

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET THE RECORD SPEAK ON
ACID PRECIPITATION

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, we have heard a great deal on the causes and effects of acid precipitation. This issue alone, aside from budgetary matters, has created the greatest amount of misinformation during the 97th Congress. During the course of our deliberations on this important issue, I have made every attempt to stick with scientific data rather than unsubstantiated claims regarding the environmental impacts of this phenomenon.

It is my hope that the record we have established during this Congress will show that science does not support a massive regulatory program aimed at reducing acid precipitation at this time. Rather, the preponderance of scientific information supports continued and accelerated study of the causes and effects of acid precipitation before final judgment can be made on how best to combat its impacts.

Many assumptions on the causes and effects of acid rain have been made by control proponents; assumptions which I question are valid. These assumptions have also been addressed by various scientific panels, among them:

Prof. Kenneth Rahn, of the University of Rhode Island, found in a study attempting to identify sources of sulfates and nitrates in New Jersey and New England that a much larger proportion came from local sources than was previously thought. This calls into question the basic thesis of the bill: that Midwestern coal-burning facilities are responsible for the acid deposition in the Northeast. Senator MITCHELL tried to shake Professor Rahn from his statement, but the Rhode Island scientist refused to alter his position.

Prof. Volker Mohnen, director of the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center in Albany, N.Y., argued forcefully in the Environment and Public Works Committee hearings that there is no linear relationship between sulfur dioxide emission reductions and acid rain in the Eastern United States. Professor Mohnen indicated that the limiting factor in the formation of acid rain is not the ambient concentration of sulfur dioxide, but the availability of oxidizing agents which determine the rate of conversion.

A technical panel sponsored by the Department of Energy, the State De-

partment's advisory committee on environmental affairs, and the previously published Jason report of SRI International, all support the thesis that factors other than sulfur dioxide concentrations control the rate at which acid rain is formed.

A more recent draft study by Dr. Perry Samson, of the University of Michigan (for OTA), indicates the importance of nitrogen oxide and hydrocarbons in determining the sulfuric component of acid rain. This study, as well as Dr. Mohnen's work, make it appear that the production of acid rain in the Eastern United States may be insensitive to the ambient sulfur dioxide concentrations. Hence, a reduction in sulfur dioxide emissions, even one as large and costly as that proposed by the Environment and Public Works Committee, may produce no measurable decrease in acid rain in the sensitive areas of the Northeast.

A more recent study by the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) of data furnished by the State of New York shows a shift toward lower levels of acidity in Adirondack lakes during 1980 and 1981.

Similarly, a just-published report by the U.S. Geological Survey, based on the most extensive monitoring data available of trends in the acidity of precipitation and surface waters in New York, shows either no change or a slight decrease in acidity between 1965 and 1978.

Notwithstanding the domestic controversy on acid precipitation, much has been said on how this issue affects United States-Canadian relations. At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues remarks made by Carl Bagge, president of the National Coal Association, before the 64th annual meeting of the Canadian Bar Association on August 30, 1982, in Toronto. While Mr. Bagge obviously has a vested interest in seeing that acid precipitation controls are not enacted, I believe his remarks contain a great deal of merit with respect to what both nations are doing to address this issue. His remarks are as follows:

REMARKS OF CARL BAGGE

"Geography has made us neighbors. History has made us friends. Economics has made us partners. And necessity has made us allies."

John Kennedy's words to the Canadian Parliament in 1961 ring true today. For we cannot repeal our unique partnership, our friendship, and our economic kinship.

Rowland Frazee, Chairman of the Royal Bank of Canada, recently put it this way: "We cannot change Canada's close and intricate relationship with our major trading partner, the United States. Our recession and our recovery are tied to theirs . . . In

most major ways," he added, "events here depend on events there."

That's why the acid rain issue cannot be separated from economics—from the most far-reaching air quality program proposed in American history. And that's why the effects of this proposal on both our economies is part of my message today.

For it's the recognition of these effects that leads directly to the still unanswered scientific questions so closely tied to the acid rain issue. They are not a "smoke-screen" as we hear so often from Ottawa. Scientific understanding—not wishful thinking, not political slogans—is the foundation for sound solutions to both human and environmental problems. And it's answers to these scientific questions that have to steer the acid rain course of our two great nations.

There are at least three plausible explanations of acid rain.

One, the "local-source" theory, holds that emissions don't regularly travel long distances before falling as dry particles or wet precipitation. Instead, acid rainfall is caused principally by sulfur and nitrogen oxides from local sources.

Also, many scientists believe that these pollutants serve as raw materials, which are converted into acid compounds by other oxidizing chemicals. Under this "catalytic theory," it's not the amount of sulfur and nitrogen oxides in the atmosphere, but the oxidants which make possible the acid content of rainfall.

Two weeks ago, the Battelle Institute announced that its scientists believe a vital chemical link to acid rain has been found—a catalyst that's common in urban smog. Battelle says that this potential breakthrough opens up an entirely new area of research.

Yet, it's the "coal plant-long transport" theory which is touted as the single cause. It's accepted by some politicians on both sides of the border, and often reported as fact by the media in Canada and the United States.

As this theory goes, acid rain is caused when sulfur dioxide from Midwestern coal-fired plants mixes with nitrogen oxides. These effluents are sent on the winds hundreds of miles where they fall as acid rain on parts of the Northeastern United States and Canada. Emissions from coal plants allegedly are directly involved in lake acidification and fish kills, harming vegetation, and linked to some human health problems.

Three theories, three possible answers, but we believe the jury is still out. I ask you to consider some of the reasons:

Scientists haven't found any sound evidence of acid rain damage to vegetation in the natural environment, and no direct link between acid rain and human health problems has been confirmed. Clearly, the most important scientific question at issue is whether there's a direct cause and effect relationship among sulfur dioxide from coal plants, acid rain, and ecosystem damage.

The recent National Academy of Sciences study, called "Atmosphere-Biosphere Interactions," is the most widely-quoted in support of this theory—basing its findings on "overwhelming circumstantial evidence."

One reason is the statement found on page 182: "Acid rain, due to further oxidation of sulfur and nitrogen oxides . . . from anthropogenic (man-made) sources," the author wrote, . . . "is causing widespread damage to ecosystems . . ." But here's what the same author wrote on page 142: ". . . direct cause and effect linkages between sources of acids and effects on ecosystems will not be possible for the foreseeable future."

Not even the most skillful form of press agency can reconcile internal conflicts like these. Based on the second statement, it's impossible to draw a direct cause and effect relationship between coal plants and acid rain.

The mystery doesn't end there. Central to the "long-transport" theory is the hypothesis that effluents are travelling hundreds of miles where they are falling as acid rain in Canada and the United States.

But as it turns out, American and Canadian scientists can track emissions from a particular source only about 30 miles, not hundreds of miles. Since this is so, scientists from both nations are using computer models to help track effluents much longer distances.

The problem is, there's insufficient long-term rainfall monitoring data of reliable quality. What's more, scientists are having difficulty modeling the complexities of atmospheric phenomena, which are known to affect effluent movements. This means that the statements pinpointing how much acid rain is coming from the United States, and how much pollution is of local or distant origin, are purely hypothetical and theoretical.

Last year, in a Los Angeles Times story, an official of the Ontario Ministry of Environment admitted that computer modeling is only a "useful guideline" to help find out what's happening in the atmosphere over one year. Computer guidelines are useful. But they aren't a scientifically-proved method. And there's no justification for using these guidelines, however useful, as the basis for a multi-billion dollar regulatory program, regardless of what you've been led to believe.

One acid rain theory, as you'll recall, holds that local sources are possibly to blame for acid rain. But acid rain theorists on both sides of the border seem to get an advanced case of myopia when local sources are suggested as a possible cause of lake acidification. A case in point in the INCO smelter.

The INCO smelter is the world's largest. It's sending nearly one million tons of sulfur dioxide into the air each year from a "superstack" taller than the Sears Tower. That's one to three percent of all sulfur dioxide in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet, we read and hear that thousands of Canadian lakes are increasingly "sensitive" to acid rain from the United States. Press reports claim that by century's end 50,000 lakes "may" be dead.

Let's look at what's actually happening, rather than what might happen. A "sensitive" lake isn't an affected lake. The Canadian lakes so far identified as dead are a tiny fraction of the half-million lakes in this vast country. What's more, many of these dead lakes are found in the Sudbury area—the INCO smelter's backyard.

Canadians aren't the only ones who are looking past local pollution sources. The same myopia persists among "long-transport" theorists in the United States. The acid rain bill reported out of the Senate En-

vironment Committee, for example, essentially ignores sulfur dioxide from oil-burning plants, and for all intents and purposes controls only coal-burning plants in 31 states on or east of the Mississippi River.

Kentucky and New York have roughly the same overall sulfur dioxide emissions. Yet, Kentucky—a large coal-burning state—would have to cut its emissions four times as much as New York—an oil-burning state.

The American coal industry isn't making light of acid rain. Acidified lakes are real, not imagined. And we are keenly aware of the economic implications of damage to Canada's environment. But inflammatory rhetoric can't replace unvarnished facts. Above all, let's get our facts straight.

There's no doubt that a large percentage of sulfur dioxide in the United States is produced from man-made sources. But if the "coal plant-long-distance transport" theory is to hold water, as sulfur dioxide levels go down, so should acid rain.

Yet, scientists aren't even sure if acid rain is increasing or decreasing. In the longest-running survey of rainfall in the United States, the United States Geological Survey found virtually no change in rainfall acidity in New York State over 13 years beginning in 1965. This is significant, because New York is one of the most often-mentioned targets of acid rain damage.

Also, EPA is reporting a 40 percent drop in sulfur dioxide concentrations over the past ten years, and a 15 percent drop in sulfur dioxide emissions in the Ohio River Basin—the alleged source of Canada's acid rain.

These cuts are all the more impressive, for as sulfur dioxide levels were falling, electric generation in the United States was rising from 888 billion kilowatt-hours to 1.4 trillion kilowatt-hours—a 56 percent jump. During that same time, coal burning by America's electric utilities shot up 65 percent.

In light of these trends, we are dismayed at Ottawa's charge that the United States isn't doing its fair share to curb air pollution. Over the past ten years, American industry—and ultimately consumers—spent nearly \$160 billion on air pollution control. We are doing an outstanding job removing pollutants from our plants and our automobiles.

This doesn't imply that the coal industry has supported every tenet of America's clean air laws, any more than the Canadian Provinces welcome every pronouncement by the Ottawa Government.

It means that American people are paying willingly but dearly for clean air—some \$14 billion each year to keep the Clean Air Act in force. And it's simply wrong-headed for Ottawa to suggest that our industry and our government are "footdragging" on cleaning the air, or that our government's actions aren't reflecting the wishes of the American public.

We find these allegations even harder to take, given the Ottawa Government's continued heralding of its pollution-control efforts. Again, let's look at the record.

One good example are pollution controls at the INCO smelter. These controls are offered by Canada's Environment Minister, John Roberts, and others as evidence of Canada's good faith to meet its obligations on what's called a "two way street."

In a recent interview, Mr. Roberts said that the smelter's emissions have been cut from 3,500 tons per day to 2,500 tons. "This is a significant step," he said. I agree, but how were these reductions made? Mr. Rob-

erts gave the answer: "It was done successfully at the sacrifice of potential production at the world's largest smelter."

Isn't this a perverse kind of progress? I doubt the Canadian people—particularly in the Sudbury area where unemployment is reported at 40 percent—relish more pollution controls at the expense of this nation's already-flagging industrial performance.

The coal industry and the American people will never support clean air progress through economic stagnation. We aren't "backing away" from clean air goals. But we are also supporting greater economic growth—more jobs, and better paychecks for the working people of our country. And it's this tandem goal that's at the heart of our efforts to streamline the Clean Air Act.

And, we should remember that the United States Clean Air Act is still the world's most effective. Unlike Canada, our federally-mandated clean air laws are enforced vigorously with civil penalties and the cutoff of federal funds.

Just as important, the Clean Air Act continues to benefit both our countries. New Source Performance Standards are in force. So, as new coal plants go into service, replacing older, less efficient ones, the air will get progressively cleaner—even in the face of quickened economic growth.

On the other hand, the proponents of tighter sulfur dioxide controls got a lot of mileage out of Ontario Hydro's decision to build two scrubbers. According to press reports, an Ontario Hydro official said the building of scrubbers would likely have a "multiplier effect." In short, if Ontario Hydro "bit the bullet," perhaps utilities in the United States would jump on the bandwagon.

I'm not sure what the gentleman means. For there are already 87 scrubbers in the United States at a cost of \$4 billion, plus an annual cost of \$1.7 billion to keep them operating. Thirty five more scrubbers are under construction. And EPA is reporting that half of all America's coal-burning units will be outfitted with scrubbers in less than 20 years. Canada, I am quick to add, has yet to build a single utility scrubber.

I've also heard talk that Ottawa's much touted acid rain program is a ploy to increase electric power exports to the United States, which last year brought in several million dollars.

Mr. George Rejohn of the Canadian Embassy in Washington recently said, "Such silly inventions and distortions do not merit serious nor thoughtful attention."

I agree. We don't accept these conspiracy theories. But can you blame people for wondering, when Ontario Hydro cancels its first two scrubbers, and admits the decision came after the loss of potential power sales to General Public Utilities?

When you step back and take a long, hard look at all the evidence, it comes down to this: The causes and effects of acid rain are unknown. America has the best clean air record in the world. We've spent billions of dollars on clean air, and billions more are committed. Yet, despite all this—despite the sacrifices—the acid rain theorists, including the Ottawa Government, say it's not enough.

We are asked to embrace the potentially most burdensome regulatory program in American history, and are expected to have guilt feelings if we resist.

Mr. Roberts summed up the Canadian Government's view this way: American calls for more acid rain research are like saying: "We need to know which mosquitoes are

carrying malaria before we clean up the swamp."

I would only remind the honorable gentleman of Lord George's famous warning. He said: "It is very dangerous to leap a chasm in two bounds."

Can the coal industry—and the American people—possibly look past the chasm of scientific doubt and make a leap of faith to accept what in reality is a 12-million ton cut in sulfur dioxide over the next 12 years? How can we when the Department of Energy is predicting costs to industry and consumers of as much as \$300 billion—over and above the present Clean Air Act—in the next 30 years? Shouldn't we be angry when electric rates in some parts of the United States are expected to rise 100 percent, placing an awesome burden on consumers, who already are strapped by the high cost-of-living?

Why shouldn't we fight this legislation? According to the United Mine Workers of America, the jobs of 89,000 mining industry employees and 225,000 jobs in related industries would be affected. Total income loss would be \$6.6 billion per year. These job losses would hit in Northern Appalachia and the Midwest areas where unemployment is at 10 percent or more.

The coal industry will stand fast in opposition to this bill and let me make the reason crystal clear: Even with the billions of dollars spent, the jobs lost, and the crushing effects on our economy, there's not the slightest assurance that the acidity of rain will be affected.

Yet, when the coal industry and the U.S. Government through its State Department point to the lack of acid rain evidence, the enormous costs and job losses, we are accused by your acid rain Minister in Ottawa of engaging in "informational haze." What's more, the Ottawa Government is expressing "outrage" at our attitude, and predicts a worsening of relations between our two countries unless we come to our senses. Frankly, I believe the "outrage" is misplaced, and it's not just the weakness of the case for acid rain controls.

Your Government is openly proud of the millions of dollars spent in lobbying our Congress to enact acid rain controls. The Ottawa Government apparently believes that these tactics are successful. For after the acid rain bill was reported out of the Senate Public Works and Environmental Committee, it was followed by speeches in the Canadian Parliament calling the action a "great breakthrough."

But let's not let our wishes become the father of our thoughts. As reasonable men and women, do you actually believe that a majority of Congressman and Senators from the 31 affected states will support a bill that imposes such massive electric rate increases on their consumers with no assurance of benefit?

Is there likely to be much support for a bill that would have such devastating human dimensions, and such crucial implications for the revitalization of America's industrial and commercial heartland?

Acid rain is based on the theory of gravitation—that what goes up must come down. But don't forget Newton's law, which says: For every action there's an equal and opposite reaction. And we are reacting.

Calling to mind what Rowland Frazer said about the close and intricate relationship of our two economies, let there be no doubt: if this legislation becomes a part of the Clean Air Act, the higher energy costs, the job losses and severe overall economic effects will also affect this side of the border.

What's more, if this bill is part of the Clean Air Act, the chances are good that there will be no change in the law. This means, very frankly, that the efforts to streamline this Act—while preserving both economic growth and clean air goals—will be lost, also to the detriment of both our nations.

There is a reasonable course, and I urge you to consider it. The American coal industry believes deeply that acid rain research must be accelerated, and we are in good company.

Two weeks ago, a federal task force set up under the Acid Precipitation Act of 1980, called for more research to fill the "major gaps" of information about the causes and effects of acid rain.

Several bills are pending in Congress which would build a strong acid rain research foundation.

One bill of considerable merit, which would step up research, is sponsored by Senator Robert C. Byrd, the Senate Democratic Leader. In the House of Representatives a similar legislative approach is sponsored by Congressman Edward Madigan. His bill was approved by the House Energy and Commerce Committee by an overwhelming 27-5 margin. And, I might add, it is the only acid rain legislation approved by the House.

These bills call for more acid rain research beyond the three-year \$64-million commitment of the Reagan Administration, and would augment the \$32 million already spent or earmarked by the American Utility Industry.

A key element of the House bill is to restore existing acidified lakes with liming, and other methods known to be effective.

Acid rain may well be a serious problem for our two countries. But we must be certain that the cures that are prescribed actually works, that it doesn't have the side-effects of greater economic adversity and a worsening of relations between our two great nations.

How can we allow the acid rain issue to undermine the trust and cooperation between Canada and the United States, which has flourished for nearly 200 years? I urge the thoughtful members of the Canadian bench and bar through this organization to send a message to your public officials. Good common sense must replace strident rhetoric.

I'm no diplomat. But it doesn't take a statesman to see the need for voices to be lowered, and for thoughtful consideration to begin. We need to get this issue out of politics and public relations and into the laboratory where it belongs!

Let me close with these thoughts.

Churchill once said, "The farther backward you can look, the farther forward you can see." His admonition applies to the United States of America.

