EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE LAW OF THE SEA: PLUMBING THE DEPTHS AND ROCK BOTTOM

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, numerous articles have appeared in various publications regarding the Law of the Sea Treaty in the last several years. I am including in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues excerpts from an article which appeared in the Intellectual Activist last April. The Activist is a publication dedicated to the defense of individual rights.

The article follows:

PLUMBING THE DEPTHS

The ocean floor contains vast quantities of untapped mineral wealth—and the undeveloped nations want it. More precisely, they want the industrialized world to get it for them—to discover the requisite knowledge, to develop the appropriate technology, to locate the profitable sites, to excavate the hidden resources, and to hand it all over.

The developed countries, led by the United States, have naturally been quite accommodating.

In 1970 the United Nations General Assembly voted on a Declaration of Principles concerning seabed mining. It stated: "The seabed and ocean floor . . . as well as the resources of the area, are the common heritage of mankind. . . . No State or person . . . shall claim, exercise or acquire rights with respect to the area or its resources incompatible with the international regime to be established and the principles of this Declaration. . . . The exploration of the area and the excavation of its resources shall be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole, irrespective of the geographical location of States, whether landlocked or coastal, and taking into particular consideration the interests and needs of the developing countries."

This advocacy of one-world socialism—which condemns even nationalization of industry for being too much like the pursuit of self-interest—was approved by 108 countries, including the United States; there was not a single dissenting vote. For the past seven years, U.N. members have been working on the practical implementation of the heritage-of-mankind theory. They have managed to produce a nearly completed document, the Law of the Seas Treaty, which internationalizes the ocean floor. The mining of its mineral wealth—which Kennecott Copper says could provide over half the world's supply of nickel and manganese and all its cobalt by the early part of next century—is to be regulated by an International Seabed Authority.

For the privilege of being permitted to risk hundreds of millions of dollars in a frontier more than three miles below the ocean's surface, the mining companies must submit to strict controls. They must apply to the Authority for "contracts" to work the ocean floor. They must prospect two sites before applying, submit all their findings—and let Enterprise (the U.N.'s own mining company) choose, at no cost, to keep the better site for itself. Enterprise will then develop that site in direct competition with the private mining firms, which must find their mineral sites by themselves. The source of Enterprise's working capital? "Soft" loans from the industrialized West. Contracts are awarded based on an as-yet-undefined "financial and technical capability" in combination with "the need to enhance opportunities for all States . . . to participate." There are quotas limiting the number of sites given to applicants from any one country. Contract recipients must abide by maximum production ceilings, with preference given to those sites being worked by Enterprise. The administrative costs of the massive Seabed Authority bureaucracy are paid by the mining companies—$500,000 per site. They must also pay a minimum of $1 million a year in income taxes and production fees. In addition, they are required to transfer to Enterprise—at a "fair and reasonable" price—all their technology and expertise in the form of a complete and "viable" ocean mining system. All payments to the Authority, as well as Enterprise's own profits, are to be distributed to undeveloped nations. Finally, if the mining companies somehow manage to function under this arrangement, the terms can be changed after fifteen years if a Review conference decides that too much of a free market still exists.

The flavor of this Law of the Seas Treaty was well conveyed in 1978 by the delegate from Cameroon:

"We cannot have a viable convention if many nations participating at this conference must find at the end they have gained nothing from it. This is particularly so with regard to poor young nations who obtained self-determination after generations of subjugation and must struggle in a cruel and complicated world. In my considered opinion, we are not here merely to write a business arrangement to facilitate exploitation of the seabed resources by the industrially rich and powerful nations. We are here to design a new relationship among states, and . . . to ensure that the declared common heritage benefits all of mankind."

Fundamentally, seabed mining should be treated no differently than terrestrial mining, where private property rights are recognized. There is only the minor question of which government is to have jurisdiction—which is not at all related to the issue of who is to exercise ownership. There should be a set of laws defining the procedures for filing claims, the methods for settling property disputes, etc. But this is easily resolved by agreement among the governments of the major industrial states—as long as they understand that the views of the Cameroon delegate and his ilk should be ignored.

. . . AND ROCK-BOTTOM

The gnawing question about this Law of the Seas conference is: How could it have happened? The ocean floor is unexplored territory. Most member-nations of the U.N. have not the slightest capacity to exploit it. The technology was developed primarily by U.S. firms. It is America that has the knowledge and the ability to mine what would be absolutely out of reach to most of the world—and the military power to defend its rights—yet it is Cameroon that is coming out ahead. Why have U.S. delegates willingly surrendered so much?

