCLEAR POWER

HON. MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, the nuclear industry has concisely stated some compelling reasons for continuing and encouraging nuclear-fueled electric energy production. I have long advocated the removal of institutional barriers to encourage the utilization of this technology in the private sector for both environmental and economic reasons.

Nuclear power is environmentally benign and it is the most cost-effective way to supply electric energy for more jobs and industrial growth. Even Peter Bradford, a former NRC Commissioner and reputed nuclear energy critic, has publicly stated "that from a public health and safety standpoint, I thought it (nuclear power) would be a better deal."

It seems clear to me that without growth in the nuclear industry to enhance our Nation's ability to provide electricity, our growing work force will face an inherent inability of industry to employ them, and consequently the standard of living of our increasing population will decline. This alone is sufficient reason to support policies that encourage nuclear electricity growth.

Additionally, electric energy can substitute for oil consumption in transportation and in home heating. Electric vehicles may soon be introduced

into the market for commuters and around-the-town driving. Electric energy with heat pumps is, in many areas of the country, the most effective way of displacing the use of home heating oil. This substitution provides an easy mechanism for reducing our oil imports and our dependency on unreliable suppliers.

The close link in our system of electric energy growth with growth in the gross national product of our Nation is yet another compelling reason to support nuclear-fueled electricity production. It is clear evidence of the importance of this energy source to the economic health of the Nation.

It seems clear for all these reasons that our future is intimately tied to the success of nuclear power in our Nation's electric energy industry. Without it, our Nation's quality of life and, ultimately, our system of government will begin to decline.

I am including the industry's fact sheet for our reading. Please take the time to consider it. I believe it is factually accurate and allows for only one logical conclusion: we must encourage nuclear energy growth and other viable energy options by all reasonable means at our disposal so that we have the broadest flexibility in charting a course of economic health for our Nation through energy security.

[From the Nuclear Assembly, May 1982]

ENERGY, ELECTRICITY AND NUCLEAR POWER

Dramatically apparent over the 1970s was the extreme jeopardy to this nation's economic, social and military security posed by excessive reliance on foreign sources of fuel, perilous in availability and capricious in price.

Imperative for the 1980s, then, must be a broad and sustained effort to restore an essential balance between this country's rising demand for energy and the contribution of its domestic fuel resources, secure in supply and stable in cost.

Part of the answer is conservation. Through more efficient and more productive utilization, growth in energy consumption could be reduced by some 25 percent to the end of this century.

The need for increased energy at that time, nevertheless, already has been established:

Population—rising from 225 million to approximately 260 million consumers;

Employment—increasing from 105 million to about 135 million workers;

Households—mounting from 80 million to approximately 110 million units;

Gross National Product—expanding from \$2.6 trillion to about \$4.5 trillion (1980 dollars).

Fulfilling even modest social and economic expectations to accompany this growth results in a demand for energy by the year 2000—after conservation—of approximately 105 quads: an increase of more than 40 percent over the 1981 consumption of 74 quads.

A quad is a convenient measure for large amounts of energy, equivalent to some 172 million barrels of oil. More useful than its precise definition are the numbers preceding it.

From most of the nation's current energy supplies, however, little expansion over the next two decades can be expected:

Petroleum—unconventional sources and advanced recovery could maintain production relatively constant: about 20 quads.

Natural gas—despite new reservoirs in frontier areas and enhanced extraction, a slight reduction is anticipated: approximately 15 quads.

Hydro, geothermal power—few sites for additional development permit only a small increase: about 5 quads.

Solar, renewable resources—the need for reliable technology and competitive cost will limit significant gains: approximately 1 quad.

Foreign fuels—federal import reduction programs will limit their present supply: some 8 quads.

Together, this maximum production of conventional fuels and extraordinary development of emerging alternatives—as well as continued imports—will provide about 50 quads of energy: less than half the requirement projected for the year 2000.

The solution to this shortfall can be found in the fastest growing segment of the nation's energy system—electricity. In 1981 one-third of U.S. energy was used to generate electric power; by the end of the century, this fraction could rise to nearly one-half.

Only through this uniquely flexible means of energy conversion can the full potential be realized from the sole major indigenous fuel resources capable of significant future expansion:

Coal—recoverable demonstrated reserves can meet present levels of demand for more than 300 years. Primarily for electric production, along with direct burn and synthetic fuels, coal's contribution to energy supply in the year 2000 could reach about 38 quads.

Achieving this level of mining, however, requires an annual rate of growth sustained over the next two decades that is more than double the historical average.

Uranium—applying available reactor technology to reasonably assured resources yields potential energy equivalent to that obtained from all domestic coal, oil and gas. Nuclear power, then, clearly can furnish whatever amount of energy might be necessary—including the remainder urgently needed by the turn of the century: approximately 18 quads.

To meet even this minimum required level, however, the nation's electric utilities must order over the next 10 years as much new nuclear generating capacity as that already operating and being built.

Through this growing use of more plentiful and less expensive domestic coal and uranium made possible by electricity, the U.S. could regain substantial control over the security and cost of its vital energy supply.

Expanded contributions from these fuels are constrained neither by geology nor by technology.

Obstacles to accelerated deployment of new generating facilities, however, must be removed: by improvement of electric utility investment capability, predictable licensing procedures and, above all, commitment to a prudent, pragmatic energy program by the nation's public and political leaders. ●

LET NONE DARE CALL THEM
TURKEYS

HON. PETER W. RODINO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as we renew the 1983 budget debate, I implore my colleagues to engage in no further derogation of that noble bird, the turkey.

In the last go-around, after all the substitutes were as dead as dodo birds, one of those among us branded all eight proposals as turkeys.

The speaker was implying, I believe, that they were all bummers. This was yet another manifestation of the defamation of this true original native of America. Thanks (or no thanks) to show business turkey has become synonymous with a flop or failure.

In short, the turkey has become something of a sitting duck—a clay pigeon, if you will—for lazy phrase-makers.

It was not always thus. Not always did the turkey wear this albatross. I would remind my colleagues, for instance, that Ben Franklin thought the turkey "a much more respectable bird" to serve as our national symbol, rather than the bald eagle, a creature Ben found to have few redeeming qualities and besides was "often very lousy."

In contrast to the show biz usage, turkey is still a sign of some success—three straight strikes—among the 10-pin bowlers.

In a relatively new usage, popular among our younger citizens, I think turkey is used to convey a gentle, amused affection—as in, "You turkey."

And this fine bird remains a source and symbol of joy and fulfillment and thanksgiving for our great holiday—sad to say for the turkey.

Summing up, I think we should be proud as peacocks of the turkey.

Now we have three more budget proposals to consider. They may be stormy petrel. They may elicit coos of approval from the hawks and shrieks of derision from the doves. Some may even think them a little cuckoo.

But this time let us come to decision. Let us meet our responsibilities. Let us not act like silly geese and bury our heads like ostriches in the sand.

And, above all, with regard to these proposals, let none dare call them turkeys.●

GENE FADNESS—SEWARD
COUNTY INDEPENDENT

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact about our world that we must rely on nuclear weapons to preserve the freedoms we now enjoy. Though most of us sympathize with those who seek to limit such weapons, we cannot allow sympathy to overcome rational thinking. Gene Fadness of the Seward County Independent is one commentator who has faced reality, no matter how saddening. I would like to recommend to my colleagues his recent column, which applauds the educational efforts of Ground Zero Week while not blinking at the realities of our world political situation. Mr. Fadness notes that we all pray for an end to the arms race but that pragmatic leaders of all ideologies have opposed a freeze of weapons at present levels. I would like to have this clear-thinking article printed in the RECORD.

[From the Seward County Independent,
May 19, 1982]

SAD REALITIES

(By Gene Fadness)

The recent groundswell of public opinion and action concerning the arms race has resulted in much that is positive. There at least seems to be a glimmer of hope that public reaction may be the impetus behind an agreement in a halt to the arms race and reduction in existing weapons. For that alone, Ground Zero Week and other such public-awareness events have been worthwhile and even necessary endeavors.

But behind every good thing it seems there is the sheep in wolf's clothing. There is that threatening risk of decisions made based upon emotion, of idealism replacing the awful but nevertheless real facts. Just as we are fearful of death and crippling brought upon us by a nuclear warhead, let us be just as wary of decisions made upon the basis of a waving placard rather than a careful, educated study of the facts—for in the end, this could produce the same result, only perhaps more quickly and convincingly.

Perhaps one of the better things about Ground Zero Week is that it was a venture primarily aimed at educating rather than demonstrating John Lyman, a former president of Stanford University, put it very well when he said, "Almost the worst thing the universities could do would be to opt for a few easy and dramatic gestures, satisfying outlets for our frustrations that might make us all feel a nice warm glow of self-righteousness but would do nothing to advance our basic understanding of the problem." I hope that efforts of Ground Zero Week will not be limited to one week but that a careful and objective study of the problem on the part of the public will continue.

And the problem is a complex one. Too often we hear of liberals decrying the conservatives for simplistic solutions. In this area, I believe, liberals may be advocating a simplistic and dangerous solution. The immediate enactment of a total freeze at present levels could be very dangerous if we

don't have absolute assurances from the Soviets and all Communist bloc nations that build-up will discontinue and verification be allowed not only by satellite but even on-site inspections if suspicions warrant it. The same, of course, would be true for the United States and its allies.

One must always keep in mind the past track record of the Soviets. The Soviet people undoubtedly fear nuclear destruction as Americans do, but in the U.S.S.R. the opinions of the people do not weigh that heavily. And it will take a lot of convincing to get this skeptic to agree that Soviet leaders do not have as their prime goal eventual world communism. The only reason their goal has not been realized is fear—fear of an unwinnable nuclear war. Sad, but realistic.

Lest we forget, may I bring these nations and their struggles to your recollection: in the Far East we have Afghanistan, Cambodia and Mongolia; in Africa we have Angola, People's Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia and Libya; in Eastern Europe we have Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland; and regrettably in our own hemisphere, Cuba with Nicaragua and El Salvador on a dangerous fenceline.

I'm not dusting off any old atlases to get this information. These few Communist states are recent campaign trophies of the Soviets, most of them in the 1970s, with 1956 as the farthest back I go.

We would do well to keep our eyes on South America now. Should the Falkland Islands war continue, you can bet that the Soviets will take advantage of Argentine anger at the U.S. and try to get a foothold there.

No question about it; their nature is aggression. To be able to dismantle U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons will require a complete turnaround in Soviet philosophy.

I find it interesting that the past three presidents of both political parties and the past four secretaries of state of both parties have expressed opposition to a freeze at present levels. They have been and are privy to more information than you and I. Even West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, considered a dove among U.S. allies, warned against a freeze now.

Those who would portray our president as one wanting war are wrong. His recommendations made so far in arms reductions indicate his careful approach to the problem.

Meanwhile we can continue to pray. Pray that the arms race will end and, in the same prayer, remember those that had to opt for war instead of peace to preserve the freedoms we enjoy today.●

THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF
TURNVEREIN OF CARLSTADT

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I am delighted that I have been invited to help celebrate the 125th anniversary of a very special organization in my community, the Turnverein of Carlstadt.

The proud history of the Turnverein predates the incorporation of the Borough of Carlstadt. It is an integral

part of the history and the development of South Bergen County, N.J.

Originally organized by German immigrants to our area who shared a common desire to achieve success in their new land while maintaining and furthering their unique cultural heritage, the Turnverein established one of Carlstadt's first schools and its fire department.

The tradition of civic responsibility and the motto of "Sound Mind-Sound Body" flourished among the second and third generations of the families of the founders and among the newcomers and other ethnic background members who joined the Turnverein.

Through the years, thousands of residents of our communities have been able to take part in the gymnastic training, physical fitness programs, and chorus activities the group offers at its facilities. And their performances have been enjoyed by countless others and have received awards and honors in competitions throughout the State.

The Turnverein has upheld its legacy because its membership through the years has devoted a great deal in time and energy to its worthy endeavors in the public interest. We recognize this weekend 125 years of community-based involvement and action.

As a lifelong East Rutherford resident, myself of German descent, I am very familiar with the activities of the Turnverein. I am proud to extend my commendations to its members for a fine record of service and my sincere best wishes for every success in the years ahead. ●

BUDGETS

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the amazing things one discovers when one gets out of the hothouse of Washington, is that there is a great deal going on in the rest of the country. Here the talk is all about the budget, and will we or will we not get one that most of us can agree upon. Out there, the illusion of the budget has not taken hold, and people are concerned with real things like their jobs, tax rates, the rates of interest, and survival of their businesses.

One comes to the conclusion that a great deal of the problem of the economy is a media creation. After all, the people in the country will not be affected directly at all if we fail to adopt a budget. They will be affected if we raise their taxes, or if we adopt a series of short-term measures designed to help this or that sector of the economy. As to spending, it is not the

budget resolution that spends money, but the appropriations process. We can adopt all the balanced budget resolutions we want to, but if we then proceed to appropriate beyond those resolutions, they will not stop us. Only our own political will can save us then. We should not delude the people into thinking that the budget process controls spending. Nor should we allow the media to confuse the real issue.

The media, for instance, are now trumpeting news of huge tax cuts for the rich, of course, and how they are robbing the Government of revenue needed to balance the budget. The truth, of course, is that there have been no tax cuts at all, so far, and what is scheduled to come will do little more than compensate for inflation.

It is likely that future cuts, especially those in top rates, will have very positive impacts in terms of Government revenues, but this is a point hardly broadcast on the nightly news, or alluded to by headline writers for the major papers.

It is a point addressed by Mr. George Gilder, who finds the prospect promising and encouraging. His is a viewpoint not popular with the pseudoeconomists of the media, or even with many real economists, but it is nonetheless persuasive, and I include it as part of these remarks so that my colleagues can see for themselves.

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1982]

THE BOOM OF THE 1980'S

(By George Gilder)

U.S. economic policy currently operates in a house of media mirrors—a gallery of distorting myths and statistical gargoyles—that panic the policy-makers themselves into blind fits of self-defeating behavior. They raise taxes to fight recession, raid our scarce savings to stimulate the housing industry of the world's most overhoused nation, and ululate over fake data that miss all the dynamics of economic life.