For many years, our domestic policy was fueled with a spirit of action, despite the financial costs. We sent men to the moon and brought them safely back to earth. We opened our hearts and our treasury to help create a better life for millions of our people. And we are still waging a war to protect the health and safety of our citizens, and to preserve a legacy of environmental quality.

We've had a large measure of success, but we've also learned some lessons from experience. For far more could have been accomplished, at far less cost, if we had tempered our burning desire to act with a proper understanding of what we were trying to get done.

Armed with the lessons of history, we are optimistic about the future—about finding solutions to both our human and environmental problems—and with good reason.

America has no lack of scientific genius. We have some of the world's best minds. America doesn't lack political will. Our record in building one of the greatest societies on earth is beyond question. And we suffer from no lack of spirit. The flame of desire to forge a better life for our children and grandchildren still burns brightly.

Yet, the acid rain debate brings into sharper focus on overriding challenge facing America. We must find a way to face the future with a relatively diminishing amount of financial resources. Like it or not, these hard choices must be made in the years to come.

This doesn't imply that the United States is ready to set aside any of its national goals. Far from it. But it means that we must meet all our goals with the resources at our command without sacrificing any one of them.

Clean air is one of America's goals. But it isn't the only one. We must also produce more energy at reasonable cost—energy needed to build economic growth and development which serves all our people. We can do it only by tackling our many goals in an efficient, and a cost-effective way, and with a full understanding that greater use of coal is essential to our success.

That's why our government—and your government—must understand the full dimensions of acid rain, before creating more bureaucracy, more costs, and an uncertain economic future for our people.

But it isn't just economic uncertainty that's at stake for our two nations. For I remind you again of what John Kennedy said to the Canadian Parliament nearly two decades ago: "Geography has made us neighbors. History has made us friends. Economics has made us partners. And necessity has made us allies."

Then the President added this thought: "What nature hath so joined, let no man put asunder."

I hope, and I pray God we don't forget it. ●

UNITED STATES AND THE U.S.S.R. DISCUSS REDUCTIONS IN NUCLEAR ARMS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Los Angeles Times carried an interesting report on the status of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. strategic arms reduction talks currently underway in Geneva. While I am not privy to the details of these talks, and cannot verify the accuracy of this report, I must tell my colleagues that this news report is worth reading.

I think the time is rapidly approaching when the sincerity of the U.S. negotiating position will have to be proven. I sincerely hope our Nation demonstrates its good faith in these nuclear arms talks, and gets on with the deescalation of the nuclear arms race.

The news article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 13, 1982]

U.S. WEIGHS SURPRISING SOVIET OFFER ON ARMS

(By Robert C. Toth)

WASHINGTON.—In its counterproposal to President Reagan's call for drastic strategic arms reductions, the Soviet Union has made a surprisingly forthcoming offer, according to U.S. officials—an offer that would cut Moscow's own missile and bomber force by 25% and the U.S. arsenal by 10%.

The Soviet move, presented at the new strategic arms reduction talks (START) in Geneva before the mid-August recess, has created a sharp division among U.S. analysts. Some see it as a sign of serious negotiating intent by Moscow. Others consider it a sophisticated ploy to buy time until domestic and international pressures force the United States to accept a compromise the Soviets would find more favorable to them.

As a result, Administration officials are approaching the Soviet formula with great caution.

"The Soviets are always less willing to consider deep reductions in their forces" than the United States, Fred C. Ikle, under secretary of defense for policy, said. "They seem somewhat less reluctant now than previously, and to that extent I'd say they appear relatively serious about the negotiations."

In a speech last May at his alma mater, Eureka College in Illinois, Reagan called for cuts of almost 65 percent in the Soviet missile strength and 50 percent in U.S. forces—down to a common ceiling of 850 missiles each. He excluded bombers and cruise missiles.

The Soviet proposal calls for a maximum of 1,800 missiles and bombers on each side, according to U.S. officials. It also calls for:

—Curbs on the giant new missile-carrying submarines being developed by both nations.

A total ban or limits on cruise missiles.

Extension of "confidence-building" measures such as giving advance warning of missile test flights.

While the Soviet offer is unacceptable as it now stands, U.S. officials said, the extent of the proposals surprised most American specialists. The Soviets had been expected "only (to) nibble at our proposal this year," as one Administration official said, while they sized up new Secretary of State George P. Shultz and waited for maneuvering over the Kremlin's leadership succession to end.

Not all Administration officials are convinced that the Soviet proposal is significant, however.

"The Soviets have done nothing more than throw (Jimmy) Carter's 1977 plan back at us," complained one official critical of the offer. "It's as if that's the most radical idea they are capable of."

In March, 1977, the Carter Administration proposed cutbacks on both sides to a common ceiling of between 1,800 and 2,000 weapons. Moscow immediately rejected the idea, but there have been recurring reports that it later regretted having done so.

The 1977 plan was shelved by the Carter Administration after the Soviet rejection, and the two sides went on to conclude the more modest second strategic arms limitation treaty, dubbed SALT II. The treaty was never ratified, however. Reagan has called it "fatally flawed," even while promising not to violate its provisions.

The new Soviet proposal has been also criticized as a mixture of "warmed-over"

ideas rejected during the SALT II negotiations, along with predictable extensions of that agreement. SALT II had projected significant reductions in superpower arsenals in a SALT III treaty.

But the more optimistic view—held by a minority of U.S. analysts—is that the Soviets have made a significant overture. U.S. officials in this camp see the Soviet offer for reductions to 1,800 weapons, as well as the implicit call for some limit on total warheads for those weapons, as accepting two key principles in the Reagan plan. (Reagan called for a limit of 5,000 warheads on both sides, a cut of one-third in existing arsenals.)

"Obviously no breakthrough is imminent in the START talks," one White House aide said, "but the Soviets have certainly not closed the door to serious negotiations with this offer."

As the two proposals now stand, in terms of weapons coming into the U.S. arsenal, the Soviets want to ban or limit weapons they most fear—cruise missiles and the highly accurate D-5 ballistic missiles to be deployed on the giant Trident submarines—without making any concession to U.S. fears of specific Soviet weapon systems.

Reagan's proposal, for its part, sought much the same in reverse. It would curb just those Soviet weapons that could launch a successful surprise attack against U.S. weapons and command centers—Soviet land-based intercontinental missiles, particularly the SS-18 ICBMs with their large payloads and high accuracy—without taking into account Soviet fears of U.S. weapons.

Neither attitude is unexpected at the start of negotiations. But some U.S. officials consider it surprising that the Soviets proposed substantial cutbacks as their opening position at this juncture.

These officials say they are surprised for two reasons.

First, Moscow must be uncertain—since most U.S. officials are uncertain—whether Reagan will ultimately be willing to make the inevitable compromises between the two positions to achieve a new treaty. In the same way, Shultz's views on arms control and his influence at the White House are still largely unknown.

Second, with the Kremlin leadership in transition, contenders for the job now held by President Leonid I. Brezhnev are expected to be reluctant to make arms reduction offers that might alienate the powerful Soviet military, whose support they would need in the succession maneuvers.

Given this situation, one Pentagon official said, "the Soviet offer seems to indicate they are at least as serious about a new arms agreement at this point as we are."

Whatever the Soviet motives, the proposal that was made still has many blank spaces that U.S. diplomats will want to fill in when the START talks resume in Geneva on Oct. 6.

Chief among the questions is how the Soviets would divide up the 1,800 weapons among land-based and submarine-based missiles, bombers and cruise missiles, particularly what limits they would put on their own land-based ICBMs.

The Soviet proposal also calls for a total ban on cruise missiles before they are deployed. Soviet diplomats reminded American negotiators that if the SALT I treaty had banned multiple warheads on missiles, much of the problem of arms control now would be obviated. They thus seek to prevent cruise missiles from becoming the next intractable weapons.

However, with the United States about to start deploying more than 8,000 cruise missiles and with the Soviets themselves mounting an intensive program to catch up in this area, U.S. officials believe the Soviets would settle for only limiting the weapons in number and range. Soviet delegates have hinted as much, one official said.

In that case, he added, the Soviets would insist on counting the nuclear warheads on U.S. cruise missiles in the total warhead ceiling for strategic weapons that Reagan wants in any new agreement. In this way, he said, the Soviets have implicitly accepted the Reagan principle of a limit on total warhead numbers. ●

**ANOTHER VIEW OF VIOLENCE
IN NORTHERN IRELAND**

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I receive hundreds of letters a month from individuals concerned about the issue of peace and justice in Northern Ireland.

Recently a Mr. Tadhg Seosemh Farrell of Toledo, Ohio, sent me a copy of an article he had published in the Catholic Chronicle of Toledo. The article is entitled "England Shares Blame for IRA Violence—Killer Plastic Bullets Denounced."

I call this article to the attention of my colleagues as I find it consistent with my longstanding position that all forms of violence in Northern Ireland whether civilian or official is wrong and stands in the way of a peaceful political solution which is so desperately needed.

The article follows:

ENGLAND SHARES BLAME FOR I.R.A. VIOLENCE—KILLER PLASTIC BULLETS DENOUNCED

(By Tadhg S. Farrell)

As Americans able to live in a civilized society, at times we seem to display a very strange capacity for demanding reprisals or revenge when what we have determined to be our very own personal conception of human decency and justice has been violated.

Without a moment's hesitation, we are ready to openly denounce, mourn, and demand retribution when we see justice being denied in one part of our world. In the same breath, we fully support military or political regimes that are guilty of the same violations of human rights or worse.

If the oppressor is viewed as "being on our side" or antagonistic to a government we consider to be the enemy, we are ready to turn our backs and suddenly become dumb, deaf, and blind. All too often this response is determined by our economic and political dealings with the perpetrators and the victims. If our ally of the moment murders innocent people, or tortures prisoners we can justify his methods—usually by a pragmatic statement that this particular regime is

fighting a communist conspiracy or terrorism.

The bombings that occurred in London on July 20 which brought the I.R.A. again to the front pages can only underscore once more the tragedy that is Northern Ireland. After the hunger strike ended last year, we were lulled into a feeling of complacency with a belief that the troubles in Ulster had somehow been made to magically disappear.

The wounds that tear this small province apart continue to fester and to infect all who come in close contact. For the Conservative Party of Margaret Thatcher, the myopic solution to the Northern Ireland problem lies in being able to blame all the violence and murder on the I.R.A.

On June 30, 1982, a high court in Belfast ordered a new inquest into the death of Julie Livingstone, 14, who was shot and killed by a British soldier on May 12 of last year. In doing so the judge stated that the soldier may have acted wrongly.

The weapon that killed her is officially called a "baton round," but by more common terminology it is referred to as a plastic bullet. When the British first introduced rubber and plastic bullets into use in Northern Ireland, they made a determined effort to convince the news media that these were "nothing more than harmless toys." Maj. Clayton, military adviser and programs director for the manufacturer, stated that the name was deliberately changed from "baton round" to give it "a slightly humorous image," and "looking back it does seem as if that aim was achieved."

One and one-half inches in diameter, four inches long, and weighing close to five ounces, this weapon of terror is fired from a hand-held rifle at a muzzle velocity approaching 180 miles per hour. The impact on a human being is the same as being hit by a 90-pound weight. Unlike its predecessor, the rubber bullet, designed to be bounced off of the pavement and merely break a leg bone, the plastic bullet is aimed directly at the person to be hit. Since the introduction of these weapons in 1971, 16 people have been killed by their use—eight of them children under 14.

In the case of Julie Livingstone, witnesses stated that Julie was walking home when they saw a British Army Saracen (armored car) traveling toward her at a high rate of speed. As it passed by Julie, the witnesses reported hearing a loud pop. As the Saracen sped away, Julie was found lying face down on the pavement mortally wounded from a head injury. A blood-stained plastic bullet was lying nearby.

Last year alone, 12 civilians were killed by plastic bullets in Northern Ireland, among them a girl of 12, a girl of 14, and two boys less than 14. Mrs. Nora McCabe, 30, was shot and killed by a plastic bullet fired at a range of less than 20 feet while she was returning from a shopping trip. She left behind a husband and three small children.

Earlier this year, Mrs. Kathleen Stewart of Belfast was brought to Toledo to speak at Christ the King Parish under sponsorship of Clan na Gael of Toledo. She had lost her 12-year-old son Brian to a plastic bullet in 1976 as he stood waiting on a corner while his family was preparing to celebrate his birthday. Two weeks later, Mrs. Stewart's two younger children were stopped on their way home from school by a British patrol. One of the soldiers asked them if they like the birthday present he had given their brother two weeks before. Laughing, he then told them he might give them the same present next year.

In the last 12 years, close to 1,000 innocent civilians have been killed in Northern Ireland by British troops or Loyalist paramilitaries. In that time not one British soldier has been brought to trial or convicted of any crime committed while on duty in Ulster.

On May 13, 1982, the European Parliament voted on a text condemning and banning the use of plastic bullets. The only group to vote against the passage was the Conservative Party of Margaret Thatcher and the Rev. Ian Paisley.

In the U.S., Congressman Mario Biaggi (D-N.Y.) has submitted House Resolution 356 which calls on the British government to end the use of plastic bullets in Northern Ireland.

As head of the Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs, Congressman Biaggi has been most vocal in denouncing the violence committed by all sides in Northern Ireland. It was because of his untiring efforts in the cause of justice and peace that he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize to be awarded later this year.

If there is ever to be a chance for peace, it will only come when there is a change in policy on the Ulster problem. And that will only be when England realizes that it also must accept responsibility for a large portion of the violence. ●

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES WILLIAM MAZZU

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation a remarkable man. Cpl. James William Mazzu was a soldier who lost his life in the Korean conflict on November 30, 1950.

I am extremely proud to say that Corporal Mazzu was a member of my district. A man of many talents, Corporal Mazzu belonged to the 2d Infantry Division Bag Pipe Band and was an intelligence map designer. Corporal Mazzu was a dedicated artist who drew cartoons for his division paper.

Corporal Mazzu had a special talent for drawing cartoons depicting the Korean conflict. His colleagues appreciated his cartoons because they provided thoughtful insights into the lives of the soldiers. The cartoons are presently a valued addition to the Army Historical Center. I am grateful for and proud of Corporal Mazzu's contributions to the United States, his commendable service in the military, and his cartoons that are a reflection of that service. ●

THE SALE OF SURPLUS LAND

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my col-

leagues a letter I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Joe Reinhart of Portland, Oreg., concerning the administration's plans to sell off our public lands. The arguments made in this letter parallel exactly my own misgivings about Secretary Watt's "asset management" plan.

The concerns expressed by my constituents were repeated everywhere I went in my district during the August recess. Oregonians are proud of their heritage—they do not want America's public lands sold off for some short-term gain.

Mr. Speaker, we would be wise to heed the advice found in Mr. Reinhart's letter so as not to be accomplices in a terrible crime against our citizens. I hope my colleagues will join me in this.

PORTLAND, OREG., August 29, 1982.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN AU COIN: I just finished reading a Time magazine article (Aug. 23, 1982) on the Reagan Administration's plan to sell "surplus" federal land in order to reduce the national debt. I oppose this proposal for the following reasons.

First, our short term economic problems should not dictate national policy regarding public lands. These lands should be considered part of our national heritage; a savings account. The interest from our capital investment is sustained-yield forests, national recreation and wildlife areas, and aesthetic and other intangible values. All citizens benefit from that national investment. And considering our present economic problems, once that capital reserve is withdrawn, it will not be replaced.

Second, the health of Oregon's economy is closely linked to the vitality of the timber industry. As the time article points out, large timber companies are in favor of the Administration's sell-off (or sell-out) because they have overcut their own lands for short term profits. Now, in the name of the "free market," they want to "manage" public lands. God help us. In the past few years, many small, locally owned mills have either folded or been taken over by large, national companies. I am opposed to a policy of letting out of state corporations dictate Oregon's economic decisions. Witness, for example, the commitment of Georgia-Pacific to Oregon. As a representative of this state, I ask you to make sure that our resources are available for Oregon lumber companies, not put in the hands of out of state interests.

Third, the Administration's plan is another example of the rich becoming richer at the expense of the rest of us. I ask you, who can afford to buy this land? I will tell you. Neither myself, my family, nor my friends have the money. Who can pay existing mortgages, let alone borrow at today's interest rates? Land speculators, developers, and the wealthy. The Administration's proposal, in a nut shell, is a way for the federal government to take land available for everyone's use, and put it in the control of a select group of individuals: Not very democratic.

In conclusion, everyone agrees that the federal government must balance its budget, the national debt must be reduced, and the economy started on the road to good health. And, there are undoubtedly truly "surplus" federal lands. However, I do not trust Secretary of the Interior James Watt. By using

executive orders without Congressional review, the Administration's proposal opens the door for abuse. If the Administration needs more money, it should reduce military spending and/or raise taxes again. At the very least, Congress should hold hearings on this important national question.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I eagerly await your response.

Sincerely yours,

JOE REINHART. ●

THE EFFECTS OF HIGH INTEREST RATES

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, as Americans throughout the country are pleading with Congress to provide relief from high interest rates and inflation, one of my constituents, Mrs. Jody Walker from Princeton, Ky., has written a thought-provoking letter to me in order to illustrate what our Nation's present economic climate is doing to small businesses. I think my colleagues will be interested in Mrs. Walker's comments. Her letter follows:

JUNE 19, 1982.

DEAR SIR: This is not a letter of complaint but rather an attempt to show you what the present economic climate and high interest rates are doing to small businessmen, and to us in particular.

Ken and I bought a Dairy Queen Brazier in Princeton, Kentucky 3 years ago. The interest rate at that time was 9%; our monthly payment of \$2,000.00 included \$1,100.00 interest; and the loan would have been paid off in 10 years.

In April of this year we had to refinance the business. The interest went to 17%; our monthly payment of \$2,500.00 includes \$2,350.00 interest; and the loan had to be extended to pay off in 15 years.

We are a small business, grossing about \$280,000 per year and employing twelve. Ken and I have worked without pay for 3 years in an attempt to make the business a success.