Politicians and editorial writers still talk of "huge tax cuts" on personal income, when in fact even after the October reductions, 1981 brought an effective 10 percent increase in tax rates for most citizens, as inflation pushed wage earners into higher tax brackets and Social Security hikes continued. The oft-repeated estimate of a \$750 billion Reagan tax cut is based on Carter administration fantasies of a revenue boom from a 46 percent increase in tax rates, brought by four more years of bracket creep. But a 46 percent rise in rates would bring a depression, not a boom in Treasury receipts.

These phantom revenues, however, have proven to be President Carter's most valuable legacy to his party. For it is this totally mythological money that is now alleged to have been "given" to the rich through the Reagan tax cuts. But in fact it is only the relatively poor who will pay less taxes in coming years.

Wealthy earners of "unearned" income, who have confronted rates well over 100 percent adjusted for inflation, will see their marginal rates substantially reduced. But the long history of tax cuts demonstrates that the decline in the top rate from 70 percent to 50 percent will actually bring a surge

of new tax payments from the rich, as they pay more to the government and less to tax lawyers and accountants. On very conservative assumptions, Michael Evans of Evans Economics, Inc., estimates a net revenue increase of \$3 billion from this source alone in 1982.

The media mythology becomes especially bizarre on the subject of interest rates. A generation of Keynesian economists constructed an imposing edifice of spurious capital theory on the assumption that interest rates were low during the Great Depression, when, in fact, adjusted for deflation, they were prohibitively high. Now another generation is misleading policy-makers by speaking of today's real interest rates as a "historic high" when, in fact, adjusted for inflation and taxes, they have long been close to zero for the dominant savers and borrowers.

With an inflation rate of 5 percent, for example, the saver must receive an interest rate of over 14 percent to receive a 2 percent real return after taxes in the 50 percent bracket where most savings occur. Conversely, individuals and corporations borrowing at high tax levels pay relatively low interest rates after inflation and taxes. Thus we punish the supply of funds (personal savings) with exorbitant taxes on false interest; and we reward the demand for this money with an array of subsidies for favored borrowers and with the deductibility of interest costs. The predictable result is a twisted money and bond market that imposes exorbitant rates on all unfavored borrowers in low tax brackets, chiefly unprofitable companies, start-ups and low-income mortgage seekers.

Nor can tax increases in any way relieve our interest rate problem. Increased income tax rates, effected through bracket creep and deferral of the "cuts," will reduce savings virtually dollar for dollar and also repress activity and tax revenues. Tax hikes retard savings four ways: by taxing most heavily the high incomes from which all net personal savings come; by deterring acquisition of further income still more likely to be saved; by taxing interest income at confiscatory rates; and by lowering incomes and savings in the conventional way explained by Keynes.

Thus President Johnson's infamous surtax of 1968-69 destroyed savings, increased inflation and interest rates and brought economic collapse in 1970. President Carter followed the hidden tax hike policy throughout his administration and reduced the federal deficit from almost 4 percent of GNP to under 1 percent by 1979. The result of this triumph over the deficit was a complete collapse of personal savings (to 3.6 percent), soaring inflation doubled interest rates and a deficit that leaped to \$60 billion in 1980. Incredibly enough, the Reagan administration followed this path again in 1981, allowing effective income tax rates to rise in an effort to reduce the deficit produced by Carter's tax hike policies. The result is our current predicament: higher deficits and lower growth.

As this decade of experience shows, tax hikes cause deficits by retarding taxable activity, and then exacerbate their effects on interest rates by extinguishing savings. The resultant recession triggers new welfare and other transfer payments that expand the size of government as a share of GNP, while requiring continual cutbacks in popular government spending programs, all in a politically and economically suicidal austerity package that pleases no one but Pete Do-

menic and other budget-blinded politicians and economists.

While President Reagan has so far failed to achieve substantial tax cuts, he has prevented the catastrophic bracket creep increases projected by the Carter administration and still sought by his opponents. Thus he has allowed the economy to maintain the highest level of employment in the West (58 percent of the adult population) while accepting more immigrants than any other country and opening the way for dramatic economic gains in coming years.

Beyond the hall of media mirrors—distorting and exaggerating the econometric gloom—U.S. industry is moving, at astonishing speed, toward a new era of high productivity and growth. While the television cameras circle like vultures around the decaying carcass of Detroit, and financial journalists recite false figures of capital formation and productivity that totally miss the productive breakthroughs in energy and electronics, the nation's economy has made a dramatic transition into the long-heralded computer age.

Over the next three years, the U.S. computer industry—led by companies like Apple and Osborne, which scarcely existed three years ago—will probably sell more personal computers than the Big Three auto companies will sell cars. Together with only slightly more modest surges in other revolutionary products, such as Computer Aided Design and Manufacture, and in energy production and conservation, this entrepreneurial achievement is well on the way to solving the world's energy and productivity problems and launching the boom of the 1980s. The current dismay about our economic prospects reflects a morbid preoccupation with nearly meaningless statistics, an obsession with the declining industrial structure of the past, and a blindness to the entrepreneurial future. ●

RUSSIAN JEWISH WEDDING IN NEWTON, MASS.

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the very great privilege of attending the event which highlighted in the most dramatic possible fashion the difference between a free society such as ours and a totalitarian regime such as the Soviet Union.

Sixty couples who had originally been married in civil ceremonies in the Soviet Union—because they were denied the right to religious ceremonies—were married again according to the tenets of Judaism at Temple Mishkan Tefila in Newton, Mass.

For all of us who attended, this religious ceremony was an extraordinary moving event. One hundred and twenty Russian Jews were given the chance to marry again according to the tenets of their faith. To those of us who take religious freedom for granted, it was an important reminder that many in the world are still denied this basic right and we must continue to fight on their behalf.

Many people worked hard on this magnificent event. Particular recognition is due to Emily Lipoff who took the lead in organizing the wedding and to Rabbi Richard Yellin of Temple Mishkan Tefila for his leadership. All of us are in the debt of these two talented and dedicated people.

I enclose an article by Sylvia Rothchild which appeared in the May 20, 1982 issue of the *Jewish Advocate* on the wedding. The article follows:

THE RUSSIAN JEWISH WEDDING AT MISHKAN TEFILA

(By Sylvia Rothchild)

It was a Lag B'Omer to remember! A wedding with sixty brides and grooms, with ten rabbis and three cantors officiating, a thousand guests, a 1,000 square feet of huppah decorated with thousands of flowers! Some of the couples were grandparents, with civil marriages in Kiev and Kharkov and Moscow in the 1930s and some were young couples also married civilly in Brookline, in 1980. All but one had emigrated in the last five years.

An extraordinary occasion! The honorary patrons included Menachem Begin, U.S. Speaker of the House Thomas P. O'Neill, senators, congressmen and national presidents of major Jewish organizations. It was a natural even for the media and the temple was full of cameras, tape recorders and bewildered looking journalists wandering around with their notebooks, trying to get to the heart of the matter.

At first glance it could have passed for a family affair of an unusually successful and public family. Only Gilbert Caterers knows how many tons of knishes, chopped liver and herring were consumed. The wine did not run out. The Bob Kovner Orchestra played everything you could dance to. It was visually a super-colossal "Goodbye Columbus" wedding. It did not look like a political rally, a mass conversion, a proclamation of religious freedom, Messianic hope and survivalist passion, which in fact it was. It was a celebration of ahavat Yisroel and a nose thumbing at bureaucratic invasion of private life, even though it was clearly a very public occasion.

I tend to measure the importance of an event by its ability to move people to tears and the Russian wedding was surely the one where I had the most requests for an extra kleenex that I have ever had in one evening, anywhere. It was as if something frozen in us was thawing, as if artificial divisions and separations had dissolved and Jews born in Brookline, Brooklyn, Leningrad, Odessa and Moscow recognized each other publicly as relatives.

Along with the recognition were unspoken sparks of understanding and remembrance. American Jews noticed faces, gestures, bodies and accents they remembered from an older generation. Russian Jews remembered the people they left behind in the Soviet Union, as well as their own risks, hopes and fears. Celebrating freedom brought reminders of how precious and rare personal freedom is in the world. Celebrating the right to marital privacy was a reminder that Soviet contemporary life includes no respect for privacy at all and that there is not even a Russian word that is a synonym for "private" as we think of it in English.

This mass wedding in some magical way became a celebration of individuality, crossing all the generations, the educations, the capacity for faith, the whole spectrum of

feeling about Jewishness. Among the participants were men and women who had deep feelings of Jewish loyalty, some who yearned for connections they had not yet made and some who were testing their ability to shed Soviet ideas that made Jewishness a defect instead of a source of strength.

Some participated for the sake of their parents and some to create good models for their children. Some couples were not at the same place in their Jewish development and saw in it a chance to become closer . . . to each other as well as the American Jewish community into which they had been welcomed. Many echoed Emanuel Borok's wish to "get in touch with his soul," now that he had freedom to work and live as he pleased. Though it was not possible for some to speak of religion as, "food for the soul," it was the religious aspect of the wedding that made it so nourishing.

The generosity of the benefactors, patrons and the businesses that contributed goods and services seemed more powered by nostalgia, the wish to do good deeds, assuage guilt for past errors, and the need for a community celebration than conventional fundraising or advertising. There were overtones of *shtetl* responsibility for marrying off its young people in the giving and the enjoying, the circle dancing, the carrying around of brides, grandmothers and Emily Lipoff, the extraordinary woman who managed the details of the event.

Along with everyone else's reasons I had my own for the damp kleenex in my pocket. I remembered the frightened and bewildered Soviet Jews who came off the train in Vienna ten years ago. They were the mythical "Jews of Silence" who were called Jews in Moscow, Russians in Israel and who received a cool welcome in America by those who saw them only as "noshrim," who did not belong here. Wherever they settled, they too were unsure of their identity and purpose. "My purpose in leaving I knew; my purpose in coming I know not," was heard again and again by those who questioned them.

In many interviews of Russian emigres in the last ten years, I came to admire their strength, their sensitivity, their search for identity and purpose. American Jews in those years also learned to differentiate between the *idea* of Russian Jewry and the real people, all different from each other that make up their constituency. The Russians taught me how much we and they are divided by style, education, class, status and early political indoctrination. They also showed that they could change and respond to their new environment and that they had lessons to teach as well as to learn.

The Russian Jewish Wedding at Mishkan Tefila was a giant step forward in the learning process, a process that engages feelings as much as intellect. The details will fill a space larger than this column affords but one seemed particularly noteworthy. Russians in America are prone to describe themselves by the work they do and are normally very worried about their economic position in life. When I tried to find out the occupations of the brides and grooms, to see if their education or status played any role in their decision to take part in a Jewish wedding, Emily Lipoff said she never thought to include that question in her questionnaire. Without the question, no answer was given. That it should not have seemed important was answer enough. ●

TRIBUTE TO FATHER FRANK J. PORAZZO

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 20, 1982, the parishioners of St. Clare's Church, Florence, N.J., are taking time to show their appreciation to a very special person. That person is Rev. Frank J. Porazzo, pastor of St. Clare's.

For nearly four decades, Father Porazzo has unselfishly served his church and community. It is significant, I believe, that the appreciation dinner falls during the year long celebration by the Diocese of Trenton of a program called Emmaus. The Emmaus program is a spiritual get-together for members of the Catholic clergy—a time for reflection and awareness.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, not to point to any single achievement of Father Frank, as he is known to many, but to recognize a life of achievement. Father Frank possesses those characteristics that have brought stability to parish life.

Let me briefly review the service of Father Frank J. Porazzo. He was ordained on June 30, 1944. Father Frank was an associate pastor for 12 years before becoming pastor of the Church of Assumption in New Egypt, N.J. on December 10, 1957.

Father Porazzo became pastor of St. Clare's Church in Florence on November 20, 1969, where he has served ever since.

As I mentioned, I do not rise to cite an extraordinary event in the life of Father Frank, but to honor his life which has been extraordinary. He has shown dedication to the church and community for 40 years. He has worked hard for his faith and his flock. He is an example of the rock on which a church can be built.

On the road to Emmaus where the two travelers questioned their faith, they were visited by Jesus. After He spoke to them they were reassured. So has Father Porazzo brought spiritual awareness to his parishioners. In Luke 24: 31 it is said, "and their eyes were opened and they knew Him."

Whether it be fighting for the human rights of the unborn or spreading the teachings of his faith, Father Frank has dedicated himself to the task at hand. The day-to-day efforts of Father Porazzo should serve as an example to all, for he truly knows the meaning of sacrifice. As Montague once said, "It is easier to sacrifice great than little things."

It is my pleasure to join with his friends and family in showing appreciation for the limitless sacrifices Father Frank has made on behalf of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

his church and the people of Florence.●

SPEECH OF ELIZABETH H. DOLE

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, my friend Elizabeth Hanford Dole, Assistant to the President for Public Liaison, recently presented an excellent speech on the accomplishments of women in the past and the great opportunities for women in the future.

Contrary to much of the downbeat talk we commonly hear, Mrs. Dole sees a future American economy in which the unique skills of women will be in great demand. I submit this speech for the attention of the House:

I trust you'll forgive me if I begin by looking over my shoulder—to a day in September 1962 when I entered Harvard Law School, one of 25 women in a class of 550 prospective movers, shakers and Wall Street lions. There were precious few lionesses back then. I'll never forget being accosted by a male classmate on my very first day at Harvard, who demanded to know what I was doing there.

"Don't you realize," he said in tones of moral outrage, "that there are men who'd give their right arm for your place in law school? Men who would use their legal education?"

That was my first—but by no means my final—exposure to chauvinism in the shadow of Frankfurter and Pound. Once each semester, there was Professor Leach's Ladies Day—when our otherwise ignored cadre of female scholars would sit before the class and answer questions—after beginning the ritual with a poem. It was at times like that when I gained a uniquely personal insight into how the early Christians must have felt while performing for the good people of Rome—in the Coliseum.

My colleagues at Harvard seemed to have forgotten that the figure of Justice is a woman. They seemed oblivious to the psychological barriers they had erected, ignorant of the fears they inspired or the doubts they nurtured.

Women in 1962 did a lot of wondering. We wondered if there would be jobs when we got out of school. We wondered if we would be accepted by the masculine domain of the legal world, where law books and leather chairs alike tended to be reserved for "old boys" whatever their age.

We wondered at times whether life on the frontier would ever evolve into real civilization—and whether we were doomed to go through our professional lives as the sole female in an audience of tolerant—at best—males. Of my own classmates at Harvard, Susan Shapiro today is a partner at Ropes and Gray in Boston. Elizabeth Holzman is District Attorney in Brooklyn. Stephanie Seemore sits on the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals in Tulsa. Jane Roth is a partner in a Delaware firm. For them as for others, the wondering is over. Success has taken its place, the product of a generation of long hours and lofty ambitions.

Today's graduating women have less to wonder about. They have much more to work toward. Those honored today provide

heartwarming evidence of just how profound the changes have been. Those honored represent an extraordinary range of skills and achievements, the frontline troops in a quiet revolution taking place all across America.

There is a sense of history in the air. Precedent has few followers in this group: among its shatterers are Jeane Kirkpatrick, the first woman to serve as U.N. Ambassador, and Sandra O'Connor, who was offered a legal typist's job in 1952—and who went on to break the type, and interpret the law of the land on this nation's supreme tribunal.

Yes, we've made progress, but there are still the problems. Even now, too many Americans practice a subtle form of discrimination. Less obvious than the law, more insidious than verbal prejudice, it's called patronization, and it undercuts women just as surely as the old barriers of statute and custom.

Social critic Marya Mannes put it best, I think, when she wrote the following: "Nobody objects to a woman being a good writer or sculptor or geneticist if, at the same time, she manages to be a good wife, a good mother, good-looking, good-tempered, well-dressed, well-groomed and unaggressive."

In other words, in today's society we are faced with the tyranny of perfection. You, too, can be treated the same as a man—so long as you out perform him. For all our gains, roadblocks still remain on the path to prosperity and job satisfaction. Large segments of our economy continue to regard millions of women as consumers instead of producers. Too many employers regard too many working women as pursuers of pin money—and pay them accordingly, about ¾, on average, of a man's salary, despite educational backgrounds that may be identical. At the same time, too many of those who are entrusted with economic decisions overlook the painful toll exacted by inflation, or the inequitable burden that hitherto has been written into the U.S. tax code.

In designing its economic program, the Administration has tried to take into account the sad but true reality that inflation falls hardest on women. In cutting taxes, we've made it a priority to ease the marriage penalty, to all but eliminate estate taxes, permitting for the first time a spouse to inherit a farm or business intact. There are incentives to help working mothers with child care—and additional retirement protection in IRA's for wives who do not work and for women who earn less than \$10,000.

The public sector can and should do all in its power to make ours an economy color-blind to blue and pink, as well as black and white. And ever since my days on the Federal Trade Commission, I've been keeping one hand on the pulse of the private sector, particularly American business, and measuring the slow but steady growth in female recruitment and utilization.

It seems clear to me that we must now focus on how to maximize the female half of the human resource ledger. We hear much about programs for women to teach them the rules of the game.

We hear much less about efforts to remove those factors causing managers to misuse or overlook female talent.

This can't continue for long, if only because market forces have doomed the old ways of doing business. In the years just ahead, America must wake up to the fact that the very interpersonal skills of consensus building, mediating, moderating, and

dealing effectively with people in general—skills that studies and surveys have historically identified as predominant in women—are the building blocks of a post industrial society. In the evolving service-oriented economy of the 1980's and 1990's, it's the management of people and not the management of machinery or material that will be crucial. It's interesting to flip through the American Management Association's catalog of continuing education and note the number of courses in interpersonal skills being offered to today's managers, most of whom are male.

And with the revolution taking place in this country, the tidal wave of women entering the work force, managers are, I believe, starting to grasp what we have always known: that women share with men the need for personal success, even the taste for power. And no longer are we willing to satisfy those needs through the achievements of surrogates, whether husbands, children or merely role models.

Indeed, the very concept of the role model may be endangered—and rightfully so. For the line separating role models and tokens is a thin one. The role model is a logical by-product of a society unwilling to utilize fully the talents of all its women, and thereby eager to enshrine and celebrate those few it entrusts with meaningful tasks.

Every person in this room recognizes both the problems and the untapped potential of the 52 percent of America's workforce that's female. So do others who are working outside the limelight to advance justice wherever it is blocked, who understand how far we have come, and who know firsthand how far we have yet to travel. What all of us—and all of them—have in common is commitment. And with that commitment goes a vision of society as it might, and ought to, be.

That vision encompasses a limitless horizon for every woman of courage and conviction. In large measure, it is the product of women whose lives demonstrate an ability to see beyond the commonplace, and a reach for greatness that encompasses the distance between their dreams and reality.

One of the country's greatest poets was a woman who never left her home in Amherst, Massachusetts. She never worked in an office, never raised a family, never won a headline. The only power she wielded lay in her poetry. But her artistry and her vision have inspired millions.

"We dwell in possibility," Emily Dickinson wrote in her clapboard cloister nearly 150 years ago.

But we must adapt the gospel of Emily Dickinson's positive thinking to the world as it exists. We realize that for most women, success is achieved by dwelling in the improbable, by challenging the odds and overcoming the conventional wisdom.

Surely it was a combination of possibility—and reaching for the improbable—that led Rosa Parks to claim a seat at the front of a Montgomery bus, and thus launch a peaceful revolution a hundred years overdue. Surely it was a brush with the improbable that raised Golda Meir to the Premiership of Israel—or suggested that Mother Teresa's responsibility to a hungry world involved far more than mere obedience to the rules of her order.

So, even as we join together this afternoon to break bread and break precedent, let us in the pursuit of economic and social equality, continue to strive for the day when the improbable becomes the probable. Back in June 1965, I was welcomed some-

what uneasily into a circle still known as "the fellowship of educated men." I've seen enormous progress since then. I've seen the circle expand, and opportunities open up.

And I am convinced that today's women stand in the reflected light of a rising, not a setting sun. Our day has barely dawned. Our dreams are just beginning to be realized. We dwell in possibility—but we challenge the improbable. So, as we leave this room, let us not forget why we came.●

JOURNAL-STAR "VIP" PROGRAM

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, some of our more pessimistic citizens were skeptical of this country's ability to face the recent round of budget cuts. Americans will not stand for fewer government services, they said. President Reagan, of course, did not buy that line. And, apparently, neither has the Lincoln Journal-Star Printing Co. of Lincoln, Nebr. The Journal-Star Co., which prints the two largest newspapers located within the First Congressional District, has heeded the President's call for increased volunteer service and launched the "VIP" (Volunteer in Parks) program.

Lincoln's city parks and recreation department suffered from budget cuts that resulted in 65 fewer employees tending the parks. Long grass and weeds became problems. But the Journal and Star did not think Lincoln's citizens would sit back and watch their beautiful parks go to seed.

The newspapers told their readers:

Lincoln's pride and joy, for years, has been its Parks and Recreation System. All of us at one time or another has bragged to others from around the nation that we have the best.

And we do! But, our Parks and Recreation Department desperately needs our help now! . . .

We want to preserve the beauty of our parks and we want to support the President's volunteer program. We want you to join with us in a VIP program—simply meaning Volunteer in Parks.

The newspapers were correct; Lincoln's citizens responded. In a few days over 85 citizens and two of the city's larger businesses had come forward and volunteered to help mow, trim, and cleanup the city's parks. I am sure that many more have since offered their assistance. The Journal-Star Co. has notified the White House about its program, and I would like to take this opportunity to notify my colleagues in Congress and ask them to join me in applauding the newspapers' efforts. Anyone who thought America would not respond to the President's request for more volunteerism need look no farther than Lincoln, Nebr. to find out he was wrong.●

CONGRESS AND THE BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, June 9, 1982 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS AND THE BUDGET

The question on the mind of every member of Congress is whether the House of Representatives will be able to find the majority it needs to adopt a budget resolution for the federal government in 1983.

During a grueling week of extended sessions, House members considered 68 amendments, took 34 recorded votes, rejected seven budgets, and cast into oblivion numerous legislative strategies which had been carefully drawn up weeks in advance. The failure of the House to finish work on the budget told the American public and a tense financial community that there is still no consensus on a taxing and spending plan for the federal government in 1983.

When I was in Indiana immediately following the voting, the first thing Hoosiers asked about was the inability of Congress to agree on a budget. I pointed out that the circumstances surrounding consideration of the seven budgets made passage of any one of them unlikely. The nation's economy is reeling, the projected deficits are huge, interest rates are soaring, unemployment is high, and a general election is approaching. The economic pressures make more difficult the struggle of Congress to write a budget.

Budget resolutions have always been tough to pass because they set basic national priorities which are often hard to reconcile with one another. The philosophical differences among members of Congress are deep and difficult to bridge. Conservatives want to spend more for defense and less for domestic programs; liberals want to do the opposite. On this occasion, half the budgets debated in the house proved too conservative for the liberals and half too liberal for the conservatives. Each group; was strong enough to block the other's proposals but too weak to win with its own proposals. Attempts to accommodate one group quickly antagonized the other. The conflicting ideological crosscurrents now prevalent in the House make it extremely hard to line up a majority behind any single budget resolution.

Other factors complicate the budget debate. For example, budget resolutions provoke intense lobbying by special interest groups. These groups are no longer vying for a larger piece of the pie; rather, they are demanding that their piece not be reduced in size. To add to the difficulty of forming a budget, the budget process itself is being vigorously challenged. There is growing resentment of the budget committees, which, in the view of many members of Congress, are usurping the powers of the standing committees and controlling substance through process. Many of the most powerful and senior members of the House stood on the sidelines during the recent budget debate, complaining that the process absorbed too much of the House's time and that the process really was not all that important because subsequent changes in the budget are invariably made. These members also complained that the budget process has

become far too complex and the procedures of debate far too confusing. The fact that 1982 is an election year has not made things any easier. For many members, competing budget resolutions have not been financial blueprints for running the federal government as much as they have been partisan political statements for use in the campaign. Because a budget resolution covers so many items, reasons to vote against it can always be found. A vote against any of the budget resolutions debated last week could be construed as a vote against enormous deficits, against tax increases, for national defense, or for the poor and the middle class. Whatever the reason, the writing of a budget for 1983 has consumed so much time that Congress has done little else during this session. Unresolved national business is crowding the congressional agenda.

It is not certain whether the forces of fragmentation can be overcome and a budget eventually be produced. We will be successful only if a strong sense of national purpose, expressed in active, bi-partisan leadership, can begin to inform the deliberations of the House. The key to success is the development of a national economic consensus which places fiscal responsibility ahead of partisan or parochial interest.

Last year, the President's election victory and the strong public support which followed it pushed the budget through to enactment. The President was much more in control at that time. This year, however, the President has been unwilling to enter fully into the budget fray; the leadership among the Democrats and Republicans in Congress has been unable to forge an effective alternative to his budget. No one has been able to galvanize the membership of the House in support of a budget.

I believe that the budget has to be put together in the broad middle of the Congress, with support from both sides of the aisle. The theory that a budget can be built out from the center of the political spectrum remains valid, even if its execution is problematic. Not having a budget resolution is the worst possible result, yet the country seriously doubts that Congress can now produce a budget. Failure to do so will indeed send out frightening signals to financiers and ordinary Americans alike.

Delay in dealing with the budget will only prolong uncertainty about the outcome. It will probably reduce the chances for a healthy recovery during the second half of the year. The budget impasse has helped keep interest rates higher than they would have been if there had been the prospect that deficits would decline. A budget is a necessary condition of lower interest rates.

My view is that we must not be discouraged by events in the House of Representatives last week. We must get right back to the arduous, thankless task of passing a budget resolution for the federal government in 1983. ●

H.R. 5158 IMPEDES MOBILE PHONE AVAILABILITY, TELEPHONE COMPANY VIABILITY

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have previously expressed my concerns regarding H.R. 5158, the Tele-

communications Act of 1982, including its provisions affecting "cellular" mobile telephone service. When the Energy and Commerce Committee considers this legislation, I intend to offer an amendment on that subject.

The bill requires the Federal Communications Commission to start fresh to allocate a portion of the radio spectrum for the new cellular mobile telephone service, which uses many low-power radio transmitters so that a great many more calls by mobile phone can be made in an area at one time. The Commission has allocated half of that portion of the spectrum to local telephone companies in at least 35 major markets. In reallocating, the FCC could not, as it did, decide that local telephone companies are especially suited to operate the cellular systems.

This provision of H.R. 5158 would seriously retard advanced mobile telephone availability just as this service is about to be brought to the American public. Also, because cellular mobile service will be an offering of the local telephone companies under the proposed modified consent decree, H.R. 5158 would jeopardize opportunities for growth and revenues in an emerging market which would significantly aid their economic viability.

It makes no sense whatsoever to put the contribution cellular can make to local phone companies' viability at risk and to postpone its availability. It makes no sense to delay American manufacturing of cellular equipment. I hope the committee will approve the following amendment:

AMENDMENT BY MR. CORCORAN

(Amendment to the committee print of April 8, 1982 (H.R. 5158).)

On page 63, line 21, strike "(1)".
On page 64, line 3, strike "(2)" and all that follows through the end of line 8. ●

MEMORIAL TO THE VICTIMS OF THE RAPID CITY FLOOD

HON. CLINT ROBERTS

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 1972, 238 persons lost their lives in a flood that ripped through Rapid City, S. Dak. That day, a group of thunderstorms formed over the eastern Black Hills west of Rapid City, and, by a freak of nature, remained almost stationary. Nearly 15 inches of rain fell over a few hours time culminating in the largest flow ever recorded on Rapid Creek. Thirteen thousand acre-feet of water flowed through Rapid City during the 2 days of flooding.