We had hoped to be able to open another Dairy Queen in a nearby town this year, but after finding out what the interest rate would be, we are not going ahead with our plans. This keeps 12 or 15 people from finding jobs and eliminates several construction jobs. It means less sales taxes to be paid and less income taxes to be paid. We simply are not willing to pay \$2,500.00 per month and have \$2,350.00 applied to interest while we work for nothing. When interest rates are 17% and 18%, the small businessman pays little on principal and the entire payment is used to pay interest. As a result, the small businessman is unable to reduce his debt which prevents him from improving his building or adding new equipment. As a result companies supplying the products and services must lay people off. The small businessman pays little tax in that interest is deductible. The small businessman is hurt and the Federal Government is hurt.

This is only one small example but when you multiply it by all the small businesses that must pay these high interest rates, you can see it is a problem of great dimension.

In our town (Princeton, Ky.) the Ford Agency, a grocery store, a clothing store, a department store and a furniture store have all closed in the last eight months. Princeton's population is 8,500. The Federal Government must get this situation under control. I do not have the answers but I do know that if we operated our business like the Federal Government operates we would have closed down 2½ years ago. Something must be done to stop the Government from competing with individual citizens for loan money. Also, I feel a sincere effort must be made to balance the budget.

I am writing this in hopes a graphic demonstration of the effects of high interest rates will have more impact than the overall statistics.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JODY WALKER.

FARM LABOR CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION ACT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, by request, the administration's recent proposals to replace the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act with the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act.

The negotiations which led up to the administration's proposals were long and at times frustrating. Representatives from all sides had serious concerns with the existing law that they felt needed to be addressed. Agricultural producers have long labored under the uncertainty of the 1974 FLCRA. In the past 10 years growers and producers have faced extensive private litigation and enforcement actions by the Department of Labor.

We have attempted to establish certainty during these long negotiations. That is also the goal of the administration's bill. It will answer the question "Who is responsible for the protections and duties available under the act?" with the answer, "He or she who provides the service or employs the worker—farm labor contractor or not—has the duty to protect the workers."

Certainty will benefit all parties. Agricultural employers will be relieved of the excessive burdens of FLCRA and will for the first time be sure of their duties to migrant workers. Agricultural employees will, in turn, know who is responsible for their protections, by fixing the responsibility on those who ultimately benefit from their labors—the agricultural employer. Unions, likewise, will be assured for the first time that they will not fall within the coverage of an ever-increasing maze of conflicting definitions which characterize the current law.

All of the problems of the migrant workers in this country will not disappear after this bill becomes law.

Today, as always, exploitation, poor housing, and abuse all too often go hand in hand with the backbreaking work performed by the agricultural worker. As this bill is put into place, I will continue to use this subcommittee's oversight authority to investigate the effect of these changes on the lives of the migrant worker and to look for ways to insure a better quality of life for these workers and their families.

I remain concerned about another group of workers who perform the same services as those covered by this law, the temporary foreign workers brought into this country under the H-2 worker program. The Judiciary Committee this morning will begin markup of the Simpson-Mazzoli amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. That bill, as passed by the Senate fails to address adequately the future of the labor protections found in current regulations. If we do not insure that those protections for both the foreign and domestic workers are retained, we will have opened up a "guest worker" program under a different name. Congress cannot create a new statute, on one hand, which attempts to protect workers, while on the other hand pass another statute that weakens labor protections for workers doing similar work.

The parties that took part in the negotiation should be congratulated on their efforts to work out a compromise in a difficult area. They have recognized a problem that needed attention and have worked tirelessly to see that it is resolved.

I am introducing the administration's legislation because I believe that it should become law. I was involved in its development. I believe that it represents a positive step in the protection of migrant workers and I will continue work to see that it is enacted. ●

NDANK, NDANK

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, most Americans are unaware of the tremendous stake our country has in a successful conclusion of the efforts of Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker to negotiate a settlement leading to a free and fair election in Namibia under the truly impartial supervision of the United Nations Resolution 435.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have watched with increasing concern the efforts of the Soviet empire to expand further into the southern part of Africa. Numerous committees of the Congress have in-

quired into the continuing "resource war" being conducted by Russia in its effort to gain control of the sources of oil and strategic minerals in Africa. Congressional studies show that 62 strategic minerals are extremely important to the industrial base of the United States economy. Namibia has many of these minerals, including the largest uranium mine in the world and one-sixth of all the uranium in the free world. Such other important minerals as copper, zinc, gold, diamonds, cadmium, arsenic trioxide, germanium dioxide, and possibly gas and oil are found in Namibia.

Let us hope that Dr. Crocker is not maneuvered into any kind of a cosmetic settlement which, in effect, will open the door to slow-motion domination and control of Namibia by SWAPO or some other Soviet "proxy" government of the kinds now controlling Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and other targets of Soviet Empire expansionism.

Any settlement which would permit even the remotest possibility of a future Soviet takeover by the terrorists of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Soviet-financed organization which has been conducting a guerrilla campaign against the people of Namibia for the last 15 years, would be totally unacceptable. The following lead editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 23 states the case very well. I hope my colleagues in Congress, as well as other interested Americans, will read it carefully.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 23, 1982]

NDANK, NDANK

Among the Wolos tribesmen of West Africa, there is a popular saying: ndank, ndank. Literally translated it means slowly, slowly. Things take time. To press a matter too hard is to risk spoiling the outcome.

It's a perspective worth keeping in mind as we watch events on that often unhappy continent, particularly in Namibia. Diplomats have been pressing hard for a political settlement of the conflict between South African backed forces and guerrillas of the South West Africa Peoples Organization, or SWAPO. Our fear is that the five-nation Western "contract group" that has been ramrodding negotiations may be pushing a little too hard.

Certainly the results to date would appear meager. About a year ago there was a flurry of excitement when it was hinted that agreement had been reached on the political principles of a settlement. But it soon became clear that the parties couldn't even agree on a voting formula.

Then there were reports that one of South Africa's prime conditions for a settlement—the removal of Cuban troops from neighboring Angola where they have supplied and succored the guerrillas' assault on Namibia—might be met. The Angolans, it was said, were increasingly unhappy with the Cubans, who haven't helped much in their own fight against internal dissidents but who nonetheless are costing Angola half or more of its annual foreign exchange earnings.

But Fidel Castro, not surprisingly, promptly said he had no intention of pulling out. Even more recently there were reports of a ceasefire between South Africa and SWAPO but this too turned out to be a mirage.

It's still possible that something will be worked out sooner rather than later, we suppose. South Africa would undoubtedly like to be rid of its Namibia defense cost. The SWAPO guerrillas, who have been all but defeated militarily, might be tempted to come to terms in hopes of winning elections scheduled for next March. Most of the guerrillas come from Namibia's dominant tribe, the Ovambos.

Contact group diplomats thus have remained optimistic about the possibilities of settlement. They believe that the key to success is American pressure on South Africa combined with economic incentives to Angola and possibly even Cuba. But all this ignores that the real key to a settlement, withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, lies in Moscow.

Castro can't make a move without the Kremlin's consent and Angola's Marxist government would likely collapse in the face of its own guerrilla movement without Cuban protection. A Soviet signal to withdraw would come as a thunderclap, a blow to the Soviet reputation for reliability nearly as grievous as the U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. As the Soviet Union has little to offer besides its military reliability and that of proxies such as Cuba and East Germany, it is hard to imagine such a step.

So we fear that much of the talk about an imminent settlement may reflect less the realities of the situation than the fond hopes of the Western contact group.

Chester Crocker, the U.S. assistant secretary of state who is point man in the negotiations, has played a brilliant diplomatic game so far. By tying Cuban withdrawal from Angola to a Namibian settlement he has overcome South African intransigence and shifted the spotlight of public opinion to Cuban and Russian imperialism.

But the contact group should not be too eager to force a settlement. Unless the settlement is truly in the interest of all parties, it will eventually fall apart and destabilize the area even further. The political process in Africa is a frail reed: Witness the near-coup in Kenya and the resurgence of terrorism in Zimbabwe.

Also, the SWAPO cause is not as popular in Africa as one might think from reading the newspapers. Moderate African nations are asserting themselves more vigorously in continental councils. Even some of the front line states in southern Africa would prefer an opportunity to stop the fighting and get on with their business.

By all means let the diplomacy continue but time is not necessarily on the side of the insurgents. If the insurgents perceive that we can't be hustled into agreement that they can't win by force of arms, meaningful agreement will be all the easier to reach. Ndank, ndank. ●

JAPANESE TREMBLE IN FEAR OF "BIG ONE"

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese may be beating

us at another game—earthquake prediction and hazard mitigation.

The Washington Post reported today that Japanese scientists have predicted Tokyo is due for a massive earthquake before the year 2000. Scientists there keep a 24-hour watch over seismic detection devices located along the ring of Japanese islands. These devices help determine when an earthquake is likely. Satellite data and other information is coordinated with this seismic information providing officials with the basis for emergency planning decisions.

I am pleased to report that earlier today the House passed the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act reauthorization. I am satisfied with the bill and hope the Senate will defer to the House version. The upcoming HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill will be considered by the House during the next couple of days. Funding for earthquake programs conducted by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the National Science Foundation is included in this bill, although not at the levels I would prefer to see.

A severe earthquake could disrupt not only the local area where it occurs with loss of life and property, but could have ramifications for the entire country. A catastrophic event in California for example, has been estimated to potentially cause 5,000 to 25,000 fatalities and \$20 to \$50 billion in damages. No one State, not even California, can sustain such a blow. The Federal Government will have to become involved if only to address the problems caused by such losses to the rest of the country.

The Japanese may have several thousand years of experience ahead of us in this area, but with a little commitment from our Government I think we can catch up.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Washington Post article for the RECORD for my colleagues to read.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1982]

JAPANESE SCIENTISTS WARN TOKYO IS DUE TO BE HIT BY MASSIVE QUAKE

(By Tracy Dahlby)

TOKYO—A handful of Japanese civil defense experts, tiny black boxes in hand, coverage on a climate-controlled room. Amid situation maps and the whir of computers, they advise the prime minister to sound a full-scale alert.

Local businessman Jiro Hatano calmly gathers up his stocks of water and dehydrated food and makes a speedy getaway, possibly to a camouflaged concrete bunker in a neighborhood garden as hordes of his fellow residents of Toyko rush to evacuation staging areas throughout the city.

This doomsday scenario, which specialists say could become a reality any day now, is not based on fear of nuclear attack or invasion but on the threat of the gigantic earthquake that is expected to devastate this congested city of 12.5 million.

Just when calamity will strike is now the subject of a sharp debate among Japanese scientists, who are busily marshaling the country's high technology to the still-murky task of quake prediction. But they generally agree that the city has now entered a danger period, making a major quake likely sometime between now and the year 2000.

"History tells us that Tokyo has been hit repeatedly by giant earthquakes," says Masahiro Kishio, assistant director of the earthquake analysis division at the national meteorological agency. "We can say with absolute certainty that the area will be hit again."

Early in the month, 100,000 residents of Tokyo took part in massive firefighting and evacuation drills in commemoration of the great Kanto earthquake of Sept. 1, 1923. It registered a magnitude of 7.9 on the open-ended Richter scale and killed 143,000 people, mostly in the ensuing firestorm, which reduced the city to a smoldering moonscape.

Should a jolt of similar magnitude rock Tokyo today, government officials estimate that at least 36,000 people would die, and another 63,000 would be seriously injured. Nearly half a million wooden houses and shops would be destroyed by fires or tidal waves, leaving 4 million people homeless.

The officials admit, however, that such calculations are extremely difficult. Tokyo now has five times more inhabitants than at the time of the Kanto quake and a population density of 26,000 people per square mile, or nearly three times that of Washington. Its sprawling cityscape is a maze of skyscrapers, apartment buildings and elevated highways built above hundreds of miles of underground shopping arcades and subway tunnels, all of which has amplified the scope for disaster.

The grim possibilities have sent tremors through Japanese officialdom and touched off massive efforts to shield the old capital from destruction. Tokyo is spending nearly \$6 billion—an amount equal to half its yearly national military budget—on a current series of countermeasures including the construction of "earthquake-proof" public buildings, hospitals, schools, roads, and sewer and water systems.

More than 1 million rations of milk, rice, hardtack biscuits and a 42-day emergency supply of fresh drinking water have been stocked near five large city parks designated as official evacuation areas. A big budget for television and radio spots and printed materials is aimed at keeping the average resident well briefed on what to do when the big quake comes.

"We can't entirely prevent widespread damage, but we can try to limit it," says Kishio. "And we're fairly certain we can predict the occurrence of a major earthquake within one or two days."

Scientists keep a 24-hour watch over data from devices located at 238 stations along the volcanic spine of the Japanese islands and from one underwater cable on the seabed southwest of Tokyo for signs of the swarm of smaller tremors which are thought to presage a serious jolt.

Tokyo's subterranean water table is checked for a sudden drop that night also indicate a big quake is imminent, while photos from weather satellites are monitored for changes in the cracks in the earth's crust that are thought to run through the city's suburbs.

Should the signs point in an ominous direction, chauffeur-driven government cars will fan out through the city to pick up a

half-dozen seismological experts, each fitted out with an electronic signalling device in a black box and deliver them to the situation room at the national meteorological agency. There, they must quickly decide whether to formally ask the prime minister to call a public alert.

A study of a thousand years of historical documents led the late professor Hiroshi Kawasumi of Tokyo University's earthquake research center to the theory that a major quake occurs in Tokyo roughly once every 69 years. Scholars now point out that, according to that theory, the city has already entered a critical period.

According to Hiroaki Yoshii, a senior researcher at the Japan Institute for Future Technology, who has recently completed a study on the subject, a giant-size jolt could create havoc in the country's big business circles because of the high concentration of corporate headquarters in Tokyo. "There would be a sudden shortage of funds from financial institutions to manufacturers, and a lot of business failures and corporate mergers," he says.

Major banks already have begun spreading their highly computerized operations to branch offices around the country and installing emergency communications networks. Earlier plans by the government to relocate the national capital have now been dropped because of the astronomical costs involved, Yoshii says.

Japan, as all schoolchildren here know, is a land of earthquakes and, historically, the destruction brought on by frequent giant tremors has kept a powerful hold on the popular imagination. The Hojoki, a 13th century Japanese classic, says, "For one terror following on another, there is nothing to equal an earthquake."

Today, Japan is jolted by more than a thousand tremors a year large enough to be felt by its inhabitants, many of them in Tokyo. That, and the fact that the city was destroyed both by the great Kanto quake and American firebombings in World War II, has made Tokyo residents largely fatalistic about another impending disaster. And government efforts to gird for the worst, officials complain, have failed to prompt a genuine state of readiness among the public.

"We are the kind of people who spend scads of money and time on vacations and golf," says Hatano, who sponsors a private organization to educate his fellow citizens on earthquake relief measures, "but won't give a second thought to our own individual security."●

RESTORE FULL COLA'S FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND FIREFIGHTERS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today that would restore full cost-of-living adjustments (COLA's) for Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters, who were unfairly penalized in the recently adopted Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-253).

Under the Budget Reconciliation Act, which I voted against, all civil service employees who retire before

age 62 would receive only half of the COLA that other Federal retirees receive. The intent of this provision is to reduce Federal spending by discouraging early retirement from the Federal Government.

However, this new law is blatantly unfair because it makes no distinction between the civil service employee who can choose his or her retirement age, and the approximately 30,000 Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters who are forced by law to retire at age 55.

My bill would correct this injustice by allowing those Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters who retire before age 62 due to the mandatory retirement law (Public Law 93-350) to receive full cost-of-living adjustments in their retirement pay.

As a former law enforcement officer, I am committed to insuring that our Nation's public safety officers receive fair and adequate compensation for the important, and often life-threatening, work they perform. The legislation I am introducing today, the "Federal Law Enforcement Officers' and Firefighters' Retirement Protection Act of 1982," is consistent with that objective.

I wish to express special thanks to the 5,000 member Federal Law Enforcement Officers' Association (FLEOA) for bringing this problem to my attention. I am hopeful that the legislative remedy I am proposing today received the prompt and favorable congressional consideration that it certainly deserves.●

THE EXPORT TRADING COMPANY ACT—A JOBS BILL THAT WILL WORK

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's newspapers that the House leadership will apparently seek quick consideration of a massive \$1 billion "jobs bill." The news reports suggest that the legislation may be brought to the floor later this week, rushed before us because—in a quote attributed to you, Mr. Speaker—"the American people need to see action now before it is too late."

Mr. Speaker, the voters will issue this Congress its report card on November 2, and I suspect that the grades that they hand out will, in many cases, not be passing marks.

While it is certainly "too late" to enact much of the legislation our constituents had a right to expect from us when they elected us in 1980, I would humbly point out that there is no compelling reason to rush an ill-advised \$1 billion jobs bill before this

body. The House of Representatives has already approved—unanimously—a jobs bill: the Export Trading Company Act. The legislation would create between 320,000 and 640,000 new American jobs in the small- to mid-sized businesses hardest hit in these tough economic times. In addition to creating many more jobs than the legislation you propose to bring to the floor, the trading company bill would give our American businesses the tools to compete more effectively in the ever more competitive world market. The jobs created by this legislation are real jobs, jobs that will last because they result from an increased demand in the private sector, not “quick fix” jobs created through increased Federal spending. The jobs created by enacting the trading company measure will not cost the taxpayers an additional dime.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has also passed—unanimously—its version of the Export Trading Company Act, and it is awaiting action by the conference committee. Does it not make more sense to urge the conferees to complete their work on this major job-creating trade legislation than to spend precious time bringing an ill-advised, budget-busting, counterproductive, billion-dollar measure to the floor?●

**PASTOR HONORED FOR 50
YEARS OF SERVICE**

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend congratulations and best wishes to both the Crescentville Baptist Church and to its pastor, Charles L. Dear. Today Pastor Dear is celebrating his 50th year of service to the East Godfrey Avenue parish.

After responding to a call to serve, Pastor Dear began his ministry at the Crescentville Baptist Church on September 14, 1932. He and his wife Velma have provided extraordinary guidance and spiritual leadership throughout the entire history of the church even during such tragic occurrences as a 1977 fire which heavily damaged the Bible School Building.