The unexpected flood traveled the 22 miles between Deer Creek and Rapid City in about 3.5 hours, giving little to warn visitors and residents of

the impending disaster. The result was the worst catastrophe in the history of South Dakota. The flood left 238 persons dead; 8 missing and presumed dead; 3,057 injured; 1,335 homes and 5,000 automobiles destroyed, with total damage in excess of \$160 million in the Black Hills area.

Today, a memorial will be dedicated to remember those lost in the flood. It is most fitting to erect a memorial to honor the victims of the 1972 Rapid City flood, but the most meaningful tribute to those 238 persons will be the efforts made to provide for the safety of the living, now and in the future. We must do all we can to see that such a tragedy does not happen again.

In the past decade, Rapid City has adopted flood-plain zoning laws that restrict development along Rapid Creek, and the city has acquired much of the low-lying area for conversion into parks and greenways. The Bureau of Reclamation began the expansion of the Deerfield Dam this year to increase its capacity and the Bureau is planning a review of Pactola Dam in the next year. Congress is considering legislation to expand the Dam Safety Act, so that more of this work may be done.

I have worked with the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the safety of our present dams, and will continue to do so. But nature can and will exceed the works of man. It is the constant watchfulness and preparedness on the part of citizens and this Congress that will provide a living tribute to the victims and survivors of the 1972 flood.

The memorial is an appropriate tribute, and an explicit warning of the dangers of nature. Let us hope that we will never again have the need to construct such a memorial. ●

ANNOUNCING A BILL TO RESTORE THE 5 MPH DAMAGE STANDARD FOR CAR BUMPERS

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which I believe is an important test of this Congress willingness to protect the American consumer. The relaxation or elimination of important damage and safety standards is not the way to help the ailing auto industry. Such deregulation is a tragic reversal of our commitment to inform and protect the public.

In 1972, the Congress directed the National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration (NHTSA) to establish a bumper standard which would improve the fragile bumpers then being made. From that early standard came the current 5-mph standard in 1979.

An exhaustive study of the cost effectiveness of the 5-mph standard was made in 1979-80. The study found the 5-mph standard more cost beneficial than a 2½-mph standard. Now, reversing itself, the NHTSA has determined that a 2½-mph standard is "cost effective." Well, it is neither cost effective nor acceptable to the average car buyer whose insurance premiums will skyrocket as "fender benders" take their toll. General Motors has already announced in response to the new ruling that it plans to reduce its bumper standard without offering an optional 5-mph bumper to its customers. Should we really allow a questionable cost effectiveness study to determine car bumper standards, especially when the new standard is opposed by everyone except those in the auto industry?

In 1972, the Congress mandated that safe and reliable bumpers be offered to the car buyer. It is important that we keep our pledge to maintain safe as well as efficient standards in the car industry and, further, that we look critically at attempts to deregulate today's standards. Let us restore the 5-mph car bumper standards; our concern for public safety must be maintained.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 6552

A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to require that the impact test velocity in the motor vehicle bumper standard established by the Secretary of Transportation shall be 5 miles per hour

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 102 of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (15 U.S.C. 1912) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any impact test velocity specified in the bumper standard established in part 581 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the effective date of this subsection, shall be 5 miles per hour."●

BILL TO HELP STOP DAMAGE OR DESTRUCTION TO SOCIAL SECURITY COMPUTERS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish a mandatory minimum penalty for people convicted of willfully destroying, altering, or abusing computers and other resources vital to the operation of the social security system.

The data processing operation of the Social Security Administration is one of the largest in the world. Records are maintained on over 200 million Americans and monthly benefits are

paid to over 36 million people. The Social Security Administration utilizes 25 large-scale computers. There are 76 software systems of varying size that comprise the Social Security Administration's basic operations, and these software systems consist of more than 1,200 computer programs in all. Most of the information vital to getting social security benefit checks out is stored in some half-million reels of magnetic tape. All of these resources are essential to the effective operation of this Nation's most important social program, yet we continue to learn of acts of vandalism, sabotage, or malicious alteration which threaten to bring the system down. We cannot afford to jeopardize the financial security of 36 million social security beneficiaries.

Last October, the Wall Street Journal reported on "malicious mischief" at the Social Security Administration's main computer facility in Baltimore. They cited instances of memory discs being intentionally scratched, of tapes containing beneficiary information being thrown in the trash and of various damage to computer machinery. Plugs from operating computer equipment have been kicked out of wall sockets and air-conditioning systems have been turned off. These may seem like small pranks from our own experience, but when dealing with computer systems, these malicious acts can cause serious and expensive computer damage.

Vandalism is not the only security problem for the Social Security Administration. Rhoda Mansher, the former director of the Social Security Administration Office of Systems Development, testified last September before the House Government Operations Committee that she resigned her position because the constant threat of sabotage made her job impossible. She resigned in June 1980, a few weeks after a Baltimore television station got an anonymous threat that the computer program tapes at the main computer facility would be destroyed. That threat required her to make copies of the major program tapes and hide them every night. In the morning she would compare the copies with the tapes running in the computers to make sure that the little magnetic marks controlling our most vital social program had not been tampered with.

In a GAO report which has yet to be published, continuing acts of malicious alteration of social security tapes are reported. Fictitious beneficiaries can easily be entered in the system or deceased beneficiaries can continue to receive checks with a little creative programming.

Mr. Speaker, the social security system is experiencing financial difficulties which, if left unattended, could threaten the well-being of all our Na-

tion's retirees and disabled. The threat of costly vandalism, sabotage, or alteration of social security records and equipment, however, is just as serious. The legislation which I am introducing today would come down hard on anyone convicted of tampering with social security computers and other vital resources. It calls for a mandatory minimum penalty of 3 to 10 years in prison without parole for anyone convicted of willfully destroying, altering, or abusing the equipment, facilities, support systems, or material resources of the Social Security Administration which the Commissioner determines to be vital. In addition, a person could be fined up to \$50,000. In determining those resources vital to the operation of the social security system, the Commissioner should consider hardware and software components, storage media, and facility support systems such as electrical and air-conditioning resources.

Our commitment to a sound social security system does not end with getting the checks out every month. The Social Security Administration must maintain accurate records on every worker, beneficiary, and dependent in this Nation. This job could not be done without a dependable computer system. Guaranteeing the security of these computers, guaranteeing the benefits of the American workers, retirees, and disabled, is our responsibility. We must have a law to stop destruction of social security computers. I hope my colleagues agree, and will join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.●

MR. CHARLES ADAMS OF STATION WEEU

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, in my most recent trip back to the district I had the opportunity to see a good friend of mine, Mr. Charles Adams, who is a very talented, creative and capable news announcer for radio station WEEU in Reading, Pa. Mr. Adams prepared a news feature for the station and was kind enough to give me a cassette tape and transcript of his remarks. After listening to the tape, I thought Mr. Adams' feature should be shared with the rest of my colleagues in the House. I am submitting a copy of the feature to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that others can appreciate Mr. Adams' fine sense of humor and enjoy his witty and interesting piece.

From the Hallowed Halls of Congress have come countless Bi-partisan, co-sponsored bills that help regulate our lives and keep all good Americans on the straight and narrow . . . most notable, the Gramm-Latta

and Kemp-Roth, Taft-Hartley, etc. etc. well, we scoured the "Congressional Handbook" of the 97th Congress, to see what mythical bills could be concocted by using the names of actual Senators and Congressmen.

So here goes. First, Congressmen Jim of Texas and Melvin of Illinois could go a long way by introducing a "Wright/Price" bill to solve the budget dilemma.

And, a companion piece of legislation could come from Congressmen Bill of Alabama and Tim of Colorado could offer a "Nickols/Wirth" proposal.

The ever-mounting problem of tongue-twisters could be legislated by Florida's Claude and Texas's J.J. Pickle and Pepper, who could be joined by New York's 23rd District Congressman to introduce the "Peter Peyser/Pickle/Pepper" bill.

And, of course, Congressman Pickle could link up politically with Pennsylvania's senior Senator to sponsor the "Heinz/Pickle" bill.

And, caviar could be regulated by New York's Hamilton and New Jersey's Robert in the "Fish/Roe" bill.

Auto racing would be the topic of Oklahoma's Congressman Wesley and Ohio's Senator John in the "Watkins-Glenn" proposal.

And, auto safety is the topic of Kentucky's Wendell and Arkansas's Dale "Ford/Bumpers" bill.

And, the publishing industry would benefit if Congressmen from Illinois and Pennsylvania would unite for the "Simon and Shuster" bill.

Golfers would take note of any legislation proposed by Congressmen from Maryland and Florida in their "Byron/Nelson" bill.

And, if the Senator from Ohio and a Congressman from South Carolina even got together on a bill affecting the entertainment business, the "Glenn/Campbell" bill might evolve.

And, Congressmen from Maine and Texas could combine for a fairy tale bill, the "Snowe/White" Act. Congressman White could in turn offer a bill dealing with Santa Claus, by joining with colleagues from Maryland and Tennessee for the "Long/White/Beard" bill.

And, of course, egg farmers would take note of any bill offered by West Virginia and Utah Senators in their "Byrd/Hatch" bill.

And a major foreign policy bill could be introduced by legislators from South Carolina, Florida, Virginia and Oklahoma, in the "Holland/Ireland/Paris/English" bill.

And finally, if Congressman John of California and Gene of Missouri were to unite, they could introduce a "Burton/Taylor" bill—which just might have a tough time of passage if Senator Warner decided to veto it!

For WEEU news, this is Charles Adams.●

THE SMALL-ISSUE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOND ACT OF 1982

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will permit the pooling of small issue industrial revenue bonds. This bill, the Small-Issue Industrial Development Bond Act of 1982, is aimed at preserv-

ing one of the most important means of access to capital for many small businesses.

Industrial revenue, or development, bonds, are the tax-exempt instruments used by State and local governments as a means of stimulating industrial expansion. Through the issuance of these IRB's, localities are able to exert a great deal of influence over their future economic development. These tax-exempt bonds have taken on an ever greater importance since the beginning of the lengthy period of record-high interest rates, from which we are currently suffering.

Without these small-issue IRB's, small businesses are forced to borrow money as high as 2 or 3 points above the prime rate in order to meet their capital needs. Small-issue IRB's have enabled many small businesses to obtain working capital at prices closer to 60 or 80 percent of the prime rate. Oftentimes, this wide difference in the cost of capital has meant the difference between business expansion and job creation, and the canceling of projects. It is a well-documented fact that small businesses have created nearly 90 percent of all new jobs in this country in the last decade. We must not cut off this key source of capital for small business.

The results of the use of industrial revenue bonds have been dramatic. In Massachusetts, for example, the Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency has given final approval to over \$1 billion in IRB's in just the last 3 years. The use of tax-exempt funding, in conjunction with locally designated commercial area revitalization (CAR) districts, has significantly rejuvenated aging downtown areas in cities such as Malden and Melrose. And, perhaps most importantly, the Massachusetts Industrial Finance Agency estimates that the use of IRB's has created 40,000 new, permanent jobs.

Despite the tremendous boost of economic growth and job creation, IRB's have been subject to considerable criticism, mostly as a result of a number of highly publicized abuses. No one denies that the issuance of IRB's demands strict public scrutiny to insure that they are meeting desired goals. But the relative minority of abuses should not result in the elimination of this important program, or in any restriction which could dramatically reduce its effectiveness.

On August 24, 1981, the Internal Revenue Service issued Revenue Ruling 81-216, which effectively would prevent State and local governments from bundling small-issue IRB's into a larger bond offering. This rule would require each small issue to be handled individually, resulting in significantly higher administrative costs for issuing these IRB's. The effect is clearly discriminatory against small business, since the ruling would only affect

bonds of less than \$1 million. The size of bonds for large businesses are usually far bigger.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today is quite simple. It would reverse the IRS ruling of last August, and permit the pooling of small-issue IRB's. I believe it is critical that Congress acts to preserve this vital source of capital for small business. At a time when Congress is in the midst of a vital debate on the future of our economy, we should be striving to sharpen the tools in our arsenal to stimulate economic growth, not remove them. Small-issue industrial revenue bonds are an important part of that arsenal, and this legislation will guarantee their continued availability.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of this legislation in the Record at this time:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any small issue which is part of a multiple lot shall meet the requirements of the small issue exemption

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 103(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption for certain small issues) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(K) SPECIAL RULE FOR MULTIPLE LOT ISSUES.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—An obligation which is part of an issue which issue otherwise meets the requirements of this paragraph shall not be treated as not meeting such requirements if such issue is part of a multiple lot issue.

"(ii) MULTIPLE LOT ISSUE.—For purposes of this paragraph, a multiple lot issue consists of 1 or more issues with respect to which—

"(I) all of the obligations are sold substantially at the same time and at substantially the same rate of interest,

"(II) the obligations are sold under a common plan of marketing, or

"(III) a common or pooled security will be used, or is available, to pay debt service on the obligations."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply to obligations sold after August 23, 1981.●

WEISS OPPOSES ABORTION RESTRICTION IN SMALL BUSINESS ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed by the inappropriate and unnecessary anti-abortion language that is included in H.R. 6086, a bill which amends the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. This represents another in a long line of dangerous attempts by a small, well-funded minori-

ty to impose their morality and personal code of behavior on all Americans.

Section 12 of this bill denies Small Business Act financial assistance to any business which performs abortions, engages in research on abortion, promotes or recommends abortion, or trains any individual to perform abortions. The Senate bill rightfully contains no such provisions.

Enacting antiabortion language as part of this important bill smacks of irresponsible legislating for the sake of political expediency. These restrictions were inserted before any analysis was done on their implications for small business. There have been no hearings and very little public discussion on this matter. Consequently, most Members, both in committee and on the floor, were forced to vote on this provision without any substantive information about how it relates to the plight of small businesses across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must put a halt to the efforts of abortion opponents to arbitrarily sabotage, confuse, or hold hostage important pieces of legislation in order to further their narrow position. It is tragic that the actions of the Congress have so eroded the constitutionally protected rights of millions of women and that the issue continues to be recklessly injected into more and more areas of legislative concern.