Furthermore, their combined sense of selflessness is exemplified by the unique fact that throughout their ministry at the Crescentville parish, Pastor and Mrs. Dear have lived by faith, receiving only the funds channeled directly to the support of the pastor by the church members. Because they have been so willing to give of themselves, the Lord has seen fit to bless their ministry and consequently, the church has grown considerably from the original few who first met to form a church.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is with a grateful heart that I join with my colleagues and the entire congregation in honoring Pastor Dear for his faithful service to the ministry. May Pastor Dear continue to proclaim the riches of the word of God and may God's blessing be with him and his wife in the future that lies ahead.●

**SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRATION:
VIOLATORS MUST BE
PROSECUTED**

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in a followup to statements I entered earlier in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to share this Washington Post editorial of September 1, 1982.

The editorial, entitled “Politics and Draft Registration,” echoes the point I made in earlier statements on this issue. Selective Service registration is the law of the land, and as the Post says, violation of the law requires prosecution.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 1, 1982]

POLITICS AND DRAFT REGISTRATION

Should young men be tried and convicted for violating the law requiring registration for the draft? A number of thoughtful readers, some of whose comments we printed last Thursday, evidently think not. We continue to disagree, respectfully, and we think the subject is worth addressing again, especially in light of the conviction on Thursday of a second student, Benjamin Sasway, for violating the law.

Some readers complain of our characterization of the draft registration law as “about the mildest intrusion on personal liberty a government interested in maintaining the possibility of conscription can make,” and they complain of our comparison between this law and laws requiring motorists to stop at stop signs. But they are unable to describe any milder intrusion, and then they say nothing that convinces us that the stop sign analogy is not apt. Governments put up stop signs and require registration for military service to protect, in different ways, the public safety. Governments have obligations to enforce these laws—to protect others and to encourage obedience—even against those who will not obey them because of a genuine religious belief that to obey such a law is wrong. The conscientiousness of that belief is a proper factor for a judge to consider in sentencing, but not one that should sway a prosecutor from bringing a case or a juror from returning a guilty verdict.

Mr. Sasway and, we suspect, most of those young men in violation of the law do not claim a religious objection. Their objections to the draft registration law are political. In a letter sent to President Carter in 1980 and which he has not repudiated since, Mr. Sasway said, “I am obligated to protest even simple registration since I feel the spirit of this mandate, like the actual conscription, is immoral and incompatible with a free society. Furthermore, I cannot allow myself to be forced into a military establishment that is too misdirected and too conservative to

September 14, 1982

serve the country's interests.” It is settled constitutional law that conscription is not incompatible with a free society; the argument that the military establishment is misdirected is by its very nature political. Mr. Sasway has been free, and would have been free had he registered, to try to persuade his fellow citizens that, by ordinary political means, his views are right and should be enacted into law. Violating the law requires that he be prosecuted.●

THE TOM AND JANE SHOW

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 22, 1982, I submitted an interview with Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden that appeared in Stars and Stripes which convincingly pointed out that while Tom and Jane may have changed their outward style and appearance from that of their radical stance in the 1960's and early 1970's, their ideology has not changed one iota. And what is that ideology?

I would like to submit for the RECORD statements made by Tom and Jane over the years which bear remembering. Tom and Jane should also take a good look at an article by Al Santoli entitled “Why Vietcong Flee” found in the “Extension of Remarks” of July 16, 1982, to see where twisted Hayden ideological views ultimately lead: Cambodian genocide, nearly a million boat people—over one-half dead—reeducation camps, and close to a half million Vietnamese sent to Siberian labor camps.

Ideas have consequences, Mr. Speaker, and Tom and Jane should be willing to face up to the tragic consequences of their Marxist-Leninist ideology. At this time, I would like to submit Tom and Jane's statements for the RECORD.

THE WORD ACCORDING TO TOM AND JANE

“I am the Vietcong. We are everywhere! We are all Vietcong.”—Tom Hayden, Czechoslovakia, 1967.

“Of course I am a socialist.”—Jane Fonda, Interview with Oriana Fallaci, McCalls, 1971.

“I'm not a do-gooder. I'm a revolutionary, a revolutionary woman.”—Jane Fonda, 1971.

“... the movement needs violence to organize its ranks and to capture people's minds.”—Tom Hayden, Speech at Sequoia Union High School, Palo Alto Times, March 1, 1969.

“Somehow the idea of the Communists as enemies had been drilled into my mind. So I expected Russians to be strange people, bad people, and I saw such beautiful people instead. So much less aggressive than Americans.”—Jane Fonda, The Register, August 5, 1979.

“I would think if you understood what communism was, you would hope, you would pray on your knees that we would someday become Communist.”—Jane

Fonda, Speech at Michigan State University to raise money for the Black Panthers, Detroit Free Press, November 22, 1969.

"They (the POWs) all assured me that they have been well cared for. The . . . they listen to the radio. They receive letters. They are in good health."—Jane Fonda, Radio Hanoi broadcast, August 15, 1972.

"We have no reason to believe that U.S. Air Force officers tell the truth. They are professional killers."—Jane Fonda, Washington Star, April 19, 1973.

"Recently in the United States we've been doing a lot of political propaganda work among the students."—Jane Fonda, Radio Hanoi broadcast, July 26, 1972.

"Today's terrorist may be tomorrow's George Washington."—Tom Hayden, Parade Magazine, May 20, 1979.●

QUESTIONS ON H.R. 6046, THE EXTRADITION REFORM ACT OF 1982

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, a bill has been reported to the House by the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs Committee whose stated purpose is to reform the Nation's extradition laws and to make it easier to cooperate in international efforts to deal with terrorists.

Stronger efforts to deal with terrorists and other violent criminals are clearly called for.

But in the last several days, I have received reports that the bill may seriously erode the rights of Americans and of foreigners in the United States who have struggled against repressive regimes abroad. Because of drafting problems, the bill may do much more than it originally intended. According to some, the bill would prohibit U.S. courts from reviewing extradition demands by foreign governments to insure that no demand is part of a foreign effort to suppress political dissent. Failure to provide such judicial review would be an end to the proud, 200-year tradition of the United States as a refuge for those fleeing from political dissent. Of course, we support returning terrorists, but I doubt that any American would want to be part of returning an editor of a newspaper or a religious figure who may have led a protest against his country's repressive government. One would not want to pass a bill which would enable, for example, the Soviet Union to demand the return of a Solzhenitsyn if he were to publish another book critical of the Soviet Union.

Enough questions have been raised by the bill that I hope we will have a detailed debate on what the language of the bill will actually permit. It is quite possible that as a result of that debate, a number of amendments will be in order.●

SECRETARY OF STATE SHULTZ OPPOSES TRADE EMBARGO AND SUPPORTS DRESSER INDUSTRIES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I read a fascinating article by the present Secretary of State George P. Shultz, which clearly opposes the foreign policy of the Reagan administration. The speech, I should quickly add, was made before George Shultz became Secretary of State and a supporter of the Reagan foreign policy. Personally, I found the earlier speech more convincing than the present statements by Secretary Shultz.

Coincidentally, I also just came upon an editorial from Industry Week, a publication which usually gives the Reagan administration strong support, which reads very much like the views of Secretary Shultz before he became a defender of the Reagan foreign policy.

George Shultz, in his pre-Secretary role, said:

We must recognize that major commercial relationships cannot be turned on and off like a light switch; they have to be built up and sustained over a period of time.

The Industry Week editorial says:

It's time to stop using trade indiscriminately as just another pawn in the world's political chess game. It's time to think through and establish a foreign policy that is consistent with sound international economic policy and compatible with our domestic economic and social goals.

I urge Secretary Shultz, or whoever is determining U.S. foreign policy, to pay heed to the advice of George Shultz and those who must live and work in the real world.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to insert in the RECORD the two articles discussed above.

(From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1982)

SHULTZ BACKS DRESSER, VILIFIES EMBARGOES(!)

(The following article is based on a speech that Secretary of State George P. Shultz delivered in October, 1978, when he was president of the Bechtel Corp. Last week Shultz said these views did not apply to the latest sanctions imposed by his new employer, the Reagan administration.)

(By George P. Shultz)

An extra element has been injected into international trade in the past few years, a political dimension overlaid on top of commercial transactions. This political element is a vigorous and flamboyantly administered initiative that uses foreign trade as a tactical instrument of foreign policy. I call it light-switch diplomacy.

There is apparently a belief in our government that individual trades can be turned on and off like a light switch to induce changes in the domestic and foreign policies of a host government. As a result, the posi-

tion of U.S. goods in world markets is eroding as our trading partners increasingly see evidence that we cannot be counted on as a reliable supplier. The impression abroad now is, unfortunately, that the U.S. wants foreign business on our own terms and that as yet we have not figured out what those terms are.

Examples of light-switch diplomacy abound. Take this chronology involving Dresser Industries' \$150 million contract to build a drill-bit plant in the Soviet Union. As a way of demonstrating our protest to Soviet treatment of dissidents, various presidential advisers urged the president (Jimmy Carter) to veto the sale.

Aug. 9 [1978]: The Commerce Dept. (reportedly with the president's blessing) approves Dresser's export license, enabling the company to go ahead with the sale.

Aug. 25: A special review panel convened at the request of the Defense Secretary advises against the "technology transfer."

Aug. 30: The president's senior advisers vote by a 3-to-2 margin to stop the deal.

Sept. 6: The president reaffirms the decision to allow the sale.

The light goes on, the light goes off, the light flickers, the light goes on. I don't know whether it is going to stay on or not but in the meanwhile it is hard to see that these manipulations have had any impact on the nature and operation of Soviet society.

Against this background, we must realize that our dependence on world trade has increased sharply. Exports and imports, considered together, are equivalent to about one-fifth of our gross national product, which is double what they represented a decade ago. Yet our share of world exports has been steadily declining. Our market share of exports of manufactured goods, for instance, has fallen almost 30 percent since the late 1950s.

Meanwhile, our appetite for imports has been voracious. These imports are not just a matter of taste and convenience. We can't just say, "Well, she doesn't need to have a handkerchief from Paris." We have come to depend on many of these imports to provide us with key commodities; oil is only the best-known example.

We must recognize that major commercial relationships cannot be turned on and off like a light switch; they have to be built up and sustained over a period of time. It takes a long time to go abroad, get positioned, and learn about how to do things there. A considerable investment is made on both sides of the transaction, and there emerges a certain interdependence that necessitates confidence in the continuing good faith of both sides. In this process of investment, a company develops what the government may regard as a bargaining chip. But if our government then takes that bargaining chip and spends it, where does that leave the company? The company has lost out, and its commercial relationship deteriorates. Who wants to deal with an unreliable supplier, especially when the supplier is not the only game in town?

We can predict, even observe, that light-switch diplomacy as it is used more and more becomes a wasting asset. Increasingly, when the diplomat flicks the switch, the light will not go on. It will not go on because private firms cannot afford the cost, cannot make the investments, to create the bargaining chips and then have the bargaining chips used. And self-respecting trading partners will not put up with it.

If light-switch diplomacy is turning off our trading partners, what then is the

proper relationship between trade and government policy?

(1) Governments should provide a stable and predictable set of rules under which trade can take place on individual and corporate initiative, as free as possible from the uncertainties inherent in the ad hoc exercise of government authority. Rules instead of authorities—rules that we can read; rules that are predictable.

(2) Traders, individual or corporate or government, must keep their bargains, and government must not place private parties in the position of breaking a bargain properly arrived at.

Certain products and countries may require special treatment on grounds of national security. But here, as elsewhere, rules are essential. If there is some product we should not sell, it should be specified. Just because a product is in an area linked to security does not mean we should just leave the whole thing open to the discretion of an ever-changing cast of characters who have access to the light switch. Ad hoc and changeable decisions add up to chaos and an environment that frustrates fruitful commercial relationships.

Outside the security-related area, rules should be kept to a minimum, be clear and consistent, and be as free as possible from the need for interpretation by government authorities.

If our government adheres to these principles, then U.S. companies can develop and uphold their reputation as reliable suppliers, a reputation essential to their success in export markets. When our government turns away from these principles, it correspondingly undermines our competitive position abroad.

[From *Industrial Week*, Sept. 6, 1982]

RUSSIAN PIPELINE EMBARGO SETS OMINOUS PRECEDENT

It's politics as usual in Washington. The use of trade as a political weapon or carrot by the Administration in power is not new. But now it has been elevated to new heights.

In the U.S. vs the USSR natural gas pipeline to Europe, the President has not only put sanctions on sales from U.S. firms; he has also broadened them to prohibit sales from foreign subsidiaries or licensees of U.S. multinationals.

This action sets a precedent that can only further confuse and frustrate U.S. industry's efforts to get involved in international trade, efforts which must be accelerated and expanded as we enter the era of a one-world market.

The irony of the situation is that, as foreign policy, it is inconsistent (pressure from the farm lobby keeps grain shipments going), is angering our European allies, is ineffective, and is doomed to failure. It all started with President Carter tightening exports to Russia as punishment for its invasion of Afghanistan. The Russians are still there.

President Reagan during his election campaign decried the idea of applying U.S. law overseas. Pointing to the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, he said we can't export our morality. Now it appears he may have fallen into the same trap.

The Russians will build the pipeline. Foreign competitors stand ready and willing to supply the materials. Europeans need and want the gas the pipeline will bring them. They are angered by President Reagan's position, which they feel is an impingement on their sovereignty.

Europe's dependence on a Russian energy resource is ominous. But so is our continued dependence on foreign oil. Ill-conceived national policies and laws put the U.S. into the energy bind it's in today. That same bumbling will put U.S. industry behind the eight ball in the competitive race toward internationalization and world markets. Industry can hardly be faulted for shying away from trade if the rules keep changing.

It's time to stop using trade indiscriminately as just another pawn in the world's political chess game. It's time to think through and establish a foreign policy that is consistent with sound international economic policy and compatible with our domestic economic and social goals. And that has to include support, rather than hindrance, of the internationalization of U.S. industry. ●

AN ANALYSIS OF MEDIA COVERAGE OF WAR IN LEBANON POINTS TO BIAS AGAINST ISRAEL POSITION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the recent Israeli operation peace for the Galilee, I have been concerned over what I consider to be less than accurate reporting of the campaign by certain segments of the American media.

The organization Accuracy in Media Inc., of Washington, D.C., has done a detailed analysis of the media's coverage of this conflict. What emerges as a central theme was the fact that notwithstanding certain clearly biased reports by the major media of this Nation—the support of the American people for Israel continued strong.

From the outset coverage failed to fully emphasize the fundamental reasons why Israel launched the campaign. They did so to protect her citizens from the relentless attacks by PLO terrorists operating in Lebanon. It was nothing more than any nation would do to protect her people from an enemy so close to its borders.

With the evacuation of the PLO from Lebanon now complete one hopes it will signal a new peace between Israel and Lebanon, one which will be a catalyst for a more enduring peace throughout the Middle East. I recently visited both Israel and Lebanon together with my colleagues Mr. SCHEUER and Mr. McGRATH. While there we met with Prime Minister Begin and left convinced that he too wants a lasting peace in the Middle East but one which respects and recognizes a sovereign Israel secure and free from those who would destroy it.

I urge my colleagues to read the Accuracy in Media analysis carefully and one hopes that the bond which has united this Nation with Israel will continue undiminished. It is a relationship which has been the very corner-

stone of our foreign policy over the past 30 years. A strong and sovereign Israel is vital to our own national security and our policies must be directed to insuring the maintenance of a strong State of Israel.

I now wish to insert into the RECORD the article entitled "Lies About Lebanon."

[From the AIM Report, September 1982]

LIES ABOUT LEBANON

On August 20, the day before the PLO evacuation from Beirut began, The Washington Post published a poll which indicated that 42 percent of the respondents believed the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the removal of the PLO from that country would change things for the better. Only 22 percent thought that the change would be for the worse, while 9 percent didn't think that there would be much change, and 27 percent had no opinion.

This poll indicated that public opinion in this country was still predominantly on the side of Israel. Fifty-two percent of the respondents said their sympathies were more with Israel, while only 18 percent sided with the Arabs. The pro-Israel percentage was down by three points from March, prior to the invasion. There was a three-point increase in the number who said that they sided with neither Israel nor the Arabs.

These results are rather surprising in light of the fact that the news coverage of the Israeli invasion and editorial opinion tended to be highly critical of Israel, with considerable emphasis placed upon charges that there had been heavy civilian casualties and widespread destruction of homes. Partisans of Israel felt strongly that the media were exhibiting a pro-PLO bias.

Despite the sympathetic interviews with Yasser Arafat and photos of him kissing babies, The Washington Post/ABC poll found that the number of respondents who believed that the PLO did not represent a majority of Palestinians had climbed from 48 percent in March to 60 percent in August.

This poll suggests that the invasion and the media coverage of it did little to alter the strong pro-Israel sentiments of the American people. This raises the question of whether the coverage was less pro-PLO than it was perceived to be by partisans of Israel. Or were the American people simply not paying much attention to what the media were saying? The latter is a distinct possibility. The poll showed 60 percent of the respondents saying that they had not followed the news from Lebanon at all closely even though editors had considered it to be a top news story for two months.

THE PLO DISINFORMATION CAMPAIGN

On June 20, a full-page ad appeared in The New York Times with the bold headline: "Death and Devastation in Lebanon." In smaller type: "40,000 people killed and wounded; 700,000 people homeless." The ad charged that the Israelis had intensively bombed Beirut, Tyre and Sidon and had totally destroyed scores of small towns, villages and refugee camps. It charged that virtually every population concentration of Palestinians and Lebanese east and south of Beirut had been "subjected to terror bombing, with consequent death and dreadful injury among the most vulnerable of the civilian population—women and small children, the elderly and the ailing."

The ad was signed by 214 Americans who said they were anguished by the knowledge that this wanton destruction had been inflicted by armament supplied by the United States. The signers included a number of familiar names from the anti-Vietnam movement—Ramsey Clark, the Berrigan brothers, Dave Dellinger, Julian Bond, Pete Seeger, I. F. Stone, and Studs Terkel.

The same figures for casualties and homeless in Lebanon were used again in an ad submitted by an organization called Concerned Americans for Peace for publication in several newspapers on July 11. This ad demanded that "the killing of innocent men, women and children and the destruction of their homeland must stop." It then said that "various established organizations have created separate committees to channel aid to the war-ravaged people of Lebanon." Saying, "Some of these include," it proceeded to list the names and addresses of six well-known relief organizations, including the American Red Cross and CARE. The placement of the names and addresses of these organizations gave the impression that they were co-sponsors of the ad.