For these reasons, I urge the conferees to recede to the Senate and drop this provision in conference. ●

IMPORTANT PROVISIONS OF THE LATTA BUDGET VERSION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues two important provisions which have been included in the Latta version of the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1983. One of the provisions relates to user fees; the other relates to 90 percent self-financed trust funds.

However, before describing the provisions, I would like to commend the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL); the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT); the distinguished ranking minority member on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA); and the other Members of Republican leadership for including these perfecting amendments in the minority substitute. I thank also my Public Works Committee colleague from Pennsylva-

nia (Mr. SHUSTER), who is also a member of the Budget Committee, for his valuable assistance in this successful effort.

These provisions are virtually identical to the amendments which I was prepared to offer to each of the category B substitutes during initial House consideration of the budget resolution. As my colleagues are aware, both the user fee and trust fund issues were resolved by the house prior to the time that my amendments became in order, and thus it was not necessary for me to actually offer them.

I would now like to describe each of these provisions so that the Members of the House will be fully informed when the House continues its consideration of the first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1983.

The user fee provision adds language to the Ways and Means reconciliation section of the budget resolution to provide that if any of the increased revenues, which the Committee on Ways and Means is directed to develop, involve the imposition of new or expanded taxes to directly finance programs within the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House or the imposition of any new or expanded user fee within the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House, an appropriate referral pursuant to rule X of the House should be considered.

This provision does not change a single number in the budget resolution. It is purely technical in nature and is intended to do nothing more than assure that our current House rules relating to committee jurisdiction will be scrupulously followed with respect to any new user charge legislation proposed pursuant to the concurrent resolution.

Under our House rules and normal legislative procedures, there would be no need for this amendment. House rule X requires that all matters relating to subjects within the assigned jurisdiction of a particular committee be referred to that committee so it can consider the matter and report to the House with respect thereto. When, in the course of developing legislation, one committee includes a provision or provisions under the jurisdiction of a second committee, that second committee has a right under rule X to receive a sequential referral of the matter involving its jurisdiction.

I do not believe that anything about either the budget-setting process or the concurrent resolutions we have here before us today should negate the applicability of rule X to this legislation. However, these are not normal times, reconciliation is not a normal procedure, and the form of the reconciliation instructions is unique.

Thus, someone could somehow argue, because of all this unusualness we are caught up in, that authorizing committees having legitimate exper-

tise and unquestioned jurisdiction are precluded from exercising their rights under House rule X, should the Ways and Means Committee choose to respond to its reconciliation instructions by recommending the establishment of new user charges under the jurisdiction of those authorizing committees.

There is no doubt in my mind, and I cannot imagine that there is serious doubt in anyone's mind, that the authors of the Budget Act ever intended to produce such a result.

Let me give an example of the kind of situation this amendment is trying to address. Twice this Congress, the administration has submitted proposed legislation calling for the imposition of new deepwater port user fees. Both administration bills were introduced by request in the House and both bills, H.R. 2959 and H.R. 5073, were referred only to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. If the Ways and Means Committee, in responding to its reconciliation directive to raise revenue, was to propose deepwater port user fees, it would be the intent of this provision to assure that the Public Works Committee would receive a sequential referral of the appropriate portion of the legislation.

There are similar but somewhat different problems with respect to current administration proposed legislation calling for new inland waterway user fees. And I suspect that other authorizing committees may be in a similar position concerning other types of user fees, such as Coast Guard fees.

This provision simply assures the authorizing committees with jurisdiction over programs covered by the new fees of their rights under House rule X. It does nothing more. It neither requires new user fees, nor does it prevent them. Rather, the amendment merely provides that if, in responding to the reconciliation instructions contained in this budget resolution, the Ways and Means Committee chooses to recommend new or expanded user fees within the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House, then the latter committee's rights to a sequential referral under rule X of the House would be assured.

The second provision addresses one of the important procedural requirements included in the budget resolution: The so-called deferred enrollment provision. That provision would prohibit final enrollment of any spending bill which exceeds the budget resolution committee spending allocations.

As you know, under the budget resolution substitutes which will be offered, nondefense discretionary spending is, for the most part, held at the fiscal year 1982 appropriated level. Accordingly, the committee allocations under the resolution would reflect

these amounts. However, also included in the resolution is a reconciliation directive to the House Ways and Means Committee to increase aggregate revenues for the next fiscal year. A technical but very real problem that I foresee is that if revenues are increased—specifically trust fund revenue programs—and spending is held at the fiscal year 1982 level, then spending bills which could support these increased program levels would not be able to be enrolled.

Therefore, the amendment proposes to address this specific problem by exempting from the deferred enrollment requirement 90 percent self-financed trust fund spending bills if, and only if, Congress increases revenues for these programs. It is important to note that the exception applies only to the selected trust fund bills which historically apply earmarked revenues for a dedicated purpose.

It does not affect the social security trust funds. It is limited only to 90 percent self-financed trust funds for which revenues are increased and only to the extent that such increases exceed the committee allocations.

Let me share with you an example of how this amendment might come into play.

Most Members are aware that the Secretary of Transportation has been advocating an increase in revenues paid by highway users in an amount equivalent to a 5 cent increase per gallon in the Federal excise tax on motor fuels. Four cents would go into the highway trust fund, and 1 cent into a public transportation trust fund which our committee has requested the Committee on Ways and Means to establish for public transit capital spending.

In the budget process, allocations of budget authority in amounts commensurate with such increases have not been requested. This has been because of the uncertainty over a number of proposals to increase revenues from sources now dedicated to the highway and airport trust funds. This caution was well advised, as events proved, since the President decided just a couple of weeks ago to defer the matter of dedicated highway revenues as far as fiscal year 1983 is concerned.

However, that uncertainty persists. Notwithstanding the President's decision to defer the highway revenue issue, no one can predict with any confidence the outcome of the current budget deliberations or the fate or proposals to increase revenues from a long list of potential sources. If revenues for the highway and airport programs were raised, the constraint against enrollment of authorizing legislation commensurate with those increases would tie the hands of the Congress to no constructive purpose.

This provision would preserve the latitude of not just the Public Works

Committee but that of the entire House in dealing with authorizing legislation involving those programs for which new or increased revenue sources ultimately result from the budget process.

This amendment is simply intended to keep the situation open, rather than see it locked up at this point in the budget process. Aside from that, Members would not be committing themselves to anything. Nothing in this amendment would raise trust fund revenues. Nothing in this amendment would govern the use of the increased revenues if taxes for such trust funds were, in fact, increased. Finally, nothing in this amendment would commit any Member to any level of authorization in any bill dealing with trust-fund-financed programs.

Members of this House have clearly recognized the merit of trust fund financing for major capital infrastructure programs such as highways and airports. They have strongly supported the programs, and they have supported the trust funds that sustain them. This support has continued in the years since 1974 when the Budget Act was enacted and, in fact, has been reflected in provisions of that act recognizing the unique character of trust fund-financed programs.

All we ask with this provision is that the same consideration be continued in the case of this budget resolution as we work toward resolution of policy differences which have absolutely nothing to do with the procedural problems which my amendment addresses.

In closing, I would like to reemphasize the limited scope of the trust fund provision. It only applies to those 90-percent self-financed trust funds which are already exempt under section 401(d)(1)(b) of the Congressional Budget Act. Moreover, this provision is only triggered if congress increases one of the user taxes supporting one of these trust funds.

I would also like to take a moment to thank the staff of the Public Works Committee, the Budget Committee, and the House Republican leadership for their efforts with respect to these provisions. While everyone involved did an excellent job, I feel compelled to single out Bill Pitts, John O'Shaughnessy, Jed Morrison, and Ron Boster for the thoroughly professional manner in which they carried out their responsibilities. Despite the enormous pressures they were under with respect to the overall budget resolution, they took time out from their busy schedules to meet with Public Works Committee staff and to allow our staff to present the committee's position on these matters. And finally, I would like to pay special tribute to Sante Esposito, counsel for budget law and economic matters for the Committee on Public Works and Transporta-

tion. His work on these provisions, and the budget resolution in general, has been outstanding and has been a benefit to the entire committee.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN HICKOK, SR.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, a good friend and a very remarkable Kansas City area resident passed away. John Hickok, Sr., was an active leader in both the business and civil community. It was with great sadness that I learned of his death.

Serving as president of the Dible Development Corp., and partner in the N. W. Dible Co., Jack Hickok was also active in civic and community affairs. He was a former president of the Overland Park Chamber of Commerce, former treasurer for the board of directors of Research Medical Center, and advisory trustee for Big Brothers and Sisters of Greater Kansas City.

Mr. Hickok was also active in the academic community. Serving as president of the board of trustees at Pembroke-Country Day School, he led the fund-raising drive for the construction of the Hall Student Center there. He was also a member of the University of Missouri Kansas City Board of Trustees.

I first met Jack while in school at the University of Missouri. He was a fellow member of the Sigma Chi Fraternity there, and we became close friends. He was ever a source of encouragement through the years. His battle with illness in recent months was an inspiration to all who knew him.

I was truly fortunate to have known Jack Hickok. Although he will be greatly missed by his family and all who knew him, Jack will be remembered for all he has done for his community.●

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN DANIEL K. AKAKA

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, the economics of the world sugar market is too often misunderstood; the history of our domestic sugar policies is too often forgotten. For the benefit of those Members who did not see my "Dear Colleague" yesterday, I would like to insert it in the RECORD, along with the attached analysis by the First Hawaii Bank in support of sugar import quotas.

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 8, 1982.

Dear Colleague:

President Reagan's recent decision to impose emergency import quotas on foreign sugar was the most aggressive step taken thus far by this Administration to avoid a massive influx of sugar imports that would destroy the domestic sugar program enacted by Congress last fall.

While this action has been given considerable public attention, we must all remember that a program of import quotas for sugar is by no means a new idea. For 40 years, from 1934 to 1974, the United States had a consistent and effective sugar policy which benefited the consumer, the sugar producer, and friendly sugar exporting nations. The cornerstone of that policy was a system of country-by-country import quotas similar to those imposed by the recent presidential proclamation.

In the period after the expiration of the Sugar Act in 1974, the world price of sugar jumped to 64.5 cents per pound in 1974 and then dropped to 7.07 cents per pound in 1977. In 1980, the price jumped to 44.2 cents and only last week declined to a low of 7.22 cents. The absence of a coherent sugar policy has meant that the domestic sugar price has followed the wildly fluctuating course chartered by world sugar prices. By contrast, the annual average price for domestic sugar during the 40 years when import quotas were in place never varied more than two cents from any one year to another.

Just as the American customer does not benefit from high prices during periods of short supply so, too, he does not benefit from low prices in times of abundant supplies. As pointed out in an article in the Wall Street Journal last December 23, when very high sugar prices pushed the price of sweets up, the price of those products stays up even after the price of sugar falls. This is especially true of prepared products such as candies, ice creams, soft drinks and baked goods. Since almost three-fourths of the sugar consumed in America is consumed in prepared foods, the price "roller coaster" has a particularly harsh effect upon the consumer even when sugar prices are low.

The solution to the price instability which hurts the consumer is a coherent program that will both preserve most of the existing domestic sugar producing industry and assure adequate supplies to consumers at stable prices. Such a program was enacted by Congress in the 1981 Farm Bill. This sugar program is designed to maintain a domestic sugar producing industry which currently satisfies more than half of our domestic needs.

Without a strong and stable domestic sugar industry, there will be nothing to prevent the domestic price from following the "roller coaster" prices of the world market. If the U.S. sugar industry, the fifth largest sugar industry in the world today, fades from the scene, with it will fade our ability to maintain stable sugar prices once we become dependent upon the chaotic world market. With this in mind, the Reagan Administration announced sugar import quotas to protect the price objective established for sugar in the Farm Bill when, in the now familiar price cycle, the world price dropped below 9 cents per pound. Quotas were the only tool available once the world price dropped to such a drastically low level.

The attached analysis by the First Hawaiian Bank will provide you with further insight into the situation I have described. I think you will find it helpful in understand-

ing of the economic realities of world sugar production.

Sincerely,

DANIEL K. AKAKA,
Member of Congress.

[From Economic Indicators, May 1982]

SUGAR IMPORT QUOTAS: THE ONLY ANSWER

Ever since the Congress failed to renew the 40-year-old Sugar Act in 1974, this bank has argued insistently that the only salvation for the U.S. domestic sugar industry would be the reimposition of country-by-country sugar import quotas. This would also protect American consumers from high sugar prices. The Reagan Administration has just reinstated these quotas, but it is a temporary measure intended to protect the U.S. Treasury from making massive sugar price support payments to domestic growers. These quotas, which will be in effect over the next few months, will stabilize the market, and hopefully show Congress that this is the only solution to the sugar problem—for producers, processors, consumers, and sugar workers. Let us review the problem briefly.

The U.S. produces about half the sugar it consumes. The other half, imported from foreign producers, was controlled from 1934 to 1974 by country-by-country quotas so that the total supply of sugar in the American market would result in a price that would be fair to both domestic consumers and producers. Since 1974, the nation has used various means, all ineffective, to maintain a semblance of a domestic industry. There were direct subsidies by Presidential order in 1977, the de la Garza amendment creating a price support-loan program in 1977-78, various import fees and duties, and finally the inclusion of sugar in the Farm Act of 1981. When the sugar bill failed in Congress in 1979, Congress ratified the International Sugar Agreement, hoping the ISA would control world supply by withholding sugar during low prices and adding to supply when prices rose above 21 cents. However, the European Common Market, among some other exporting nations, declined to be a party to the agreement, and the current world surplus is in large part due to Common Market overproduction.