However, when these organizations were asked about the use of their names in conjunction with the ad, they all denied that they had authorized anyone to use their names. The Christian Science Monitor had taken the trouble to check this out. Finding that the use of the names of the relief organizations had not been authorized, The Monitor declined to run the ad. The Los Angeles Times ran the ad but omitted the names of the relief organizations. The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Chicago Tribune, The Atlanta Constitution and Journal, and The Dallas Times-Herald all ran the ad with the names of the relief organizations.

These newspapers also failed to check to see if there really was such an organization as "Concerned Americans for Peace." Had they done so, they would have found that the post office box address that was listed in the ad for the organization did not exist. They would also have learned that the advertising agency that placed the ad could not locate the individual who had given them the order, paying for it with cashier's checks drawn on a bank in Encino, California. The amount of money involved ran into tens of thousands of dollars. It undoubtedly came from the Middle East. Whoever placed the advertising was in all probability acting as an agent for foreign principals and should have registered with the Justice Department. Under the law, ads placed by such agents are required to reveal the identity of their principals. In this case the law was easily circumvented because the newspapers made no effort to find out the real source of the money.

There was something else the papers should have checked—the figures cited in the ad for the number of people killed, wounded and rendered homeless by the Israeli attack. The Washington Post did raise a question about the numbers. In The Post the ad was modified to say that "according to news reports" there had been 26,000 killed and wounded and 600,000 rendered homeless, reductions of 14,000 and 100,000 respectively from the figures originally submitted. The other papers accepted the higher figures without question.

EXAGGERATED CIVILIAN CASUALTIES

Even the figures used in The Washington Post, which had appeared in news stories, appear to be wild exaggerations. The New York Times reported on July 14 that visi-

tors to southern Lebanon could easily see that the widely used figures of 10,000 dead and 600,000 homeless were "extreme exaggerations." It turned out that these figures had originated with the Red Crescent organization, which was headed by Yasser Arafat's brother.

The number of civilians killed in Tyre, Sidon and Nabatiye was only 323 according to Israeli sources. David Shipler of The New York Times reported that discussions with local officials tended to confirm the Israeli figure for those three cities. He said that the count did not include an estimated 200 civilians killed in Israeli air strikes before the invasion nor those killed in the Palestinian refugee camps. Nor do we have figures on the number killed in Beirut. However, the scale of the exaggeration of the early figures has been exposed by recent reports on the number of homeless. On August 17, Olof Rydbeck, commissioner-general of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, revealed that the number who had lost their homes in southern Lebanon was "at least" 60,000. That is one-tenth of the number cited in early news stories. He did not have a figure for northern Lebanon, but he estimated that it might be as much as 40,000.

While the media have been criticized for having accepted unquestioningly the exaggerated civilian casualty figures put out by the PLO, The New York Times and the UPI helped publicize another highly exaggerated figure as late as the second week in August. On August 10, The Times carried a UPI story reporting that Dr. William Monsour, chairman of the Pittsburgh chapter of the Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, had said that 3,000 Palestinian children wounded in Israeli bombing raids on Beirut were to be flown to this country for treatment. On August 12, The Times discussed this project again, saying help was being sought to bring "as many as 3,000 severely wounded Lebanese and Palestinian children" to the U.S.

The Times did not ask Dr. Monsour the source for his figure, but another reporter did. His revealing reply was: "If that mad dog Begin goes on bombing . . . he should be in chains. Then there will be triple that number. If these war criminals go on, before we know there will be 10,000." Pressed for a source for the 3,000 number, Dr. Monsour said that the American University in Beirut "think there are 6,000." The representative of the university in New York, Bill Rice, who is handling communications for the project, said that he doubted that the figure came from Beirut. He referred the question to Janan Al-Awar of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee headquarters in Washington. Miss Al-Awar said that there were lots of wounded children in Lebanon, but she said she had no idea how many. She said that 3,000 was the number that Dr. Monsour had indicated that he could process through his medical center in Westmoreland County, Pa. It was not an estimate of the number of children who might require treatment. The UPI and The Times had given currency to another statistic that had simply been pulled out of the air.

THE PHOTO THAT LIED

On August 2, The Washington Post carried a large UPI photo of a heavily bandaged baby being fed by a nurse. The caption supplied by UPI read: "Nurse feeds a seven-month-old baby who lost both arms and was severely burned late yesterday afternoon when an Israeli jet accidentally (sic) hit a Christian residential area in East

Beirut during a raid on Palestinian positions to the west." The photo is said to have moved President Reagan, who mentioned it to the Israeli foreign minister when he called at the White House that day.

The Israelis made a very careful investigation of this case. They interviewed the doctor who treated the child and two nurses at the hospital. They had two Israeli doctors examine the child. They found that the child had not lost its arms. It has suffered a fracture in one arm and a superficial burn on the face. The broken arm has been placed in a cast. At the time the child was examined by the Israeli doctors it was recovering nicely.

The child has also been photographed by photographers for the Associated Press and Time magazine. They were interviewed by an Israeli journalist who reported that neither recalled anything being said about the child having lost its arms. The AP photographer has reported that the baby has been injured by the PLO shell. Confronted with the evidence that he had incorrectly described the baby's injuries, the UPI photographer is said to have insisted that there must have been two babies with the same name. The Israelis deny that this was the case. Their military investigators also confirmed that the injury resulted from PLO shelling, not an Israeli bomb.

On August 22, UPI sent out a story reporting what the Israeli government was saying both about the child's injuries and their cause. UPI Editor-in-chief H. L. Stevenson told AIM that he didn't know if the Israeli account was true or not, but he agreed to investigate the matter further. This was a change. On August 20, The Washington Post said UPI was standing by its story.

INFLAMMATORY STORIES

On August 15, the UPI provided its clients with a story by Julie Flint from Beirut that was inflammatory. "Beirut's hospitals are filled with Lebanese and Palestinians, guerrillas and civilians, who are victims of Israeli phosphorus shells, an anti-personnel weapon that produces deep burns," wrote Flint. She quoted doctors as saying there had been "hundreds of phosphorous victims." She described in gruesome detail the agony of those suffering from phosphorous burns, quoting a surgeon as saying, "Phosphorous produces the worst of all the burns. It keeps on burning. You pour water on the burn time and time again, but it doesn't go out. The skin sloughs away." Flint described one victim who had been wounded by a phosphorous shell. The doctor who treated him was quoted as saying, "We opened the bandages on the operating table and smoke came out. The man was wounded ten hours before. The leg had burned for ten hours."

Miss Flint, having described these as "anti-personnel" weapons, said Red Cross officials in Geneva had said that a 1977 protocol prohibiting the use of "inhumane weapons that cause unnecessary suffering" covered phosphorous. She also noted that a 1980 UN convention had restricted the use of incendiary weapons against military objectives in civilian areas.

The facts are different. Israeli authorities pointed out that phosphorous shells have been used by armies the world over for many years as "markers" for the artillery. The smoke they give off shows the gunners where the shells are landing and enables them to better zero in on their targets. They are not designed or used as anti-personnel weapons as Miss Flint had reported.

Loren Jenkins, writing in *The Washington Post* on August 20, said it was impossible to tell how many civilians had been killed or injured by phosphorous shells in Beirut. He said that hospital records did not distinguish between patients suffering from phosphorous and other burns, and pressure on hospital laboratories had made chemical analyses of the causes of burns impossible. In contrast to Miss Flint's assertion that the hospitals were "filled" with victims of phosphorous shells, Jenkins quoted the chief of surgery at the American University hospital in Beirut as saying, "Most of the serious injuries we were getting during the early part of the war were from bullets and shrapnel. In the last two or three weeks, though, we have been getting a number of serious burns patients."

ARE THE MEDIA ANTI-ISRAELI?

Israel has long had an excellent press in the United States, but it seems clear that even though the American public has not switched from being predominantly pro-Israel as a result of the invasion of Lebanon, there has been a noticeable change in the attitude of many in the media.

When a newspaper is offered an opinion ad that it doesn't agree with, the usual procedure is to go over the text with a fine-tooth comb to find factual errors or other plausible reasons for rejecting the ad. Accuracy in Media has encountered this almost every time it has sought to place ads in the *Washington Post* or *The New York Times*. Virtually every statement has to be documented.

The willingness of these and other newspapers to accept the highly inaccurate ad placed by the phoney organization, "Concerned Americans for Peace," without even checking to see whether such an organization existed or whether the respected relief agencies had authorized the use of their names is highly significant. Such controversial ads have to be approved by senior officials of the paper. The failure to give this ad the same treatment that is always given to Accuracy in Media ads is a clear indication that the senior official of these papers liked the ad's message.

This was reflected in the news stories, the photos, and the editorial pages of many of our leading newspapers, as well as in the reporting on TV. According to one count, 17 of the first 19 articles about the war in Lebanon on the Op-ed page of *The New York Times* were critical of Israel. The trend in *The Washington Post* was similar. Op-ed articles ran 20 to 4 against Israel and the editorials were 7 to 0 in the first weeks of the war.

The attitude that led the editors and publishers to accept the phoney organization's ad has also led them to accept wild exaggerations in news stories and questionable photos. Martin Peretz, the editor of the liberal *New Republic* magazine, was one of the first to expose those exaggerations after returning from a trip to Lebanon. Interviewed on a Washington radio talk show, Peretz was asked why professional journalists would engage in such inaccurate reporting. He replied, "Revolutionary movements . . . still seem to have some romantic cachet and way of engaging sympathy with the Western press." Martin Peretz should know. He was a leader in the anti-Vietnam movement.

The PLO is Marxist. It is backed by the Soviet Union and in turn it has given assistance to communist guerrillas in such countries as far-away Nicaragua. Those who have been responsible for distorted reporting and editorial comment supporting every

communist-backed guerrilla movement in Latin America, Africa and the Far East were often restrained in dealing with the PLO and Israel. There was a lot more risk in trying to make popular heroes of the PLO than in performing that service for the Sandinistas or the guerrillas in El Salvador, Rhodesia or Southwest Africa.

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the resulting casualties among innocent civilians provided an opportunity for some in the media to side as openly with the communist-backed terrorists in Lebanon as they had been siding with them elsewhere in the world. Those pro-terrorist journalists have had great success in intimidating the U.S. government, deterring it from taking the forceful action necessary to administer a decisive defeat to the terrorists anywhere in the last 20 years. Israel drove them into paroxysms of rage by refusing to capitulate under their attack. The *Washington Post*/ABC poll suggests that the majority of the American people also tuned them out.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

We have cited two emotion-laden inaccurate UPI reports from Lebanon. Those responsible deserve to be at least reprimanded. We suggest that you write to H. L. Stevenson, Editor-in-Chief, United Press International, 220 E. 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10017 about the photo of the baby and phosphorous shell story by Julie Flint. ●

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6956 TO CUT FUNDING FOR CENTAUR

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer an amendment to the HUD-independent agencies bill, H.R. 6956, to eliminate funding which has been added for the sole-source procurement of a Shuttle/Centaur upper stage. In a few brief paragraphs I want to outline the arguments surrounding this issue, what my amendment would do, why I feel that is the correct way to go, and then document my argument with previous letters from NASA and DOD.

The issue concerns how the United States should proceed in developing a higher energy upper stage for use with the Space Shuttle. We have the Space Shuttle which is working well, but which has limits. By design, the Shuttle will only reach orbits of a few hundred miles altitude. To go higher—for example, to go to the commercially important geostationary orbit at 22,000 miles or to the planets—an additional rocket stage is needed and this is called an "upper stage."

We usually measure the performance of upper stages in terms of the amount of weight that can be carried to geostationary orbit (GSO) 22,000 miles up. At present, we have the "inertial upper stage" (UIS) developed by the Air Force under a joint agreement with NASA which can deliver 5,000 pounds to geosynchronous orbit. The Appropriations Committee bill would provide funds for development of a

different upper stage—the "Centaur" by sole-source contract which could deliver approximately 10,000 to 12,000 pounds to geosynchronous orbit. The Centaur is not new—it has been used for some time as an upper stage for expendable boosters. It would have to be substantially modified for use in the Shuttle. Significantly, the Shuttle and several spacecraft already in development would also have to be modified. All these additional modifications will be very expensive and have not been adequately considered. Depending on how you do the accounting, the added costs could be several hundred million dollars.

Centaur advocates say it would be inexpensive because it already exists. But the "already exists" argument cuts both ways. First, Centaur has to be modified to fit the Shuttle. Second, there is already existing hardware (in the Shuttle and in spacecraft in development) that would have to be modified at great cost.

Perhaps this cost would be worthwhile if we had missions that demanded the extra capability. As of now we do not. The IUS can handle all firmly planned missions. Both NASA and the Air Force have assured me of that, as the letters below confirm.

So, as of right now, we do not have a hard requirement that cannot be met by the inertial upper stage.

What of the future? Spacecraft will grow. In the late eighties needs will outgrow current IUS capabilities, although IUS may be modified slightly to meet some of this growth. But by the early 1990's spacecraft will have grown beyond the capability of Centaur (which is already near optimum design, being an older design rocket).

In addition, NASA proposes to develop the Centaur without competition, always a questionable practice. There is adequate time to conduct an open competition for the next generation upper stage and assure that we get a capability which will carry us into the mid-1990's.

My amendment would take another step toward this by deleting funds for noncompetitive Centaur procurement in 1983.

The NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1983, H.R. 5890, which passed the House on May 13, 1982, contained funding to begin a competitive process for a new upper stage. So my amendment would conform H.R. 6956 to language the House has already passed.

My amendment was printed in yesterday's *RECORD*, but since it is brief, let me repeat it here;

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLIPPO TO H.R.

6956

On page 20, line 13, strike out "\$5,542,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,402,800,000", and

On page 20, line 17, insert immediately before the period the following: "Provided

further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or otherwise made available for the sole-source procurement of the design, development, or production of liquid-hydrogen, liquid-oxygen (Centaur) upper stages".

Finally, I want to put two letters in the RECORD. One from the Air Force outlines their needs and the tremendous extra costs of Centaur. The second, from NASA and the Air Force describes the lack of justification for Centaur. I commend these letters to your attention:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C. August 16, 1982.

Hon. DON FUQUA,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter responds to your request for an assessment of the applicability of Centaur for DOD use. Our assessment covers both Centaur performance and cost.

Currently designed DOD spacecraft will not likely grow beyond the 6000-7000 pound range which could be accommodated by improvements in the Inertial Upper Stage (IUS) performance. However, we expect the next generation of DOD spacecraft which fly in the late 1980s & 1990s will be designed with extensive survivability measures (including large maneuvering propellant reserves) which will probably increase total weight well beyond IUS capabilities. Consequently, it appears that a new higher energy upper stage (HEUS) will be required for the next generation of DOD geosynchronous spacecraft.

The Congressionally directed use of the Centaur by NASA for their Galileo and ISPM planetary exploration missions adds about \$100 million to DOD IUS program costs. To be of use to DOD, the Centaur would have to be modified into a 20 foot long version to be Shuttle compatible with DOD payloads. It would cost an additional \$400-900 million (above the \$634M NASA Centaur budget) for DOD spacecraft to make the transition from IUS to the modified Centaur. Our situation differs from NASA's in that we have several existing—and continuing—operational spacecraft programs configured for the IUS. Thus, our cost estimates include reconfiguring the NASA planetary Centaur and the DOD spacecraft to use the 20 foot version of Centaur.

Independent of the Congressional direction to NASA on the use of Centaur, we continue to believe that DOD requirements beyond IUS capability can best be met by a competitively developed new Higher Energy Upper Stage. A Centaur derivative would, of course, be a logical alternative in the HEUS competition. We do not see how legislation which dictates specific technical upper stage decisions can be helpful in giving DOD the flexibility it needs to develop a HEUS which is both optimized for DOD missions and is cost effective.

I hope this assessment of Centaur applicability for DOD missions satisfies your needs. Please advise me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

VERNE ORR,
Secretary of the Air Force.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., July 13, 1982.

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, Committee on Science and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We urge your careful review of a major issue regarding H.R. 6685, the Urgent Supplemental. The bill, as amended by the Senate, contains direction for NASA to develop, via sole source contracts, the Centaur upper stage for its planetary missions and to cancel procurement of the Inertial Upper Stage (IUS) vehicles now being bought on an Air Force contract for these missions.

While the use of the Centaur for NASA planetary missions was cost effective a year ago, NASA has proceeded to develop these missions using the IUS for the past six months. The result is that a return to the Centaur will significantly increase mission costs. Moreover, since we have also proceeded with the procurement of the IUS vehicles and manufacturing effort has gone forward for a half a year, a NASA cancellation will increase substantially the costs of the remaining IUS vehicles for the DOD. NASA is presently discussing with contractors small improvements to existing stages to meet the near-term growth requirements for commercial payloads. If a small increase in payload capacity is required for DOD payloads, this can be similarly accommodated. Since there are no other NASA or firm DOD requirements for the Centaur upper stage prior to approximately 1988 in the 1980s, there can be no justification for these increased costs since a high energy upper stage (HEUS) can be developed when a requirement exists in the late 1980s.

We therefore believe the Nation would be better served if the Air Force and NASA are permitted to proceed with a carefully structured high energy upper stage program. This approach would be far more effective and beneficial since a HEUS would be required whether or not we develop the Centaur. The USAF and NASA have developed an agreement in principle for a joint HEUS program structured to meet commercial, scientific and military needs for the 1990s.

We therefore request your assistance to eliminate the restrictive and wasteful direction on the Centaur upper stage as was indicated in the President's first veto message.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. BEGGS,
Administrator.

VERNE ORR,
Secretary of the Air Force. ●

HANDGUN BODY COUNT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, every month more than 400 Americans are killed with handguns and more than 5,000 are wounded in crimes involving handguns. Obviously our present handgun control laws are not sufficient. A gun in every hand is not the answer to crime. Legislation that would stop the easy availability of handguns is now supported by a ma-

majority of Americans and we in Congress should listen to the cries of American citizens.

Today, though, the situation remains unchanged. The handgun body count for the month of June registered 552. It saddens me that in my own State of Florida, there were 76 handgun deaths, the highest number reported in any State. Since January, 3,773 handgun deaths have been accounted for.

The list follows:

HANDGUN BODY COUNT FOR THE MONTH OF
JUNE—552

ARIZONA (9)

Grover Cockerhern, Harry Miller, Lydia Miller, Judy Music, Gus Patrick, Andrej Rudenko, Christine Snyder, John Sturges, Herbert Welday.

ARKANSAS (1)

Ezra Graham.

CALIFORNIA (46)

Norman Burkes Jr., Desiree Cain, Linda Cain, Daniel Calvillo, Dolores Campanale, Mark Campanale, Frank Civimele, Gregory Cook, Donald Davis, Melissa Davis, Michelle Davis, Thomas Davis, Victor Farias, Monte Fine, David Frederickson, Ernest Gonzales, Ira Grover, Ira Hamilton, David Harvey, Barkley Hodges, Patricia Kahn, Spec. 4 Gerald Lee.

Jay Lewis, Jennifer Lewis, Wesley Lewis, Rossano Lontoc, John Martinez, Charles Massey, Marion Massey, Timothy McDougall, Helen Parks, Jesse Perez, Joseph Ragsdale, Charles Rambert, Kenneth Roberts, Vakis Shaik, Keith Silva, Terry Taylor, Guadalupe Torres, Thomas Wilson, Richard Dawson, Keith Henderson, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male.

COLORADO (9)

Henry Callahan, Connell Carner, Iris Dally, Robert Hernandez, Charleen Hofer, John Mays, Mildred Mays, James Tovrea, Jr., Dr. Robert Varnard.

CONNECTICUT (3)

Elsie Aviles, Rev. Robert McBride, William Siegert.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (6)

Kenneth Deville, Nathaniel Haggins, Bernard Johnson, Margaret Mary Lee, Larry Ross, Rasheed Zaman.

FLORIDA (76)

Alfredo Alejo, Jose Acosta, Carson Anderson, Chester Bartley, Steven Bigham, Russell Davidson, Jr., Russell Davidson, Jesus Diaz, Anthony Felton, Ronnie Ferguson, Eunice Forehand, Jerome Gadson, James Gann, Herbert Crockett, Howard Reynolds, Helen Gerle, Jose Goday, John Gomez, Gloria Gomez, Ronald King.

Antonio Lopez, Mario Marquez, Ronald Marron, Charles Rankin, Miguel Rioseco, Dennis Byrd, Kevin Campfield, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, 42 handgun deaths from Broward and Dade Counties.

GEORGIA (10)

Carl Buffington, Constance Davis, Marvin Davis, Pierce Kidd, Charles Marshall, Jr., Grace McCree, Patricia Robinson, Kenneth Scandrett, Marshall Sims, James Vickery.

HAWAII (2)

Brandelin Urata, Unidentified male.

ILLINOIS (61)

Esther Ammirato, Ralph Ammirato, Derrick Bailey, Mary Becman, Steven Bregin, Allan Brood, Charles Brown, Edgar Brown, Henry Brown, Taylor Brown, Mrs. Brickley, Allan Cline, Janie Cunningham, Arthur Deshazor, Rose Dowery, Alferdo Figueroa, Gerald Fullman, Serafin Gonzales, Earl Green, Esther Guzman, Karen Harding, Mary Harper, Werner Hartmann, Theodore Hawkins, Willie Hawkins, Phillip Hill, James Howard.

Weslie Howard, Darien Jones, Terrell Jones, Robert Love, Otis Mack, Robert Mason, George Mizique, Willie Moffett, Donald Montgomery, Jr., Walter Nizzo, Robert Norman, Otto Paris, James Peck, Jeffery Peebles, Bishop Redditt, Phoebe Richardson, Fortino Sanchez, Leo Schmidt, Mary Simmons, Derek Smith, Curtis Strickland, Larry Swisher, Phillip Thomas, Rupert Twilley, Allen Wainright, Harry Walker, Willie Watson, Petite Williams, John Zava, Unidentified female, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male.

INDIANA (5)

Clinton Long, Gwendolyn Mason, Donald Pepkowski, Dwayne Strickland, Roosevelt Warrick, Jr.

IOWA (1)

Sandra Mysak.

KANSAS (5)

Charles Knox, John Robinson-El, Columbus Short, Mark Swanson, Shirley Taylor.

KENTUCKY (7)

Elijah Bealsey, Anna Collins, Lorene Gillespi, Kenneth Jones, Zachary McDaniel, Marlene Toll, Thomas Toll, Sr.

LOUISIANA (10)

Janis Burnette, John Brunette, Emitte Core, Robert Deemer, Burt McCoy, Donny Purdue, James Sargent, Robert Tedone, Michael Williams, Unidentified male.

MAINE (2)

Maxine Eaton, Jeffery Toothaker.

MARYLAND (20)

Terry Allmond, Prentis Barber, James Beale, Carl Bethea, James Bristol, Richard Bull, Gordon Gillis, Vernon Lomax, Gregory Moore, Jeffery Montgomery, Gary Nickell, Edward Owens, Gwendolyn Owens, Walter Scott, George Shelton, Theodore Sparks, Wayne Sparks, Kathy Thomas, Lori Todd, Unidentified male.

MASSACHUSETTS (1)

Joseph Mistretta, Jr.

MICHIGAN (39)

Jereune Bagget, Richard Bain, Doris Beverly, Royce Brown, Roy Bruinsma, Kathy Charobee, Judge Patrick Dennis, Darryl Dooley, Martin Ford, Bud Fuller, John Gibson, Ralph Harris, Woodrow Hankins, Karin Hanna, Thomas Harvey, Clyde Hicks.

Johnny Hinton, Cleothus Hughes, Curtis Jackson, Frankie King, Richard Lembas, Samuel Mann, Van McKinley, Ronald Jenkins, Cornell Johnson, Debra McKenzie, Leslie Nabors, Lamar Pierce, Keith Pryor, William Russell, Jr., Walter Sanders, Robert Smith, Stacey Smith, Lamorse Roberson, Darryl Sturinant, Boyce Thompson, Lee Trimmer, Waverly Williams, Nasser Zreen.

MINNESOTA (2)

Thomas Timmers, Keith Williams.

MISSOURI (25)

Herman Allumns, Williams Bruce, Elroy Childs, Billy Dillow, Roy Fleming, John Ilewski, Darryl Ingram, William Jackson, John Johns, Daniel King, Michael Malone, Freddie Moore, Henry Moore, Clyde Nash, Jerry Oestricker, Diane Parker, William Prather, Eugene Scott, Columbus Short, Jr., Donald Stevens, Roosevelt Upchurch, Mildred Wallace, Pollard Williams, Robert Young, Unidentified male.

NEBRASKA (1)

Darrell Yates.

NEVADA (2)

David Costley, Steven Easy.

NEW HAMPSHIRE (1)

Robert Pendergast.

NEW JERSEY (6)

Donald Becker, Kevin Booker, George Garbarino, Robert Mason, Shiela Messenger, Patrick Morrisey.

NEW MEXICO (5)

Thomas Bengel, Richard Fergus, Steven Segura, Ian Smith, Charles Webster.

NEW YORK (32)

Thomas Acevedo, Mary Alcide, Denise Batista, Michael Bonserio, Jose Boyce, Garvey Bruno, Clarence Carson, Brooke Casady, Cecil Coat, Oswaldo Fiala, Fred Furino, Antonio Gracia, Leslie Hibbert, Kester Joseph, Aston Knight, Cecil Lawrence.

Edward Murray, Frances Patterson, Stuart Schulman, Thomas Semple, Larry Su, Maria Vera, Gina Whitlock, John Ivan, Angelo Spusato, Attilio Vena, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male.

NORTH CAROLINA (5)

Henderson Caldwell, Harold Marshall, Jeffrey Pack, John Phillips, Unidentified male.

OHIO (32)

Bryan Anthony, Roosevelt Arrington, Reginald Banner, Mix Bowman, Jr., Janet Boyce, Archibald Brookins, William Burkebile, Randell Cook, Eron Denney, Donald Fields, Mary Finnegan, Elsee Foster, Kim Gallo, Robert Gibson, Herman Harris, Arthur Heller.

John Hobbs, Thomas Joyce, Theodore Krajc, Lorline Lilly, Kevin Merchant, Steve Pinson, Christopher Plevnik, Richard Sanders, Nathaniel Sretchline, Bruce Talmadge, Allen Tipping, Mary Walker, Weak Watkins, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified male.

OKLAHOMA (12)

Priscilla Flanigan, Cecil Lawrence, Melissa McCauley, Robert McCauley, Jerry Miller, William Pickard, Kathleen Roberts, Ronald Roberts, James Rollins, Dale Spergen, Sandra Vess, Roger Wolf.

OREGON (1)

Paula Finan.

PENNSYLVANIA (21)

Oscar Burns, Jack Chambers, Randolph Chambers, Richard Esposito, Joseph Geiger, Charles Geist, Alexander Glenn, Veronica Griffin, Maude Hunter, Denise Moffet, Carolyn Moore, James Morris, Willis Ober, Suzanne Ober, Police Officer Pickney, Joseph Pronchik, Anthony Pronti, Nicholas Rymko, James Sipe, Unidentified male, Unidentified male.

SOUTH CAROLINA (5)

Elma Burgess, Fred Burgess, Ernest Coleman, Terry Love, Larry Riggins.

TENNESSEE (6)

Diane Estes, Gary Estes, Hazel Estes, Jackson Kilgore, Robert Walker, Marie Wetzel.

TEXAS (60)

Ernest Barnes, Rafael Barrientos, Joseph Bellows, Danny Bradley, Gregorio Bravo, Thomas Brown, Lela Burns, Bill Butterfield, James Campbell, Virginia Campbell, Ruben Campos, Daniel Canales, Jerome Chamberlain, Jr., Jose Cortez, Marcus Cruz, Francisco Cevas, Armando De La Rosa, Ida Dodd, Obdulio Farical, Harold Green, Robert Guinn, William Hall, Syler Handcock, Gabriel Hernandez.

Alfredo Hidalgo, Eddie Hubbard, Robert King, Dep. Sheriff Kovar, Jerry Lacey, Clarence Lee, Hilton Lewis, Thomas Linton, Eugene Martinez, Grace McCree, Joquin Mendez, Abraham Montez, Pete Munoz, Damina Olvera, Elizabeth Ortiz, Kenneth Rich, Benito Rodriguez, Guadalupe Roman, Willie Rudd, Jr., John Saldana, Rudy Santellana, Christina Saucedo, Bobby Schobey, James Seay, Anado Tobias, Huong Truong, Gilberto Valdez, Tony Walls, Loren Wilder, Seadric Williams, Robert Winters, Robert Wissenger, Juan Zavala, Unidentified female, Unidentified male, Unidentified male.

UTAH (2)

Edmund Kesler, Unidentified male.

VIRGINIA (7)

Kenneth Crawford, Rudy Guillen, Jr., Larry Hoffman, Celia Lafean, Edward Lafean, Ray Peele, James Thomas.

WASHINGTON (6)

Melvin Allison, Jr. John Early, Hilton Harris, Kenneth Nye, Leonard Vanderlain, Unidentified male.

WEST VIRGINIA (4)

Mrs. Fred Burgess, Isaac Huggins, Mrs. Reba Huggins, Archie Lusk.

WISCONSIN (3)

Catherine Doetsch, Gunter Doetsch, Gunter Doetsch, II.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. CHRIS EVERT LLOYD

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and congratulate an outstanding athlete and fine young woman, Mrs. Chris Evert Lloyd, winner of the 1982 U.S. Open Women's Tennis Championship.

History was in the making, though no one knew this for certain, when Mrs. Lloyd, a native of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and Ms. Hana Mandlikova, a native of Czechoslovakia, squared off for the final match of the U.S. Open.

Throughout the 2 weeks of the Open, Mrs. Lloyd spoke of motivation and how tough it was to maintain year after year.

Her motivation and determination paid off this past Saturday as she captured the title of the U.S. Open 6-3, 6-1 before a capacity crowd at the Na-

tional Tennis Center in Flushing Meadows, N.Y.

Though history was being made at this 101-year-old tournament, Mrs. Lloyd's concentration and determination were so strong during the 1-hour-4-minute final that she had problems recalling the details of the match after she won her final volley.

Saturday's victory gave the 27-year-old Mrs. Lloyd her sixth victory at the U.S. Open. She is only the third woman to do so.

Mrs. Lloyd won her first U.S. Open in 1975 at the age of 20. She went on to win the Open in 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1980.

The victory also gave Mrs. Lloyd her 66th career victory in singles play at the Open championship, an Open record. Her record there now reads 66-6 in 12 years of play.

And finally, with this victory, she has become the first woman, ever, to win a grand slam event 9 consecutive years in a row.

Mrs. Lloyd's present addition to the annals of history further compliments the superb record this outstanding athlete and fine young woman has already established.

Mrs. Lloyd began her tennis career at the age of 6 in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., under the guidance and supervision of another pro, her father, Jimmy Evert. After winning numerous junior titles, Mrs. Lloyd turned professional and joined the pro circuit at the age of 18.

Since joining the pro tour, she has traveled worldwide, winning tournaments in the United States, Europe, and Australia. Mrs. Lloyd has triumphed in three Wimbledon and four French Open tournaments and has been ranked No. 1 worldwide in 7 of the past 8 years.

At the age of 27, Mrs. Lloyd has assured us that her career will not end here, but will continue for several more years. She has plans to play in several more tournaments in the United States and Europe and perhaps one in Australia at the end of this year.

Mrs. Lloyd, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, congratulations on a victory well earned and the new chapter in tennis history you have given to us all.●

BADGE OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce that Mr. Christopher A. Hane of Randallstown, Md., has achieved the revered rank of eagle scout. Mr. Hane, a lifelong parishioner of the Holy Family

Catholic Church, is a member of Scout Troop No. 970. I have had the pleasure of knowing Chris personally when he served as my congressional page earlier this year. I am grateful to Chris for all the good work he did on my behalf in that demanding position. It is Chris' dedication and perseverance that has earned Chris a Maryland distinguished scholarship to study international relations at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

Chris' parents, Herbert and Brigitta of 8830 Meadow Heights Drive, also deserve to be congratulated on their fine job as loving parents to Chris and his three brothers and sisters. Mr. Hane, an employee at the Health Care Finance Administration, is also a little league soccer coach, while Mrs. Hane is active with the parish school's parents association and attends community college as a business student.

Chris can be proud of this outstanding accomplishment. The rank of eagle scout is a symbol of honor which reflects the highest ideals and principles of Scouting and responsible citizenship. This badge of achievement will serve Chris well wherever he may go in life. Chris is a fine young man and I wish him much continued success.●

THE MOSCOW HELSINKI MONITORING GROUP ENDS ITS WORK

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week I received the news that the Moscow Helsinki Group announced its dissolution at a press conference on September 8 in Moscow. The announcement was made by Elena Bonner, wife of banished academician Andrei Sakharov. As a Commissioner of the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the government body charged by law with monitoring compliance with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, I view this latest development with the utmost regret, and with genuine apprehension for the future of security and cooperation in Europe.

The Moscow Helsinki Monitoring Group, along with the several other Soviet Helsinki groups that were subsequently formed, established the goal of monitoring instances of human rights violations in the Soviet Union. As most of my colleagues are aware, it was not long before the Helsinki monitors were themselves the victims of the repression that they had set out to combat.

One of these victims is Viktor Nekipelov, a pharmacologist and writer, 53 years old, who was sentenced on June

13, 1980, to 7 years in strict regime labor camp and 5 years of internal exile for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

Born in Harbin, China, Nekipelov came to the U.S.S.R. with his parents when he was 9 years old. Two years later, in 1939, his mother vanished in the Great Purge. As he began to contact dissidents and voice his own political protests, Nekipelov became the target of official harassment in the late 1960's and early 1970's. He was arrested and tried in July of 1973 according to article 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, "slandering the Soviet state." He was sentenced to 3 years in prison. At one point during his imprisonment, Nekipelov was sent to Serbsky Institute for Forensic Psychiatry in Moscow. In his book, "Institute for Fools," Nekipelov describes the conditions in psychiatric hospitals in the Soviet Union.

Upon Nekipelov's release, the KGB repeatedly harassed his family and initiated a series of searches of his home. Denied permission to emigrate, Nekipelov has so far been unsuccessful in his attempts to leave the country. A member of the International Pen Club, he joined the Moscow group in November of 1977 and since that year, he has contributed to many samizdat petitions and articles.

Mr. Speaker, although the official work of the Moscow Helsinki Group may have been suspended, there is no doubt in my mind that the struggle for basic human rights in the Soviet Union will continue. It is imperative that the Soviet Government realize that we in the free world have not forgotten the Moscow Helsinki monitors nor their fellow countrymen who have suffered for their commitment to the ideals embodied in the Helsinki Final Act.●

RESULTS OF ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE FROM 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, every year I send to my constituents in the 10th Congressional District of North Carolina a questionnaire. These questions are based on the issues that come before me in Congress. Today I would like to share the results of the questionnaire with my colleagues.

The first question, "Do you favor higher tariffs and/or import quotas to protect American industry and American jobs, even though this would mean higher consumer prices?" found 57 percent saying "Yes" and 43 percent responding "No."

There were 84 percent who favored an amendment to the Constitution which would require a balanced budget, except in the time of a national emergency.

Nuclear power as a form of energy for the future was overwhelmingly approved by a 72-percent to 28-percent margin. This question also mentioned that adequate safeguards would be mandatory in the development of nuclear energy.

Over 70 percent of the returned questionnaires indicated that the Federal Government should not set up taxpayer-financed public service jobs to assist the unemployed.

There were two questions on the issue of abortion. The first was, "Do you think the Government should decide whether or not a woman is allowed to have an abortion?" The response was clear and overwhelmingly "No," 89 percent responded negatively. However, when asked whether taxpayers' funds should be used to pay for abortions to needy women, 72 percent said "No" and 28 percent said "Yes."

On the question of banning all handguns, 84 percent indicated that the Federal Government should not require this measure to be taken.

"Do you think the Government should require stronger health warnings on cigarette packages?" This question was polled at a 56-percent negative response to a 44-percent favorable response.

There were 60 percent of the people who favored requiring health warnings to be placed on alcoholic beverages.