Sugar available in the world market to fill our national requirements is far more than we need in years of depressed prices, and far less during periods of inflated prices. The so-called world market is normally plagued with an oversupply situation and prices are far below the cost of production, as at present with sugar selling below 9 cents a pound. Less frequently shortages develop and prices skyrocket to astronomical heights. The current oversupply situation has been marketed by "massive imports," according to President Reagan. Agriculture Secretary John Block described it succinctly when he said, "The U.S. has become a magnet for sugar produced in other countries, even to the diversion of shipments already at sea."

Why is the U.S. a magnet for distressed foreign sugar? Simply because sugar is the most tightly controlled commodity in the world, with all the major importing countries except the U.S. buffering themselves against the vagaries of the world sugar market by having long-term agreements with exporting nations to provide them with a normal supply at a normal price—with no other sugar able to enter the country. These long-term agreements funnel 82 percent of world sugar production into a definite

market at a definite price even before the sugar is grown.

The remaining 18 percent of production constitutes the world market. This is the world's worst boom-and-bust market for any commodity. The New York spot price, which reflects the world price went from 9.3 cents a pound in 1973 to 64.5 cents in 1974 to 14.2 cents in 1975 to 44.2 cents in 1980. Since the price support program passed Congress last year, the spot price has ranged from 16.8 cents to around 19 cents, but the world price was less than 9 cents a pound in the first week of May. The U.S. is the only major country in the world that has chosen to ride this roller coaster, probably because of our dedication to the concept of free trade. But the boom-and-bust world sugar market is not one in which free trade could ever work to the benefit of the trading countries.

With this volatile world sugar market more often depressed than inflated, why hasn't the American consumer benefited? With more cheap sugar years than expensive sugar years, why isn't the consumer the winner? The reason is that most of the sugar consumed in America is consumed indirectly—in the candies, ice creams, soft drinks, and baked goods that we buy. And, as an article in the Wall Street Journal pointed out last December 23, when very high sugar prices push the price of these sweets up, the price stays up after the price of sugar falls. The result is that the American consumer lives with high sweetener prices even when sugar becomes cheap again. For the two-thirds of our sugar that we consume indirectly we ride the "world" sugar price cycle when it is rising, but we don't ride it when it is falling.

President Reagan's decision to impose country-by-country import quotas at this time is seen as an emergency action to protect the treasury and not necessarily to protect American sugar producers from going out of business nor to protect consumers from periodic astronomical sugar prices that stay high permanently. But anyone who knows the working of the so-called world sugar market knows that this "emergency" is permanent, although it changes its form as world sugar supplies shift from surplus to shortage and back to surplus in a never-ending cycle. It is time the Administration and the Congress realize what the true situation is after eight years of turmoil following the death of the Sugar Act. Reenactment of sugar import quotas will not affect President Reagan's Caribbean Initiative adversely. The nations targeted for special treatment under this program could be given a larger quota and a preferential tariff. And these nations would have a guaranteed market with prices slightly higher than the world price as an incentive to fulfill their quotas. During the 40 years when the U.S. assigned marketing quotas to domestic and foreign producers, the nation encountered no emergencies, American consumers, producers, and sugar workers all benefited, and the federal government didn't have to spend a penny from the general fund. Instead, more than half a billion dollars was added to the U.S. Treasury during the life of the Sugar Act as a result of sugar processing taxes levied in excess of the costs of administering the act. ●

PROBLEMS WITH LAW OF THE SEA: A FURTHER ANALYSIS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1982, I pointed out to the Members of this body some of the problems that the U.S. fishing industry might face if the Law of the Sea Treaty were signed by the United States. The potential effect of the treaty on the fishing industry has not received a great deal of attention, partially because those who reviewed the fisheries sections of the treaty for the U.S. Government prior to the latest negotiating sessions refused to consult with the fishing industry.

Since my April statement, the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea agreed to adopt a draft treaty by a vote of 130 to 4, with 17 nations abstaining. The United States, which called for the rollcall vote, was one of the four nations voting against adoption.

While I applaud the President's decision to vote against adoption, I am concerned about continued attempts by treaty supporters to press for eventual U.S. acceptance of the treaty. My colleagues should note that the opinions of some of these supporters, many of whom possess impeccable academic credentials, may be somewhat influenced by the professional relationships that these individuals have maintained with groups in countries that voted in favor of adoption of the treaty. The treaty will be open for signature in December. If the United States were to reverse its position, this could cause serious problems for our Nation.

Because the treaty is now being reviewed by the U.S. Government, I am presenting a further analysis of the potential impacts of the treaty on the U.S. fishing industry so that my colleagues can consider the serious implications of U.S. approval of the treaty.

LAW OF THE SEA AND U.S. FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

It is difficult to analyze the treaty because of the lack of a clear legislative history and the use of terms which are not defined within the body of the treaty. In many cases, arguments could be made which could result in opposing or conflicting conclusions. Therefore, any analysis of

NOTE.—Certain statements in the previous analysis require technical clarification so that there is no misunderstanding. The exclusive economic zone (EEZ) which would be established by the treaty "corresponds" to the Fishery Conservation Zone (FCZ) established by the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MFCMA) in the sense that fishery management authority within 200 nautical miles of the base line is provided to each adjacent coastal State under the treaty and to the United States under the MFCMA. The lan-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 9, 1982

the treaty must consider U.S. and foreign governments' positions, past U.S. fisheries policy, and the existing political climate, both foreign and domestic.

Fisheries management in the FCZ is based on the policies, purposes, and statutory requirements of the MFCMA. The law recognizes the need for conservation and management of fish stocks; provides a clear distinction between domestic and foreign fishing; defines management tools to be used; and establishes a system to manage both foreign and domestic fishing.

Recent U.S. fisheries policy has been to promote the development of the U.S. fishing industry and to manage fisheries within the FCZ in ways which will achieve this goal. To emphasize the goal of full development of the U.S. fishing industry, the Congress enacted the American Fisheries Promotion Act which, among other things, expanded the list of criteria which the Secretary of State must use when granting fishing privileges to foreign nations which seek to fish in the U.S. FCZ. These criteria reflect the goal of full development of the U.S. fishing industry by conditioning allocations on such things as purchase of processed fish products, the establishment of joint ventures with U.S. fishermen, transfer of fishing technology, and cooperation in research. These criteria are also included in the new Governing International Fishery Agreements (GIFA's) which are being negotiated by the U.S. Government.

The State Department has also recently changed the way in which allocations are released to foreign fishermen. Before 1982, foreign nations received their allocations at the beginning of each year. The U.S. Government has interpreted both the MFCMA and the existing GIFA's to preclude taking back fishing privileges once we have granted these privileges. Thus, if country X demonstrated a lack of cooperation with U.S. fishermen by, for example, not honoring its promises to engage in joint ventures, the U.S. Government had little leverage with which to induce cooperation that year. In 1982, the State Department adopted a new allocation policy which called for the release of allocations three times each year. This provides the U.S. Government with necessary additional leverage with which to develop U.S. fisheries.

However, were the United States to accept the treaty, we would be required to accept additional factors to consider before we granted allocations. Among other things, we would be re-

quired to take into account the need to minimize economic dislocation in States whose nationals have habitually fished in the zone. While this is only one factor to be considered and need not be the factor which determines who gets what fish, Japan has already used the economic dislocation argument to protest both the new allocation policy and an allocation reduction the United States made in conformance with the MFCMA allocation criteria:

The Japan Fisheries Agency on March 23, 1982, stated that the three-step allocation system will be damaging to operational efficiency of the Japanese fishing fleet;

In a letter to Secretary of State Alexander Haig on April 30, 1982, the Honorable Yoshio Okawara, Ambassador of Japan, said: "Japan deeply regrets such a drastic reduction of catch quota because of its tremendous adverse impact upon the Japanese fishing industry . . . the delay of the allocation already resulted in serious dislocation among Japanese fleets . . .";

The Japan Fisheries Association, a Japanese fishing industry group, used the economic dislocation argument in its protest about the second 1982 allocation, stressing that the allocation was smaller than Japan expected.

Not surprisingly, Japan is pressing hard for us to include the economic dislocation test in its renegotiated GIFA. The test is already in the existing GIFA, although not in U.S. law—a damaging incongruity that should not be perpetuated or repeated elsewhere.

Under the MFCMA, a nation dissatisfied with the allocation it receives may either keep fishing until its allocation runs out or stop fishing immediately in the FCZ. In either case, it is still possible for that nation to receive a larger allocation in the future if it complies with the allocation criteria U.S. law outlines. Under the treaty, a State which were to allege that the United States had arbitrarily—a word which is not defined in the proposed treaty—refused to allocate the whole or any part of any declared surplus—that is, those fish which U.S. fishermen will not catch—could take the United States to conciliation. Conciliation by its nature is nonbinding and in no case can the conciliation commission substitute its discretion for that of the coastal State. However, a State's refusal to enter into conciliation shall not constitute a bar to conciliation proceedings. This could allow a State—for example, Japan—which has said it considers that the United States is ignoring alleged economic dislocation of the Japanese fishing fleet by reducing Japan's allocation—a result of implementing the policy to benefit the U.S. fishing industry—to call for conciliation in every instance where Japan did not get all the fish which it thought it deserved.

Under the treaty, then, the United States might face sufficient challenges to our new development-oriented fish-

guage in article 59 of the treaty has a bearing on dispute settlement involving fisheries issues to the extent that unanticipated ocean uses may impact them. In addition, a coastal State's refusal to grant another State access to surplus fish does lead to compulsory conciliation, although not automatically; the conciliation process is available if another State were to challenge the coastal State's refusal.

eries policy to cause the executive branch to reconsider its aggressive implementation of this policy to avoid spending all of its time before a conciliation commission. Worse still, as a matter of "good faith" or out of fear of damaged relations, the United States might act to accommodate foreign interests, pending conclusion of the proceedings. Even if the United States continued to take a prodevelopment position, a dissatisfied State could decide to take other actions to influence a change in policy. Among these might be interfering with the importation of U.S. fish products into that State, or withdrawing from joint venture arrangements with U.S. fishermen. Many States are now using similar economic measures to support foreign policy objectives.

The treaty also requires a coastal State to seek to minimize economic dislocation in anadromous species fisheries. Under the MFCMA, the United States asserts management authority over U.S.-origin anadromous fish throughout their ranges, except where fish are found within the 200-mile zones of other nations. Although under the treaty the United States could establish harvest levels for anadromous fish, there is no mechanism by which the United States might enforce those harvest levels outside of our EEZ. Further, we would probably have to accept other States' fishing for U.S.-origin anadromous species outside of our EEZ where to prohibit it could result in economic dislocation for a State other than the United States. This freedom for other States to fish for anadromous species on the high seas is only ameliorated somewhat by the requirement that States consult and enter into cooperative agreements for the renewal of stocks (including the expenditure of funds by States other than the State of origin for such purpose) and the terms and conditions of fishing. Enforcement of regulations would be by agreement between the State of origin and other States concerned.

Again, under the treaty, we would be forced to assess the relative weight of the need to minimize dislocation for other fishing States as a factor which we would have to consider in managing fisheries. If the United States were to set a harvest level equal to the domestic catch of salmon, Japan, for example, which now conducts a high seas gillnet fishery for salmon, could argue that the United States was ignoring the economic dislocation that could result in the Japanese salmon fleet. If this were to lead to no agreement between the United States and Japan on the level of high seas fishing, then neither would any enforcement mechanism exist. If the United States were to use allocations for other species within the EEZ as a lever to induce cooperation (as the United

States did in 1978, by way of threat, to force a decrease in the existing high seas fishery), then the United States could use the conciliation process. Under the treaty, the simplest course of action of the United States might be to continue to allow a high seas salmon fishery.

We should also be aware that even if the United States were only to sign, not ratify, the treaty, we could still find ourselves with problems. For example, section 201(e)(1)(H) of the MFCMA allows the Secretary of State to consider other matters as he deems appropriate when he makes allocations. He could choose to consider the need to minimize economic dislocation as such a matter.

One cannot say for certain that the Secretary would use this criterion. However, we must be aware of the possibility in view of past U.S. Government actions:

In 1980, Japan received an extra allocation of 200,000 metric tons of fish when the United States was seeking support for its boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games. That same year, the U.S. Coast Guard seized 11 Japanese fishing vessels for violating the MFCMA, a noncompliance record that no other nation has duplicated.

In 1977 and 1978, Mexico received allocations of bottomfish in the FCZ off Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska, despite its lack of a historical fishing record for those species. Mexican vessels did not catch these quotas; Korean vessels did under joint venture arrangements, thus causing market access problems for the United States.

Since 1980, we have denied the Soviet Union an allocation, despite considerable Soviet cooperation with U.S. fishermen.

The so-called fish and chips policy (trading fishing privileges for cooperation with the U.S. fishing industry) has helped to minimize the use of allocations for nonfisheries-related matters; however, the potential for nonfisheries use remains, and supporters of the fishing industry in the Congress and the executive branch have often had to fight to make existing domestic fisheries policy work in spite of challenges from elements of the U.S. State Department.

Thus, the treaty presents potential problems for the U.S. fishing industry by expressly requiring consideration of factors sympathetic to foreign fishermen in the granting of access to the fishery resources off the United States and by providing a mechanism which dissatisfied nations could use to challenge U.S. fishery management decisions. The U.S. initial opposition to adopting the treaty supports the U.S. fishing industry. A change in our position could present serious difficulties for U.S. fishermen and processors who are seeking full development of the U.S. fishing industry. ●

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

●Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today we had the opportunity to express ourselves on the tax deductions made available to Members of Congress late last year.

On the first vote, the previous question, I voted "yes," because I believe Members should be treated like other business people.

The old \$3,000 deduction which was technically auditable, but in fact it was auditproof, is indefensible today. I have no objection to changing the current law to remove the \$75 daily expense assumption, although I do not think it is unreasonable. But, a return to the old \$3,000 law makes no sense at all.

Reasonable away-from-home legislative expenses should be deductible. There should be no floor for deductibility. The expenses should be real. I would not object to a ceiling on expenses to prevent taxpayer financing of an unnecessarily high lifestyle.

The second vote, on the Schroeder amendment, would have instructed House conferees to recede and concur to Senate Amendment No. 62. That amendment would have reinstated the old \$3,000 floor and ceiling. I voted against if for the same reason I voted against the previous question.

The final vote today was on the Myers motion to instruct the House conferees, as amended by the Schroeder amendment. The final vote introduced a new element for it also included instructions to the conferees to recede and concur to Senate Amendment No. 50. Senate Amendment No. 50 would restore the legal requirement, adopted in 1977, and restated in 1980, but never observed, that the Federal budget be balanced. I voted "yes," not because I expect an immediate balance but because I want to keep that important target in a place of prominence where Congress cannot ignore it.

The net outcome of all these votes may be nothing because the urgent supplemental appropriation to which these instructions refer is likely to be vetoed in other grants.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee today announced he will include a new law with prospective effect, which will provide for deductibility of real expense. That effort, which I endorse, would provide not only for rough equality between all traveling taxpayers, but would also do it only for future years.

Much of the public compliant against congressional handing of its pay allowances, and expense deductibility has been directed at actions which took effect either immediately or ex post facto. Obviously, a prospective law, applying only to a Congress to be elected in the future, would not be considered to have been enacted in the dark of secrecy.

I am concerned that this body is often too anxious to rub ashes on its head. We ought to be above board and transparent in any legislation, especially that which applies to the Members. But, we ought not to be too eager to create special tax classes for ourselves which are inferior to those for other taxpayers. We ought to be as nearly equal as possible. ●

A TRIBUTE TO BRYAN
"WHITEY" LITTLEFIELD—LONG
BEACH LEADER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, June 11, 1982, the many friends of Bryan W. "Whitey" Littlefield will gather aboard the RMS *Queen Mary* to honor him for his many contributions in making the city of Long Beach, Calif., a better place to live and work. Specifically, Whitey will be the recipient of the Long Beach Lung Association's first-ever "Humanitarian Award."

Born on Christmas Day, 1932, at Salt Lake City, Utah, Whitey became a resident of southern California 5 years later. After attending area schools, Whitey started in the wholesale beer business in 1954 as a beer truckdriver and soon thereafter, began working with most of the major distributors in the Los Angeles area. Owner of a liquor store from 1961 to 1963, Whitey went back into the beer business and in 1967 became general manager of Somerset Distributors.

An eager readiness to contribute and a sincere commitment to community betterment have been the traits of Whitey's involvement with many civic organizations. His present and past involvements include: Vice president, Long Beach Convention and News Bureau; board of trustees, Long Beach Community Hospital; chairman, Business and Industry—United Way, 1978 campaign; founding chairman, Long Beach Police Widows Trust Fund; honorary Long Beach P.O.A. founding chairman; vice president Cedar House Child Abuse Center; member, Long Beach City College Board, Delta Phi Kappa and distinguished friend of the college, life member; lifetime member, Long Beach Junior Chamber of Commerce; past chairman of the board of

directors, Boys Club of Long Beach; past president 49ers Athletic Foundation; honorary member, Signal Hill Police Department; former member of the board of directors, Long Beach Symphony; honorary Boy's Club distinguished alumni of Hollywood; member of the board of directors of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, Washington, D.C.; member, Fine Arts Affiliates, California State University at Long Beach; past director, California Beer Wholesalers Association; life member, No. 7 Long Beach Police Officers Honorary Committee; president's forum, Long Beach City College; founding chairman, Long Beach Grand Prix Charities Foundation; and, 1982 Golden Man and Boy Award, Long Beach Boys Club.

Mr. Speaker, few citizens can claim to have done as much for their community as Whitey has done for Long Beach. In all his endeavors, he has proven himself to be an able and generous leader. To the people of Long Beach and the surrounding harbor area communities, the benefits of this man's dedication are readily apparent.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Whitey upon receiving this well-deserved award. His dedication, leadership, and service to Long Beach and the entire South Bay community is greatly appreciated by us all. We wish Whitey, his son, Bryan, Jr., and his three daughters, Linda, Lorraine, and Shari, all the best, and hope that the years ahead will continue to be not only successful ones, but happy years as well. ●

HUMAN RIGHTS: AN AMERICAN
WEAPON

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been intense debate in this country over the proper role human rights considerations should play in American foreign policy. I am inserting in the RECORD at this time an article by Rev. J. Bryan Hehir who is known to many of us. Father Hehir, a Roman Catholic priest is associate secretary of the U.S. Catholic Conference's Office of International Justice and Peace. I think this article superbly places in perspective the role that human rights considerations can and must play in the foreign policy of a great democratic nation if it is to lay claim to leadership in the broadest sense of that word.

The article follows:

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST
(By J. Bryan Hehir)

(The philosophical discussions about the nature and origins of human rights are

learned, complex and fascinating; it can certainly be argued that before a statesman decides to make a national goal of their promotion he should have a firm moral theory about their essence and their foundations. But much of the literature has a tendency to overcomplicate what is already a formidably difficult subject.—STANLEY HOFFMANN, *Duties Beyond Borders*.

Heeding this cautionary note from a perceptive theorist who has explored the philosophical dimensions of rights policy, my limited purpose here is to examine three concepts from Roman Catholic theory that structure the Church's participation in the human rights debate. These concepts are: (1) the foundation of human rights; (2) the range of human rights claims; and (3) the conception of the state in international relations today. The argument is drawn from two contemporary Catholic statements, Pope John XXIII's "Peace on Earth" (1963) and Pope John Paul II's U.N. address of 1979.

The foundation of human rights in the Catholic tradition is the dignity of the human person. John XXIII opened the first chapter of "Pacem in Terris" with a statement summarizing the traditional case: "Any human society, if it is to be well-ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation this principle: that every human being is a person; his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will. By virtue of this, he has rights and duties of his own, flowing directly and simultaneously from his very nature, which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable."

This argument that human dignity is the basis of human rights is rooted in the teaching of Pius XII, was reaffirmed in Vatican II's "Declaration on Religious Liberty," and has been stated with new power and originality by John Paul II. The argument that the person has transcendent worth or dignity has its source in the origin and destiny of each person and in the way the person reflects the presence of God in history. The argument is cast in both philosophical and theological terms; the full appeal is to the resources of both disciplines, although the Catholic conviction has been that an argument from reason, useful in a pluralistic context, can sustain the claim of a unique dignity for the person.

The political significance of this argument is that it protects the person from absorption by any human institution or subordination to any ideology. Since the person has a transcendent destiny—that is, beyond history but achieved through history—no political or economic system can subordinate the person totally to its ends. It is this conviction that was cited by Carl Fiederich years ago as the reason the Church would always have to oppose the totalitarian tendencies of a state.

The logic of the Catholic case moves from dignity to rights, from an affirmation of transcendent worth to an argument about the kinds of rights needed to protect human dignity. Both "Peace on Earth" and John Paul's U.N. address elaborated a spectrum of human rights understood to flow directly from the dignity of the person. The enumeration cuts across the conventional political-civil vs. socio-economic rights. The papal position argues that both are necessary for human development, and society has a responsibility to create the conditions under which both kinds of rights can be protected and pursued. This complimentary conception of rights is, of course, reflected in the

U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and its supporting covenants.

There is contained in Catholic social thought an extensive discussion about the distinct roles of diverse institutions in realizing these rights for the person in a social system. The argument entails a doctrine of the limits and functions of the state, the role of intermediary institutions, and the relationship of Pius XII's principle of subsidiarity to John XXIII's discussion of the process of socialization. What one can conclude about the role of human rights in foreign policy from this social theory is that rights are to be conceived broadly and that a nation should assess its performance and that of other states in light of how political-civil rights are protected and how socioeconomic rights are promoted.

The third contribution of Catholic social theory to the human rights debate is its conception of sovereignty. A continuing theme in the foreign policy process is that the recognition of state sovereignty, the principle on which the international system has operated since the Peace of Westphalia, restricts the role of human rights in foreign affairs. Catholic theory begins its assessment of international politics with a conception of human community, divided into states by historical accident and/or human decision, but bound together by rights and duties to both individuals and states.

This view does not deny, in theory or practice, the significance of the sovereign state in the existing international system, but it continually stresses that national sovereignty is not a moral absolute. In Pope John's words: "The same moral law which governs relations between individual human beings serves also to regulate the relations of political communities with one another." This view attributes a relative moral value to state sovereignty; it fulfills specific, limited, justifiable purposes but does not place the state above or apart from the moral law.

"Peace on Earth" situates the state within a framework of moral and legal restraint. It rejects the idea of the state immune from criticism by its own citizens or by other states, groups, and individuals in the international community. State boundaries do not negate moral responsibility. Violations of basic human rights within sovereign states are an international and not a purely internal issue. That is why a foreign policy should have a human rights component.

POLICY ANALYSIS

Catholic social theory affirms the need for the inclusion of human rights in foreign policy. But the move from philosophical assertion to policy prescription is a complex journey, an exercise in ethical calculus. The two principles that guide the journey are that human rights are a legitimate and necessary element in a balanced conception of national interest, and that human rights concerns must be woven through the broader foreign policy equation. Both principles require elaboration.

There are three distinct arguments to be made in support of the assertion that human rights are a legitimate and necessary dimension of U.S. foreign policy. The legal argument is that the United States is party to international instruments such as the U.N. Charter and the accompanying U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, which at least imply an obligation to assume responsibility for human rights in the international system. The historical argument is that the very sense we have of ourselves as a nation is embedded in a philosophy of rights and thus should find expression in

the way we project American influence in the world. Both of these cases admit of detailed exposition, which has been made in other places. Instead of rehearsing these arguments, let me emphasize a third case, drawn from the nature of foreign policy today.

Briefly, the human rights question should be seen today as one of the transnational problems in the international system. These questions, ranging from monetary issues to environmental controls to food and population, exhibit similar formal characteristics. They are macro-questions that cut across national boundaries, affecting large segments of the global population and reaching beyond the capacity of any single state to resolve. Yet they are of such a nature that they cannot be left unresolved. Although the human rights question does not have the same kind of impact on the daily character of foreign policy as do monetary questions, it increasingly is perceived as a central rather than an optional policy problem. Precisely because there exists no adequate international instrumentality to address the transnational issue of human rights, the burden of protecting and promoting basic rights falls upon the states, which remain the unique actors in international politics. The convergence of legal, historical, and analytical arguments establishes the presumption that human rights is an abiding element of policy today, and this policy presumption complements the moral argument as stated above.

The presumption must be implemented by a human rights policy. The essence of policy involves blending a mix of factors into a coherent and consistent pattern of action. This raises the second assertion of how human rights concerns are to be factored into the policy equation. It is presumed here that human rights and foreign policy cannot be equated; the concerns of foreign policy are broader than human rights. At the same time, it is clear that an effective concern for human rights requires that it be included in principle at the very initiation of policy. If human rights objectives are treated as an addendum or footnote to large political, strategic, or economic considerations of national interest, then the human rights factor never will influence policy substantively. The policy product reflects the weight given to each factor at the very initiation of the policy process. The significant shift in human rights policy that occurred with the Carter administration was an acceptance in principle to install human rights as a constant element in the policy equation. This step makes it possible to carry on the politico-moral process of systematically balancing the human rights concern against other objectives of policy. Before commenting on how this weighing of human rights should occur, it is necessary to address the criticism that giving such a priority to human rights will lead to moralism or messianism, to a policy that inevitably will be morally pretentious or politically interventionist.

Two procedural guidelines can be proposed to guard against these real pitfalls. First is the perspective that should govern the role of human rights in foreign policy. The primary function of human rights criteria should not be to tell others what to do but to indicate to others what kinds of policies the United States will neither aid nor abet. Human rights standards should act as a restraint on U.S. policy, limiting active cooperation with regimes that systematically violate basic human rights.

Second, the protection against moralism resides in the rule that the human rights objectives should be weighed systematically against other considerations in the foreign policy equation. The presumption here is that moralism is the corruption of moral reasoning. The antidote to moralism is rigorous application of the standards of moral judgment. It is easier to identify these standards (e.g., principles of generalizability, consistency, etc.) than to apply them in the matrix of foreign policy decisions, but this is true in any serious issue of public morality.

In defining the moral calculus of the human rights policy, it is necessary at the outset to assess the pattern of relationships in which the human rights problem emerges. The two basic relationships are the East-West and North-South questions. From the point of view of U.S. policy, these relations vary in terms of three factors: the nature of the political relationship, the instruments of policy and leverage available, and the domestic constituency supporting a human rights approach to policy.

The East-West problematic, exemplified by U.S.-Soviet relations, is by definition an adversary relationship. This basic characteristic means, in turn, that the instruments for U.S. influence are few (although not absent) and that the margin of movement for U.S. policy is narrow (because our leverage is limited). At the same time, domestic support for such a policy is strong. The North-South problematic, exemplified by U.S.-Latin American or U.S.-Philippine relations, is an alliance relationship. The consequences of this are that the instruments of influence are multiple and U.S. leverage, as well as U.S. involvement in the policy of the ally, is usually substantial. Domestic support for human rights policy vis-a-vis U.S. allies is less visible and more fragmented than for U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union. None of these three factors—political relationship, degree of influence, or public support—possesses explicit moral characteristics, but all shape the way in which the moral calculus is determined, since public morality involves a balancing of what ought to be done with what can be done.

DOWN TO CASES

To illustrate just what is meant by the ethical calculus, it is possible to distinguish four general "cases" of human rights and U.S. policy. In all four cases the politico-moral balancing will be cast between human rights considerations and questions of military security. The purpose of the cases is simply to indicate how a commitment in principle to include human rights in the foreign policy equation can produce significantly different policy conclusions, each of which has its own distinctive logic and rationale.