On the controversial question of social security, several alternatives were mentioned. The ones receiving the most responses were borrowing funds from the general tax revenues to help bolster the program, reducing the cost-of-living increases and gradually increasing the age of retirement. Others considered were reducing the benefits uniformly and eliminating the cost-of-living increases totally.

The last question was, "How do you feel about the future of America compared to a year ago?" I was pleased to see that 35 percent of the people feel optimistic about the future. There were 30 percent who felt about the same as last year and 22 percent were pessimistic. Only 13 percent were undecided about how they felt.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am pleased with the way the majority of people in my district feel about the future and how they feel about the key issues which we have to examine in Congress.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTRADITION BILL FLAWED

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, although I support efforts to reform the extradition process, I cannot support H.R. 6046 in its present form. This legislation, unfortunately, does not adequately protect the civil rights of persons sought for extradition. Accordingly, I plan to offer and support amendments to the bill to rectify its defects. Reform of the extradition process has been a long time in the coming, and I see no reason to rush through legislation without serious and intense debate about each of the bill's failings and about amendments to correct them.

First, the bill authorizes preventive detention for at least 10 days upon the mere request of a foreign government. This provision would affect citizens and noncitizens alike and would apply to those simply charged with, not convicted of, criminal acts. It should be remembered that many of the nations with whom we have treaty obligations to pursue extradition are repressive regimes—nations such as Haiti, Poland, and El Salvador. Thus, there is ample reason to guard zealously the rights of the persons sought. Persons sought for extradition, like criminal defendants, should be released in most instances because they need to prepare their cases and consult with counsel, and to avoid the unnecessary deprivation of liberty.

I am also concerned that the bill contains no specific limit on the time within which the Government must be ready to proceed with the extradition hearing. Such a time constraint would provide a necessary check against possible abuses by the Government. Without such a check, the person sought to be extradited could be incarcerated and languish in jail, possibly prejudiced by the loss of evidence, dimmed memories, and unnecessary anxiety.

There are other problems with the bill. For example, the definition of the traditional exception to extradition for political offenses is too narrow and does not sufficiently protect those whose alleged crimes were in fact political. Also, the bill would prohibit a court from inquiring into allegations that a foreign country is seeking extradition of a person in order to retaliate for that person's political or religious beliefs, race, or nationality.

Extradition is a very serious process, for the individuals involved and for the nations invoking our laws. We must be careful to explore all the possible ramifications of the bill. Toward that end, I look forward to and expect a vigorous debate on these and other issues.●

September 14, 1982

PUBLIC OPINION DEMANDS AN
END TO THE NUCLEAR ARMS
RACE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the rise of the nuclear freeze issue has been one of the more remarkable political developments of recent years. While it is clear that a nuclear freeze, by itself, is not a meaningful goal for governmental policy, it should be equally clear that a nuclear freeze is an essential first step to meaningful nuclear arms reductions.

I recently came upon an interesting and useful discussion with public opinion analyst Lou Harris on the nuclear arms issue and public opinion in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Since this issue is of growing interest to the public, and almost certain to be a major issue in this November's election, I wanted to share this interview with my colleagues. I hope that those who still doubt the public attitudes on this subject pay special attention to this article.

[From the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, August/September 1982]

A TALK WITH LOUIS HARRIS

(By Jamie Kalven)

Over the past year, we have witnessed an impressive awakening of world public opinion to the dangers of the nuclear arms race. The West European movement for European Nuclear Disarmament is now finding counterparts in the United States. And more modest expressions of concern have been heard from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The American public is concerned, even scared, by the enormously high level of nuclear deployments by the Soviet Union and the United States, but they are even more worried by the belligerent rhetoric of government leaders concerning the possibility of using these weapons. Not only do Administration officials speak of "limited nuclear options," but they speak of being able to "prevail" over the Soviet Union in a "protracted" nuclear war. With the help of such comments the American public is rapidly coming to realize that we must somehow get out from under the shadow of this Damoclean sword.

One measure of their concern was the massing of more than 700,000 in the streets of New York to greet the opening of the Second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament on June 12. Other measures are provided by Louis Harris in the following sketch of American public opinion on the problem of nuclear war.

The potential political implications of Harris's findings are stunning. And the phenomenon his figures delineate has already provoked a response from Washington: the Reagan Administration's new found passion for arms control as formulated in START. But if Harris's analysis is correct, it will take more than that to deflect the rising expectations of the American people. What is a scarcely discernible tremor in 1982 could

turn into a political earthquake by 1984 unless there is measurable progress toward the elimination of any possible use of nuclear weapons as an instrument of international conflict resolution.

—BERNARD T. FELD.

"An incredible phenomenon"—these are the words public opinion analyst Louis Harris used in a recent interview with the *Bulletin* to describe his latest findings on public attitudes toward the threat of nuclear war.

Few people bring a more seasoned perspective to bear on questions of public opinion than Harris. Director of one of the most respected polling organizations in the country, he has been taking soundings on the attitudes of the American people for more than 30 years. And he says he can recall nothing quite like the "urgent hunger for peace" disclosed by his recent polls.

Consider the following findings on attitudes toward a nuclear arms freeze and toward a nuclear arms reduction agreement with the Soviet Union:

A large majority (73 to 23 percent) favors every country that has nuclear weapons banning the production, storage, and use of those weapons.

An even larger majority (86 to 11 percent) wants the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate a nuclear arms reduction agreement.

Another large majority (81 to 16 percent) wants the United States and the Soviet Union to agree not to produce any new nuclear weapons, provided both have a rough equivalence of such weapons today.

"These results are startling and simply cannot be ignored," says Harris. And it is unlikely that they will be ignored by elected officials, in view of figures like this: 56 percent of the voters say that they would vote against a candidate for Congress who favored escalation of the nuclear arms race, even if they agreed with him on almost every other issue; while only 14 percent say they would vote for him under such circumstances.

One of the most remarkable characteristics of the public's thinking, in Harris's view, is that it goes beyond the proposals that are presently under consideration. "Perhaps the most striking number in all the research we've done on the subject," he reports, "is that by 74 to 22 percent, a big majority of the American people, say that they want all countries that have nuclear weapons to destroy them." Another large majority (66 to 31 percent) think it is immoral for any country to produce more nuclear weapons.

Harris interprets these findings to mean that if an agreement were reached between the two superpowers to freeze or reduce nuclear weapons, the public would demand further reductions, and then further reductions, beyond that, until the last nuclear weapons were eliminated.

How does he account for this phenomenon? The single most important factor, he says, is probably "a growing distrust of the rulers of the two superpowers." People have long been aware "in a passive kind of way" of the threat of nuclear destruction. But now they are "genuinely frightened"—"Frightened in an activated as opposed to a passive way"—by the perception that "the leaders of the Soviet Union and the leaders of the United States are heading toward a nuclear confrontation." This fear is reflected in the 52 to 45 percent majority of the American people who are worried that

President Reagan will get us into another war. And it is reflected in the portrait of the Soviet leaders that emerges from the following figures:

A large majority of the American people (84 percent) see the Soviet Union as a threat to the security of the United States.

A 2-to-1 majority (63 to 23 percent) think that there is a likelihood over the next 40 years that the Soviet Union will attack the United States.

A substantial majority (69 to 24 percent) think the Soviet leaders would not hesitate to use nuclear arms, if they were desperate enough.

Fully 49 percent of the American people view the Soviet Union as an outright "enemy," while another 31 percent think the Soviet Union is unfriendly toward the United States even if not our enemy. Thus, an 80 to 10 percent majority see the Soviet Union as a power hostile to the United States. These figures reflect a marked deterioration since 1976 when a 69 to 21 percent majority saw the Soviet Union as hostile—a deterioration Harris attributes to the impact of Afghanistan and Poland. (According to Harris, only three other powers in the world are viewed with a comparable degree of suspicion: Iran is viewed as hostile by 80 to 16 percent; Libya by 66 to 22 percent; and the Palestine Liberation Organization by 73 to 15 percent.)

In sharp contrast to their feelings about the Soviet state, Harris notes, the American people "feel remarkably little hostility toward the Russian people on a people-to-people basis." Thus, while 80 percent regard the Soviet Union as a power hostile to the United States, no more than 19 percent think the Russian people are unfriendly toward the American people; and only 9 percent feel unfriendly toward the Russian people.

Harris also points out that American distrust of the Soviet Union cannot be attributed entirely to the fact that it is a communist country, for there is a major communist country which is now seen as a close ally by 15 percent of Americans and as a friendly power, if not a close ally, by another 55 percent; the People's Republic of China. Viewed in light of the fact that in 1976 a 74 to 17 percent majority saw China as a hostile power, the finding that 70 percent of the American people now regard China as a friend should serve as a reminder that the enmities that fuel the nuclear arms race may prove more temporary, more ephemeral, than they seem at the moment.

One of the central themes that emerges from Harris's findings is the strength of the American people's desire to seek areas of agreement with the Soviets. This desire is all the more striking, Harris notes, because it moves against the undertow of such deep distrust. By a "huge margin" of 78 to 7 percent, the American people believe that the Soviets only want agreements when they can gain an advantage; and by another large margin of 75 to 21 percent, they are skeptical that the Soviets will keep their end of agreements. Yet despite this, 8 out of 10 American (83 to 15 percent) think it is important for the United States to try to establish better relations with the Soviet Union.

This general attitude is reflected in strong support for a wide range of potential agreements between the two countries:

A large majority (82 to 16 percent) would like to see the START talks end in agreement.

An almost identical majority (83 to 14 percent) think it is urgent for the two countries

to reach agreement on capping, limiting, or reducing nuclear arms in each country.

The desire for agreement also reaches into a number of other areas:

Nearly all Americans (90 to 5 percent) would like an agreement to help end the world's energy problems.

Another big majority (88 to 6 percent) would favor agreement on a joint undertaking to curb air and water pollution.

There is a desire for agreements on matters the Soviets are not particularly eager to negotiate:

A big majority (85 to 3 percent) would like a U.S.-Soviet agreement that would enable Jews to leave the Soviet Union more easily.

Another large majority (85 to 5 percent) would like an agreement that would give more freedom to writers and scientists within the Soviet Union.

And there is as well a desire for agreements in areas where the United States has shown a reluctance to negotiate:

A large majority (72 to 16 percent) would favor an expansion of U.S.-Soviet trade.

A plurality (49 to 32 percent) would support giving the Soviet Union a "most favored nation" status in trade.

Thus, despite their skepticism about the good faith of the Soviet government, the American people want their government to seek out as many areas of agreement with the Soviet Union as possible. Harris characterizes their attitude this way: "They're saying we've got to try it, because the alternative to having agreements is building tensions which could lead to war—and to oblivion. The alternative has become unacceptable."

Harris cautions that this does not mean "that America has lost the will to defend itself" or that the public is moved to negotiate out of a sense of weakness. "The only kind of agreements people here want," he emphasizes, "are those which are to the mutual advantage of both parties."

It is precisely this concern with mutuality, he reports, that makes the present moment "seem particularly ripe to the American people" as a time to negotiate nuclear arms agreements with the Soviet Union. For a majority of Americans now feel that there is rough equivalence in nuclear strength between the two countries and hence that "This is the right time to do something." The shift in public opinion on this point over the last two years has been dramatic: In 1980 a 57 to 37 percent majority felt the United States was weaker than the Soviet Union. Today, by contrast, a 59 to 38 percent majority feel the United States and the Soviet Union are roughly in parity.

The public's insistence on mutuality is also apparent in the response Harris and his colleagues received when they recently asked the following question: "Would you favor or oppose the U.S. deciding to gradually dismantle our nuclear weapons before getting an agreement from other countries to do the same?" By 82 to 15 percent, people who had favored a nuclear freeze by 6 to 1 declared that they would oppose any such move. The moral, as Harris sees it, is that "the American people want to negotiate from a position of rough parity and want a freeze or reduction of nuclear weapons to leave each country in a state of rough parity." Any suggestion that the United States disarm unilaterally, he warns, will "blight" the emerging public constituency for nuclear arms control.

What other dangers does he foresee? There is, he says, one other "very important" danger: It would, in his view, be "a

mistake" to couple the nuclear war issue with other issues—for example, to argue that money being spent on the nuclear arms race should be spent on various social programs. Such a strategy would, he argues, "weaken rather than strengthen the movement, because what you're doing then is saying to people: 'Look, in order for you to join my anti-nuclear movement, you have to agree to call for a restoration of food stamps or something.'"

He advises: "If you want to be effective on this issue, you must zero in on it. The movement is much stronger on a straight-forward, simple basis. I don't think it's an oversimplification simply to say: 'We demand that this potential scourge of humanity be halted and finally ended.' The more you diffuse the issue with a whole series of other issues, the more you weaken the movement."

In Harris's view, any such effort to integrate the nuclear war issue with other issues misconceives—and undermines—the unique strength of the movement. That strength resides in the fact that this is an issue that affects everyone equally, an issue that has aroused the common concern of people who may agree about little else.

"There is no way," says Harris, "to paint the people who are affected by this issue into a simple mold and say they check out on this or that stereotype. They don't. This cuts right across the spectrum of social and political divisions in this country. It's an idea that will not go away. It's going to be with us until the final weapons are obliterated."●

WE DO NOT NEED EXPENSIVE ALGERIAN NATURAL GAS AT A TIME OF PLENTIFUL LOWER 48 DOMESTIC SUPPLIES

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I was joined by our colleagues CLARENCE J. BROWN of Ohio and DAN COATS of Indiana in protesting the planned import of Algerian liquefied natural gas (LNG) by Texas-based Panhandle Eastern Corp. and their subsidiary Trunkline LNG Co. The LNG was loaded over the weekend and is now enroute to Louisiana. The ship is scheduled to arrive in Lake Charles, La., on about September 26. Panhandle Eastern and Trunkline supply natural gas customers in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Mississippi, and Ohio.

We object to this importation, Mr. Speaker, because the LNG will be more expensive than most lower 48 domestically produced natural gas. Especially as we approach the winter heating season, it is very poor planning on the part of Panhandle to begin importing expensive foreign natural gas, particularly at a time when domestic supplies of gas are so plentiful. We should be utilizing our less expensive and readily available lower 48 gas, but Federal law today encourages using gas found in very deep—over 15,000

feet—formations, imported liquefied gas, Canadian and Mexican gas, and Alaskan gas.

We filed our protest with the Department of Energy's Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). ERA has the primary responsibility for deciding whether the import or export of gas is in the public interest. FERC exercises authority over domestic rates, siting, construction, and operation of particular facilities, and the place of entry or import of gas.

Several organizations and individuals have filed protests with ERA and/or FERC. The ERA docket number is 82-12-LNG and the FERC docket number is RP-82-127-000. Organizations and individuals protesting the import of Algerian LNG include: Congressmen TOM CORCORAN, CLARENCE J. BROWN, DAN COATS, ROBERT H. MICHEL, and PAUL FINDLEY; the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Associated Natural Gas Co., the Battle Creek Gas Co., the Central Illinois Light Co., the Central Illinois Public Service Co., the Citizens Gas Fuel Co., the Michigan Gas Utilities Co., the Missouri Utilities Co., the Ohio Gas Co., the Richmond Gas Corp., the Southeastern Michigan Gas Co., the Toledo Edison Co., the Consumers Power Co., the State of Michigan, the Michigan Public Service Commission, the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., and several businesses filing as members of the Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity (ABATE).

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the texts of my September 10 letter to the Administrator of ERA, with which the petition was filed, the September 10 letter to Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee Chairman PHILIP R. SHARP in which Mr. Brown, Mr. Coats, and I ask that Panhandle be scheduled as a witness at the already scheduled Friday hearing on natural gas pipeline issues, and the Corcoran-Brown-Coats petition filed with ERA. We also filed a substantially identical petition with FERC.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., September 10, 1982.

RAYBURN HANZLIK,
Administrator, Economic Regulatory Administration,
Washington, D.C.

Re: Docket No. 82-12-LNG

DEAR MR. HANZLIK: Enclosed for filing on behalf of Tom Corcoran, Dan Coats, and Clarence J. Brown, Members of the United States Congress, is an original and 15 copies of a Joint Petition to Intervene in a proceeding before the ERA initiated by Consumers Power Company titled: "Petition For An Order To Show Cause Why Order Approving The Importation Of Liquefied Natural Gas Should Not be Vacated And For Order Suspending License Pending Expedited Hearing." As you know, the project to which this proceeding relates involves the

importation of LNG from Algeria by Trunkline LNG Company.

I and my colleagues who seek intervention in this proceeding represent constituents who either are served by companies which must purchase this very expensive natural gas or are served by companies which hold licenses to import Algerian LNG and which may seek to import LNG in the near future, pending the outcome of this case. It seems to us incredible that Trunkline would choose a time like now to commence imports of Algerian LNG. Even without the price increases attributable to Algerian LNG, Panhandle has told the natural gas consumers it serves that rates will increase as much as 40 percent this year. Virtually every natural gas pipeline in the country, now has more natural gas than it can sell and is shutting in significant amounts of domestic natural gas production. The natural gas over-supply situation has deteriorated to the point where natural gas is actually being flared in Ohio.

We support the comprehensive analysis of the legal issues set forth by Consumers Power in its petition regarding Trunkline's LNG plans. Our purpose in intervening is not, however, to add to the discussion of those issues, but to put that discussion in a broader energy policy context. We believe that this is worthwhile, even imperative, because this Trunkline proceeding is conclusive proof of a natural gas supply policy gone haywire.

To the extent that Trunkline is to blame for selecting a very high cost and unstable supply of natural gas, and trying to bring that supply in at what is surely the worse possible time, the consumers served by Trunkline and Panhandle must be protected. To the extent that Federal natural gas regulatory policy is responsible for this situation, that policy must be changed.

With the loading of Trunkline's first cargo of LNG scheduled to commence tomorrow, we urge you to act as quickly as possible on the Petition filed by Consumers. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

TOM CORCORAN,
Representative in Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. September 10, 1982.

HON. PHILIP R. SHARP,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing today to urge that you invite Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company and Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation to be witnesses at the already scheduled September 17 Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee hearing on natural gas pipeline issues.