The central case in East-West relations is the role human rights should have in pursuing U.S.-Soviet policy. Some of the commentary on human rights reduces the whole policy to this relationship. It is the most politicized of the human rights questions and involves the highest stakes. It is exemplified today in most dramatic fashion in Poland, but it is not confined to the Polish case. Few, if any, voices in the U.S. policy debate are questioning whether human rights should be part of the policy with the Soviets; the hard questions arise when the moral good of protecting human rights is weighed against a substantial moral good like arms control. Since the political relationship is an

adversary position between parties of commensurate strength, the margin of leverage is narrow and the Soviets retain the capacity to deny the United States objectives that may affect the entire international system. To give human rights a unilaterally determined value in this situation could be morally irresponsible because of the contending values at stake and the narrow margin of leverage the U.S. has in this adversary relationship. In contrast, if the East-West case involved trade with Czechoslovakia, a different calculus would be at work in terms of both the contending values and the degree of influence available to the United States.

A very different kind of political and moral equation emerges in the North-South case or in alliance relationships. Here the posture of the United States is fundamentally different; it is not outside the situation seeking to influence it but is part of the policy equation. The bonds that tie it to the human rights situation in an allied country may be a treaty agreement or economic or military assistance; in some way the United States is closer to being an accomplice than an adversary. Here the problem is one of balancing human rights claims and the military or economic assistance being provided to a government accused of human rights violations. There is a more developed framework for policy judgment for this problem, since Congress has passed legislation that makes it necessary to evaluate all potential recipients of military and economic assistance by human rights criteria. Even with this framework, however, one can discern three types of "security vs. human rights" decisions.

The first exists when the ethical calculus should weigh in favor of the human rights factor, denying legitimacy to the security claim. This is best illustrated in Latin American cases, when the government is accused of gross human rights violations by sources within and outside and yet still receives U.S. military assistance under the justification of security needs. At times the case is made that U.S. security is dependent upon the stability of the government in question or of the region as a whole. After almost twenty years of this pattern, beginning with the Brazilian military coup in 1964 and now extending over the whole of Central and Latin America, enough is known about this argument to deny it the power to override human rights claims. In most instances the threat to "security and stability" derives from a prolonged conflict between an authoritarian military government and the country's civil population. In such instances the presumption of the ethical calculus should be in favor of human rights; the burden of proof rests upon those who would argue for an overriding legitimate security requirement.

The antithetical case is a situation in which legitimate and verifiable questions of security are so dominant that human rights claims can be subordinated, at least temporarily. The example that best fits this model of ethical calculus is the Middle East. There are charges of human rights violations made against Israel and against a number of Arab states. Most of these states, on both sides of the Mideast conflict, receive U.S. military assistance. How should human rights claims be weighed in these cases? The dominant political and moral problem in the Middle East is the conflict over territory, sovereignty, and legitimacy that has convulsed the region for thirty years. Until there is some basic resolution of these macro-questions of politics and security, the ability to deal with human rights claims in a systematic fashion

is gravely impaired. In this instance the presumption should be given to the security questions, not because they have greater intrinsic value than human rights claims, but because they must be resolved in order that the human rights questions can be addressed.

A third case fits between the Latin American and Middle East examples. U.S. assistance to the Republic of South Korea is perhaps the most delicate of the "North-South" issues in the human rights debate. It is possible to argue in the Korean case that there exists both an authentic security question (avoiding war on the Korean peninsula) and a human rights situation in the South that cannot simply be subordinated to security considerations. The process of evaluating what weight should be given to human rights claims in deciding how the United States should relate to the Korean regime forces us to examine what we mean by security. The human rights advocates within South Korea do not deny that an external security threat exists; but they are convinced that the regime of authoritarian control is in fact eroding the security of the country by suppressing the spirit and morale of the Korean people. These voices for human rights within South Korea ask that the security claims of the regime be tested critically before they are accepted as the overriding feature of our policy vision regarding their country.

PUBLIC OPINION AND PUBLIC POLICY

An effective human rights policy requires both a conceptual design and a public constituency. The Church's contribution to human rights is not exhausted by its philosophical and moral contributions to the policy argument. The Catholic Church has unique resources to enter the public debate on human rights, resources residing in the Church's structural presence in society. In the face of a transnational problem like human rights, the Church is by nature a transnational institution. In the present international system transnational actors have assumed a major role. These institutions are usually based in one place, present in several others, and possess a trained corps of personnel, a highly developed communications system, and a single guiding philosophy. The Church has each of these characteristics and has been using them for centuries.

The relevance of these characteristics for gathering human rights data, transmitting them and interpreting them is obvious. But the Church is not simply a transnational actor; it is also capable of participating in the U.S. policy debate from within the American political system. This mix of the transnational and the national is one that few institutions possess. To take advantage of its transnational perspective and national position, the Church in the United States must have a policy. The policy must join theological-philosophical theory and an empirical analysis of the U.S. policy debate on human rights.

The origins of a systematic inclusion of human rights in U.S. policy lie with initiatives by the U.S. Congress in the early and mid-1970s. Congressional pressure led to the establishment of the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs in the State Department. Congressionally sponsored legislation amended the Foreign Assistance Act to provide categories for assessing U.S. military and economic assistance in terms of human rights criteria. The congressional initiatives were resisted in theory and practice during Secretary of State Henry

Kissinger's tenure as not being a helpful contribution to diplomacy. During this first period the involvement of the U.S. Catholic Conference (USCC) was aimed at supporting the congressional initiative that sought to establish human rights as a pervasive theme of foreign policy.

The Carter administration made a decisive contribution by accepting the idea that human rights are a central aspect of national interest and a constant element in the policy equation. It is possible to criticize the implementation of the Carter policy while acknowledging that a major step was taken at the level of principle. The USCC supported this affirmation of the centrality of human rights in the policy equation, even though we had several differences with the Carter administration on specific cases of human rights policy.

The Reagan administration brought to office a well-publicized hostility to the Carter conception of human rights and a determination to make policy in this area in direct contrast to its predecessor. While several commentators have noted striking similarities between the recent human rights report of the State Department and its predecessor in the Carter period, there are substantial differences in the two policies on human rights. First, human rights policy is now clearly part of U.S.-Soviet policy and is to be used as an ideological weapon in the superpower competition. This theme was never absent in the Carter period (it was a favorite of then National Security Advisor Brzezinski), but it has been greatly intensified by the Reagan policy. Second, at the philosophical level, the recent human rights report explicitly demotes socio-economic rights from the position they held in previous reports. Third, the now famous distinction between totalitarian and authoritarian regimes has been used during the last year to shift U.S. policy regarding countries such as Argentina and Chile.

In none of these three periods was the Church's position identical with that of an administration. Our participation in the policy debate at the level of philosophical assessment and policy critique and analysis of specific cases will continue. By sharing in the public debate, we believe the Church contributes to both human rights and the national interest. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 10, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.

*Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain soil conservation service watershed projects.
4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on the proposed reorganization within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to continue markup of S. 2352, S. 2392, S. 2480, and S. 2493, bills authorizing funds for the food stamp program.
324 Russell Building

10:30 a.m.

*Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the proposed Motor Vehicle Treaty with Mexico (Treaty Doc. No. 97-18).
4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to continue markup of S. 2352, S. 2392, S. 2480, and S. 2493, bills authorizing funds for the food stamp program.
324 Russell Building

JUNE 14

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2469, providing for improved international telecommunications.
235 Russell Building

JUNE 15

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 2469, providing for improved international telecommunications.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
4232 Dirksen Building

*Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the tribally controlled community college program.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
2228 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic

To resume hearings on the future of monetary policy.
Room to be announced

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Agency for International Development, focusing on the trade and development program, international disaster assistance, and American schools and hospitals abroad program.
S-146, Capitol

Conferees

On S. 1193, authorizing funds for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and fiscal year 1983 for the Department of State, authorizing funds for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, authorizing funds for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and fiscal year 1983 for the International Communications Agency, and authorizing funds for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and fiscal year 1983 for the Board for International Broadcasting.
S-116, Capitol

Select on Intelligence

Closed briefing on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

2:30 p.m.

Conferees

On H.R. 2330, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
EF-100, Capitol

JUNE 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on administration of the law requiring half of all government-impelled cargoes to be transported on U.S.-flag vessels.
235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

To resume hearings on East-West relations, focusing on the Pacific.
4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Criminal Law Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2043, providing criminal penalties for the mailing of identification documents bearing a false birthdate.
2228 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider the nominations of Joan D. Aikens, of Pennsylvania, Lee Ann Elliott, of Illinois, and Danny Lee McDonald, of Oklahoma, each to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission, and a proposed resolution of regulations and/or rules changes needed to implement television and/or radio coverage of the Senate.
801 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Veterans Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 2379, requiring veterans to pay a funding fee on guaranteed home loans, and certain provisions of S. 2378, proposed Veterans' Disability Compensation and Survivors' Benefits Amendments, relating to cost-saving improvements in veterans' programs, and other related measures.
412 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

JUNE 17

9:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1735, providing for the use and distribution of funds awarded the Pembina Chippewa Indians in specified dockets of the U.S. Court of Claims.
5110 Dirksen Building

Office of Technology Assessment

The Board, to hold a general business meeting.
EF-100, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Criminal Law Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 20, S. 661, S. 954, S. 1025, and S. 1339, bills establishing penalties for robbing a pharmacy engaged in interstate commerce of a controlled substance.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 505, to subject imported grapes to the same requirements as table grapes grown in the Coachella Valley of Southern California.
324 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2469, providing for improved international telecommunications.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1562, proposed Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1981.
3302 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

Business meeting, to mark up S. 2422, providing an automatic share in retirement benefits to qualified former spouses of participating CIA employees.
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the uranium enrichment program of the Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of James B. Burnham, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
4221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee
Briefing on current assessment of U.S. economic and commercial prospects in Southeast Asia.
4221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers construction projects.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax measures, S. 2012, S. 2015, S. 2092, S. 2113, S. 2176, S. 2321, S. 2413, and Section 127 of the Economic Recovery Act of 1981.
2221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 21

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2131, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on S. 2245, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and to extend the scientific advisory panel.
324 Russell Building

JUNE 22

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the annual report of the Postmaster General.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 2245, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and extending the scientific advisory panel.
324 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2202, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1989 for the Colorado River basin salinity control program.
3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 2245, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and extending the scientific advisory panel.
324 Russell Building

JUNE 23

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2411, proposed Justice Assistance Act.
2228 Dirksen Building

*Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2084, providing for the resolution of certain disputed Indian land claims in New York and South Carolina.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Environmental Protection Agency's research and development programs.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2562, transferring certain activities of the Department of Energy to the Department of Commerce.
3302 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
*Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the National Materials and Minerals Policy Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-479).
235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

JUNE 24

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2533, providing authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to set the milk price support level, providing authority to the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate surplus dairy products to needy persons in the United States and abroad, and establishing a Dairy Advisory Board, and related proposals reducing the Federal Government cost of the dairy program.
324 Russell Building

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine certain health care services provided to older veterans.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2338, expanding the membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include three elected school board officials.
3302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 28

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 1215, proposed Malt Beverage Interbrand Competition Act.
2228 Dirksen Building

JUNE 29

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the national materials and minerals program plan and report to Congress issued by the President on April 5, 1982.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the use of competition in the procurement process of the Department of Defense.
3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for foreign assistance programs, focusing on El Salvador.
1114 Dirksen Building

JUNE 30

9:30 a.m.
*Labor and Human Resources
To resume oversight hearings on the Department of Labor's law enforcement programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

*Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on indirect cost and contract provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (P.L. 93-638).
5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on the Boulder, Colorado decision, relating to antitrust immunity of city government.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

JULY 1

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2325, authorizing funds for Federal vocational and adult education programs, and to provide for State and local occupational assistance programs.

4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings to discuss alternative means of providing legal services to the poor.

4232 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2378, increasing the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans, increasing the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children of veterans, discontinuing duplicative payments to certain veterans, increasing the level of disability required for the payment of dependent's allowances, and providing for cost-saving improvements in veterans' programs.

412 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1795, providing for the transfer of certain lands in Arizona between the Hopi and Navajo Indian Tribes.

457 Russell Building

JULY 14

9:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2294, providing for the settlement of certain land claims of the Chitimacha Indian Tribe of Louisiana.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings to review employee assistance programs for alcohol and drug abuse problems.

4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1541, amending the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) by simplifying both reporting and disclosure requirements, and the process for employers to provide retirement income to employees, and providing incentives for employers to provide pension benefits to employees.

4232 Dirksen Building

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

Business meeting, to continue markup of S. 1541, amending the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) by simplifying both reporting and disclosure requirements, and the process for employers to provide retirement income to employees, and providing incentives for employers to provide pension benefits to employees.

4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on H.R. 3731, relating to the use or distribution of certain judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the U.S. Court of Claims.

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on America's role in the world coal export market, focusing on foreign coal ports and the international transportation of coal.

3110 Dirksen Building

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to clarify certain provisions relating to veterans' employment programs.

412 Russell Building

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2153, providing for the distribution of funds awarded the confederated tribes of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in Oregon by the Indian Claims Commission.

6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 29

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To resume hearings on America's role in the world coal export market, focusing on the condition of U.S. coal ports.

3110 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 5

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the effects of alcohol and drugs on individuals while driving.

4232 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 11

9:30 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1652, restoring certain lands in Arizona to the Colorado River Indian Reservation to be held in trust by the U.S., S. 2418, permitting the Twenty-nine Palms Band of Luisena Mission Indians to lease certain trust lands for 99 years, S. 1799 and H.R. 4364, bills providing for the transfer of certain land in Pima County, Arizona to the Pascua Yaqui Indian Tribe, and the substance of H.R. 5916, providing for certain Federal lands to be held in trust for the Ramah Band of the Navajo Indian Tribe.

6226 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 12

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 2378, proposed veterans' disability compensation and survivors' benefits amendments.

412 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 21

10:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to receive American Legion legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.

318 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.

Small Business

To hold oversight hearings on activities of small business investment companies (SBIC's) and minority enterprise small business investment companies (MESBIC's).

424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Government Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up pending calendar business.

3302 Dirksen Building

JUNE 16

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund).

4200 Dirksen Building