Our desire to include Panhandle and Columbia as witnesses has been spurred by Panhandle's plans to import Algerian liquefied natural gas (LNG) beginning tomorrow and by recent disclosures that natural gas in Ohio shut in by Columbia is being flared. As you can see from the enclosed copies of petitions we filed today with the Department of Energy's Economic Regulatory Administration (ERA) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), we oppose the importation of expensive foreign natural gas when an apparent oversupply of domestic natural gas exists. We think it would be useful to discuss this situation with Panhandle and Columbia representatives at the September 17 hearing here in Washington—

prior to the planned arrival of LNG in Louisiana.

Also enclosed for your information is a copy of very recent correspondence between Tom Corcoran and ERA regarding the role of the Federal government in connection with the import of natural gas.

We commend you on the current series of natural gas hearings being conducted by the subcommittee. As members of the subcommittee, we look forward to working with you in making the September 17 hearing even more useful by including Panhandle and Columbia as witnesses.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE J. BROWN.
DAN COATS.
TOM CORCORAN.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE
ECONOMIC REGULATORY ADMINISTRATION
*Consumers Power Company v. Trunkline
LNG Company and Trunkline Gas Compa-
ny*; Docket No. 82-12-LNG

JOINT PETITION TO INTERVENE

Tom Corcoran, Dan Coats, and Clarence J. Brown, Members of the United States Congress, hereby petition for leave to intervene in the above-captioned proceeding pursuant to Section 1.8 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure adopted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Economic Regulatory Administration.

Tom Corcoran represents the Fifteenth District of Illinois and is a Member of the Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Natural gas consumers in his District are served by distribution companies which are wholesale customers of Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company (Panhandle), a corporate affiliate of Trunkline and Trunkline LNG.

Dan Coats represents the Fourth District of Indiana and is also a Member of the Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee. Natural gas consumers in his District are served by distribution companies which are wholesale customers of Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company.

Clarence J. Brown currently represents the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Ohio and is the Ranking Minority Member of the Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee. The natural gas consumers in his District are served by wholesale customers of Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (Columbia) which has previously been granted a license to import liquefied natural gas from Algeria (See DOE/ERA Op. No. 11, Columbia LNG Corp., Docket No. 70-14-LNG, Dec. 29, 1979), although no such import activity is currently planned.

Communications with respect to this Petition should be addressed to: Linda Gillespie Stuntz, Associate Minority Counsel, Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, H2-564 Annex No. 2, Washington, D.C. 20515, (202) 226-3400.

Petitioners support the case against Trunkline LNG's imminent importation of Algerian LNG which has been made so well by Consumers Power Company.¹ The pur-

pose of this petition is not to repeat the arguments set forth by Consumers but rather to present and address the fundamental question raised by Trunkline's importation of liquefied natural gas from Algeria.

Why, at a time when natural gas pipelines all across the country (including Panhandle and Trunkline) are experiencing surplus deliverability of natural gas, when gas prices have risen to the point that industrial users are switching off or shutting down, is Panhandle bringing in very expensive Algerian natural gas? In other words, why would any business do something that is so economically foolish?

Although Panhandle must be held responsible for having selected such a costly and insecure supply of natural gas, the answer to this fundamental question lies in the way in which this country regulates the natural gas industry. The economic insanity of shutting in or flaring domestic gas, as is happening right now in Ohio, while more expensive imported natural gas is delivered to consumers, could only happen in an industry distorted by Federal regulation. Any regulatory structure that permits, even encourages this, must be changed.

It is this system of regulation that makes companies like Panhandle responsible for planning in 1975 how to secure the natural gas supply that will be needed in 1982. Panhandle, unfortunately, chose to meet this future supply obligation by developing the capacity to import Algerian natural gas. Not one objection was made when Panhandle sought a license to import LNG in 1976. Panhandle subsequently spent more than half a billion dollars on LNG facilities, pursuant to the terms of that license.

Now, the LNG is finally to be delivered. Panhandle's timing could hardly be worse. As it turns out, Panhandle and every other pipeline were wrong about the needs of gas consumers in 1982. The blame lies not entirely with Panhandle, however, but with a system of government regulation that encourages companies to turn to the most expensive and insecure supplies of natural gas, like LNG, rather than sensibly developing domestic national resources. This regulatory system now denies companies like Panhandle the flexibility to respond to a gas market that is changing in ways and at a speed no one could foresee.

Natural gas regulation, including the regulation of natural gas imports, needs to be changed, but not on an ad hoc basis in this proceeding. Rather, Petitioners call on the ERA and the FERC to re-examine and revise this nation's LNG policy in light of the current developments in the natural gas industry. Only in this way can the interests of consumers in adequate supplies of natural gas at sensible prices be truly protected.

CONCLUSION

A fairer and more rational natural gas supply policy must be adopted. The testimony presented at the hearings currently being conducted by the Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee on the status of the natural gas industry should be considered by the ERA and by FERC in their review of

plans to commence Algerian LNG imports. Petitioners herein also support this effort. In addition, petitioners are today also filing a Petition to Intervene in support of the complaint filed by Michigan Consolidated Gas Company (Consolidated) before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Docket No. RP82-127-000) in which Consolidated has asked the Commission to reject any tariff sheets filed by Trunkline LNG, Trunkline or Panhandle which provide for the pass through of LNG costs to their customers.

Trunkline's activity and LNG policy generally. Petitioners stand ready to assist the ERA and FERC in arriving at a resolution of this matter which truly is "in the public interest."

Respectfully submitted,

TOM CORCORAN,
DAN COATS,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Members of Congress.

ADMIRAL RAMBONNET

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced private legislation for the relief of Adm. Henri E. Rambonnet and his wife, Jeanne.

Admiral Rambonnet is a remarkable individual with a very colorful and unique past. Born in 1923 in the Netherlands, Admiral Rambonnet worked with the Allies in WW II as a member of the Netherlands underground resistance forces. For his brave conduct in the liberation of his country and in aiding American and British pilots shot down by the German occupying forces, his name was placed on record at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force by General Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Finally able to enlist in the Royal Netherlands Navy, Admiral Rambonnet served his country with distinction for 32 years before retiring. His duties included assistant naval attaché to the Royal Netherlands Embassy at Washington, D.C., aide-de-camp to Her Majesty the Queen of Netherlands, and commander of the Benelux Channel area (COMBENECHAN) in the NATO-command line.

Admiral Rambonnet and his wife, Jeanne, have lived in the United States for 3 years now. They have many new friends, are financially secure and would like to make America their home. Unfortunately, they fall within the nonpreference category and, therefore cannot gain permanent resident status. Because they have exhausted their administrative review and because they would make fine and responsible citizens, I have decided to introduce private legislation in their behalf.

Today, when so many others come into this country illegally, with no means of support and no understanding of what it takes to become an American citizen, I believe we should accept and even encourage people like the Rambonnets to remain in the United States. They would be a credit to America.●

¹ Petitioners understand that United States Congressmen Robert H. Michel and Paul Findley, and a number of natural gas distribution companies from Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, Indiana and Ohio also intend to file today a Petition with the ERA to suspend Trunkline's authorization to import Algerian LNG pending final hearing and resolution of issues raised concerning the propriety of Trunkline's

MARKUP ON H.R. 6514

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today the House Judiciary Committee began markup on H.R. 6514, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982. I would like to share my opening statement with my colleagues:

I want to commend Chairman PETER RODINO for scheduling this markup on H.R. 6514, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982. Momentum is with this bill. The Senate passed it on August 17. Editorial boards are urging that Congress do something. However, it is not enough to change our immigration policy. Above all we have to improve our laws. That is the legacy I would like the 97th Congress to leave.

I do not think H.R. 6514 improves our immigration laws.

I agree that our current immigration "policy" is badly in need of an overhaul. I am concerned, however, that some provisions of the Simpson/Mazzoli bill may produce consequences that its supporters do not foresee—and do not desire.

The employer sanctions provisions, I believe, are particularly open to abuse. Clearly, employers should not be permitted to hire—and exploit—undocumented aliens with impunity. In their current form, however, the employer sanctions provisions of the Simpson/Mazzoli bill provide no protection against employment discrimination toward Hispanics and other minorities who are legal residents or U.S. citizens. The sanctions offer a convenient cover for an employer who wants to discriminate—he or she can simply claim that the documentation presented by an "undesirable" applicant appeared fraudulent. Even employers who hire in good faith observance of both immigration and civil rights laws may err on the side of caution when examining documents presented by minorities, especially Hispanics. I particularly fear these consequences at this time when the Reagan administration is reneging on the Federal Government's commitment to affirmative action and equality of employment opportunity.

Recent Reagan administration initiatives have set the scene for the wholesale dismantling of programs to aid minorities within Federal agencies. As chair of the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Civil Service, I have conducted on-going oversight of equal employment opportunity in the Federal Government. We found through our questionnaires to 32 of the largest agencies that budgetary commitment to special emphasis offices in Federal agencies had decreased, including the Hispanic em-

ployment program and the minority Outreach and Upward Mobility program.

The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) has prepared a brief overview of the state of equal opportunity law enforcement in the United States. Its conclusion is that no guarantee of prompt redress exists for those Hispanics who, as a consequence of the advent of employer sanctions, are wrongfully refused employment, or otherwise denied equal employment opportunity.

I have included their report in my statement:

A. THE STATE OF EEO LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Commission on Civil Rights in its June 1982 report noted that funding and staffing cuts in the EEOC have resulted in a retardation of the EEOC's progress toward providing complainants with prompt relief, addressing class and systematic discrimination problems and eliminating inconsistent equal employment requirements.

As the table below shows, EEOC's systematic spending power is \$6 million (5 percent) lower than in FY 80.

EMPLOYEE SANCTIONS AND EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

EEOC Budget Totals and Totals in Constant Dollars: 1980-83
(Proposed)

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Appropriation (annualized) ¹	In 1980 constant dollars
1980	124,562	124,562
1981	137,875	126,028
1982 (budget request)	140,389	119,041
1982 (continuing resolution)	139,889	118,617
1983 (budget request)	144,937	114,536

¹ Figures represent what EEOC could spend during a whole fiscal year under each spending ceiling.

² This figure does not include a \$4,200,000 supplemental appropriation EEOC expects during the 4th quarter of fiscal year 1982 because this appropriation has not been enacted. Mary Stringer, supervisory budget analyst, EEOC, telephone interview, Mar. 11, 1982.

As a result of spending cuts the EEOC in FY 81 cut back the number of planned class complaint investigation of broad patterns and practices of discrimination by 13 percent, and expects to keep at this lower level in FY 83.

According to the Commission's report, the EEOC plans further cutbacks in services, such as labor force data processing. Such cutbacks would restrict the EEOC's plans to include in its targets other "employers," such as unions and apprenticeship committees that have had many discrimination charges filed against them.

Because of budgetary constraints, the EEOC in FY 83 expects to approve 14 percent fewer new suits than it approved in FY 81, even though a rising complaint load indicates a greater need for litigation. The agency may also have to reduce the number of suits it actually files in FY 83.

As the table below from the Commission's June 1982 report shows, EEOC's staff resources have been declining steadily. The agency has lost 461 authorized positions since FY 80 and is currently below its authorized level. Clerical and field office attorney positions have been affected most heavily, slowing down the production of documents and work on legal cases. The EEOC plans further cutbacks in FY 83, for expert

witnesses and other support services for cases in litigation.

EEOC FULL-TIME, PERMANENT STAFF POSITIONS 1980-83
(PROPOSED)

Fiscal year	Authorized	Actual
1980	3,777	3,433
1981	3,468	3,416
1982 (request)	3,468	(1)
1982 (continuing resolution)	3,316	(1)
1983 (request)	3,278	

¹ EEOC failed to provide requested data on actual staffing levels. See Edward Morgan, Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, EEOC, letter to John Hope II, Acting Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, May 7, 1982.

As a consequence of staff shortages the EEOC in FY 81 estimated it would take 6½ months to resolve all Title VIII complaints on hand. With yet fewer staff on hand, its present FY 82 estimate is a month longer, and its FY 83 estimate is still another month longer.

Staff shortages have lead the EEOC to assume a progressively more passive enforcement role. Lack of sufficient funding and staffing has diminished the agencies ability to conduct federal civil rights compliance reviews. Staff allocations have lead to an emphasis on inefficient individual complaint investigation activities, albeit at the reduced level shown.

The resulting cutbacks in the EEOC's activities targeted at systemic discrimination, inevitably places the burden of initiating enforcement action on the victims of discrimination, persons often lacking the requisite resources of familiarization with the law or with the requirements of program operations. The rights of victims who do not know how to file complaints or fear reprisal for doing so, have been left unprotected.

CONCLUSION

The employer sanctions provisions presently contained within the proposed Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1982, will only further exacerbate the existing problems the current budget reductions are creating for disadvantaged and ostracized American citizens and legal residents. The consequence of the present legislation will be to erect additional barriers for people outside the American mainstream.

It should be noted that while the present budgetary cutbacks have limited the EEOC's capacity to initiate suits, the number of national origin complaints filed with the agency have been on the increase. (See table below.)

COMPLAINTS FILED WITH THE EEOC

Annual reports	Total charges	National origin charges	Percent of total
1966	6,133	143	2.3
1973	77,242	12,377	16
1976	103,067	10,622	10.3
1979	79,084	7,913	10
1980	90,325	8,568	9.5
1981	94,460	9,235	9.89

Note: Hispanic complainants comprise an overwhelming majority of the total percentage of national origin charges filed. The inability of the EEOC to adequately effectuate its mandate will have its most direct consequence on the Hispanic community, the group being now asked to bear the employment risks associated with S. 2222.

Unfortunately, in its consideration of the Simpson bill, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and consequently the full Senate, rejected all amendments that were offered to protect the civil rights of ethnic groups. I hope the

House Judiciary Committee will be more receptive toward these amendments. I believe we can have meaningful employer sanctions without diluting our long fought for and hard-won civil rights laws.

I also am concerned about the bill's provisions for legalizing the status of undocumented persons currently in the United States. While I agree that massive deportations are both undesirable and unworkable, I do not believe a legalization program should be established without equal attention to enforcement efforts that will ensure we are not beginning a tradition of amnesty.

Currently, the Simpson/Mazzoli bill simply expresses the sense of Congress that enforcement and border patrol activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service should be stepped up, and states that Congress intends to provide adequate funding for enforcement. As we have seen in other instances, there can be many a slip between Congress's sense of what should be done and the funds that are available to carry out that intent. Unless the Simpson/Mazzoli bill includes a firm commitment to upgrade INS, its legalization provisions will only contribute to our immigration dilemma.

This lack of commitment to enforcement brings home my most serious concern with the Simpson/Mazzoli bill: many of its provisions will be totally unenforceable. I am curious as to whether the INS have prepared any draft regulations. How would enforcement work? How much would it cost? I think the answers to these questions will be crucial to the debate on this bill.

The Immigration Service cannot even carry out its current responsibilities, and suggestions that local authorities be empowered to enforce immigration laws are frightening and must be turned back. The result will not only contribute to an already growing disrespect for our Nation's laws, but will, in some circumstances, produce the worst of all worlds. We may, for example, contribute to civil rights violations in employment while failing completely to enforce sanctions against employers who should be punished.

Immigration reform is a deliberative process. It is unlikely that any mistakes we make in this attempt at comprehensive reform of our immigration laws will be corrected quickly. Therefore, I believe it is imperative that we

consider all possible ramifications this reform may have. I thank Chairman RODRIGO for scheduling this markup so that we may do so.

I think than once my colleagues hear all the ramifications, they will agree with me that if we rush through the Simpson-Mazzoli approach to immigration in the next 2 weeks, its consequences will come back to haunt us in the future congressional session.●

NATIONAL SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS TEACHERS DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1982

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, over the past decade, our attention and the attention of citizens across the country has turned toward a series of crises: The petroleum shortage, one outbreak of war after another, the Iranian hostage crisis, and, now, mass unemployment. And while our attention has been turned, a problem we thought we had solved 15 years ago has again built to near crisis proportions. The problem is not so dramatic as a war; it does not drain our emotional energy as did the hostage crisis; and we cannot see it on the nightly news as we can the long lines of the unemployed at soup kitchens all over the country. But it is a problem that will affect our economy and our lives profoundly if something is not done about it now.

In this technological Nation today, half the new teachers assigned to train our children in mathematics and science—half the teachers whose charge is to prepare our children to join the world of work—are unqualified to teach the science or mathematics courses they are assigned. The fruit of our failure to adequately train our teachers has been a dramatic drop in science and mathematics scholastic aptitude test scores for students over the past 10 years. At the same time, colleges which should be teaching advanced courses have had to increase by over 70 percent their offerings because so many students are unprepared for college level study of science and mathematics.

On Saturday, September 11, I attended a conference sponsored by the Congressional Caucus for Science and Technology. The theme of the confer-

ence was "The Status of Science and Mathematics Education on the Precollege Level." The keynote speaker at that conference was Mr. Donald Beilman, a long-time executive of the General Electric Co., who has just assumed the directorship of the North Carolina Microelectronics Research Center. Mr. Beilman pointed out that electronics corporation executives in the United States believe that, in large measure, the advances Japan and West Germany are making in high technology are due to the fact that they have assembled a critical mass of highly trained personnel. It is people with ideas and the ability to turn those ideas into products that are moving those countries ahead.

Anyone here who represents an area where high technology firms are located needs do nothing more than turn on the radio any time of the day and listen to the aggressive advertisements designed by each company to lure scientists, engineers, and technicians away from rival companies to be convinced that the United States is far from having this critical mass of properly trained people. And if we think the problem is bad now, it is projected that in computer sciences alone, this country will need 685,000 more trained personnel by 1990. Where are we going to get them if our schools are not supplied with teachers sufficiently trained themselves to pass their knowledge on to the next generation?

Today Mr. Moffett and I are introducing the National Science and Mathematics Teachers Development Act, a modest program to begin the upgrading of teachers skills in science and mathematics. In the early 1960's it was found that one of the fastest and most successful ways of improving teaching skills was to provide summer workshops for teachers wherein they could become informed about the latest developments in their fields. We propose to begin those programs again. They served us well when the country last faced this problem. One should not argue with success, but rather take advantage of the measures that produced that success. I hope our colleagues will take note of the serious nature of the problem we face and of the long-term impact not dealing with the problem now will have on the economic well-being of the country. I hope each of you will lend you support to the National Science and Mathematics Teachers Development Act.●