Consider how former chief delegate Elliot Richardson dismissed, during Congressional questioning, the suggestion that establishing the Seabed Authority could set a dangerous precedent:

"In the future, countries negotiating agreements dealing with other aspects of the 'global commons,' for example outer space and possibly Antarctica, may look to the experience we have had with the International Seabed Authority in order to determine whether it provides a useful and applicable precedent for dealing with certain resources that cannot legitimately be claimed for exclusive use . . . by any one nation. However, the facts and negotiating pressures will certainly be different, and there is nothing in the emerging Law of the Seas convention that need dictate arrangements for other shared resources."

When Congress was passing its seabed legislation, Third World countries asserted that unilaterally proclaimed terms for seabed mining contradicted the heritage-of-mankind premise because companies could mine the ocean floor without international consent. Consider Mr. Richardson's attempt to reconcile the two:

"[I]t is our further view that [the legislation] is not incompatible with the concept of the common heritage because the opportunity to exploit it is shared in common[!] It requires only the willingness of any country to devote the resources to the development of the necessary technology. What is constantly forgotten here is that anyone could have elected to assemble the skills and resources necessary for this purpose. It is merely a circumstance that this has been done by the companies that are doing it now."

The thinking of America's representatives is: principles don't matter—it is when the real details are worked out that negotiators must stand firm; no two concrete situations have principles in common; since principles aren't important anyway, they can be interpreted in whatever manner one wishes. In other words: unadulterated pragmatism.

In sharp contrast, consider the unyielding stand taken by the chairman of the Third World contingent:

"The fact of the universal acceptance of the principle that the area would be explored and its resources exploited for the benefit of all mankind and with particular consideration for the interests and needs of the developing countries, essentially implies an international regime with appropriate international machinery. The interests and needs of the developing countries cannot be the subject of unilateral assessment by one or more States that might claim to arrogate to themselves alone the right of determining what is for the benefit of all mankind."

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Which of the two is the more persuasive argument—the uncomprising appeal to socialist principle, or the conciliatory, apologetic defense of . . . what?

Ostensibly, the overriding U.S. objective in the Law of the Seas convention is military in nature. A number of countries want to restrict the traditional freedom of navigation on the high seas. U.S. delegates claim that to forestall such action, we have to bribe them with shares in the seabed's minerals. (Actually, there were originally two separate conventions: one to deal with mining the ocean floor and the other to resolve such questions as navigation and fishing rights; they were subsequently combined.) Does this mean that our delegates believe that we in fact have no right to travel the open seas? No—just that such considerations are irrelevant.

"Clearly, the best way to bring this uncertain situation under control," said Mr. Richardson, "is by shaping the assumptions of foreign coastal states about their rights and our rights in the oceans." How—by sticking to principle? "This is not solely a matter of who has the superior legal argument. Foreign perceptions will continue to influence the scope of operational risks and costs. . . . [W]here freedom of mobility is concerned, the fact that we think we have the right side of a legal argument isn't good enough if the coastal states involved take the opposite legal view. In order to avoid the impairment of our mobility, it is essential, therefore, that both we and the coastal states have the same view of the applicable law." Which means: buy them off.

Since principles, particularly moral principles, are just words, our negotiators are eager to trade them away in return for harder currency. If they can obtain uncontested access to strategic waterways for the price of some manganese nodules, they see no need to worry about what principles they may have sold out. And when tomorrow the waterways, too, are declared mankind's heritage, they will scurry to strike some other deal. (If this reminds you of "realpolitik" and a former Secretary of State, it is no coincidence: Henry Kissinger was the one who urged that the two sea conventions be united, to facilitate the bargaining process.)

To a pragmatist, anything is negotiable—which puts him at a disadvantage when his opposite number has some principles, because he has no starting point from which to measure his success or failure. For instance: Objectively, the Law of the Seas Treaty is a major victory for the Third World countries, since it grants their fundamental premise concerning the ownership of wealth in the world. But since this is not a crucial issue to a pragmatist, he might see the treaty as representing a defeat for the Third World since the tax to be collected is only two percent, rather than two and a half.●

IDA NUDEL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1982

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today sending a telegram to President Leonid Brezhnev of the Soviet Union urging him to permit Ida Nudel to join her sister in Israel. Ms. Nudel, known as the Guardian Angel of the Soviet Jewish movement has spent 4 long years in prison. Her prison term should be ending this month. I trust that it will be. I must warn the Soviets that the United States of America and particularly the Congress of the United States will not forget Ida Nudel. There can be no real improvement in Soviet-American relations so long as Jewish, and non-Jewish "Prisoners of Conscience," languish in Soviet prison camps and jails. Ida Nudel has committed no crime. She must be permitted to leave for Israel. The text of my telegram to President Brezhnev follows:

President LEONID BREZHNEV,
Kremlin,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

I strongly urge you to permit Ida Nudel to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. Her right to do so is guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act. I assure you that the United States Congress is deeply concerned about Miss Nudel's welfare and will continue to press for her release from prison as well as her emigration to Israel.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.●

WATT'S WILDERNESS PROPOSAL

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1982 Secretary Watt offered legislation to Congress deceitfully entitled, The Wilderness Protection Act of 1982. The proposal is a sham from the first line to the last. Instead of preserving the wilderness, it will destroy it.

Never one to miss a press opportunity, Watt announced the proposal on NBC's "Meet The Press." "We think these lands are special lands and should be preserved in a natural state," he declared. As drafted, however, the plan turns out to be anything but an attempt at preservation.

The bill proposes to protect wilderness areas from development until the year 2000. In fact, the protection is illusory. Prior to the year 2000 the President, acting without congressional approval, would be able to open any wilderness by a declaration of "urgent national need." In addition, over 24 million acres of wilderness study areas would be turned over to immediate exploration and development long before the year 2000. After 2000, the wilderness system would be opened in perpetuity to mineral development, creating a sunset law for the entire wilderness system including national parks and refuge wilderness areas. This proposal would in no way improve legal protection for the wilderness, since under current law, the wilderness system will be closed permanently to new development on December 31, 1983.

Clearly, the administration, spearheaded by Watt and prodded into action by the industries that have backed both, intends to do nothing less than plunder the last few wild places we have left in America.

Watt argues that the Nation must explore for resources more aggressively and that we cannot afford to lock up our wilderness. A recent study by a top U.S. resource economist says that only 1 percent of the country's untapped oil can be found in wilderness areas. It seems clear that wilderness areas have little to offer the Nation but natural grandeur, free of pollution and the effects of man, to be enjoyed by hundreds of millions of citizens each year.

When one measures Watt's proposal against what he says, one must conclude that there is no limit to the extent of Mr. Watt's cynicism and contempt for the American people.

As a member of the House Interior Committee, I have been forced twice to envoke emergency congressional powers under the Federal Lands Policy Management Act in order to stop Watt from issuing oil and gas leases on wilderness areas. Another House committee recently held him in contempt of Congress, and the General Accounting Office has determined that Watt illegally used National Park Service funds to throw a personal party at the Custis-Lee Mansion in Arlington, Va.

It is perfectly clear to me Mr. Watt is unfit for his position as Secretary of the Interior, guardian of our national treasures. His most recent proposal amounts to an unprecedented assault on a system intended to provide a small, unspoiled resource for future generations. If Mr. Watt continues to act as a lobbyist for private industry, as I suspect he will, then he should leave the public service.

Those of us on the Interior Committee who are concerned about the preservation of our wilderness areas are often frustrated by Mr. Watt's skillful manipulation of the media. Few journalists have been able to uncover all the possible effects of the proposed Wilderness Protection Act of 1982. Aware of your concern for the environment, I thought you might appreciate knowing more about Mr. Watt's so-called conversion, than what you read in the papers.●

DR. BROR REXED, INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVANT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bror Rexed, who for the past 4 years has served as executive director of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), retired from this position on February 28, 1982, and has been succeeded by Dr. Giuseppe D. Gennaro, of the Italian Ministry of Justice and Chairman of the recently concluded Seventh Special Session of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) held in Vienna, Austria, on February 2-8, 1982.

As a member of our House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I have had the pleasure of meeting with Dr. Rexed on numerous occasions both here in Washington and at the United Nations. Under Dr. Rexed's leadership the U.N. Drug Fund has become an integral part of the U.N.'s efforts to prevent and control drug abuse throughout the world.

At the Commission's February 1982 meeting in which I participated as an adviser to our Government's delegation, Dr. Rexed submitted his last statement to the Commission on the work of UNFDAC.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of the U.N. Drug Fund and the work of this dedicated international civil servant, I am inserting the complete text of Dr. Rexed's statement at this point in the RECORD. I commend Dr. Rexed for his dedication and commitment to waging "war" on drug trafficking and drug abuse and wish him well in his new endeavors.

STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR DRUG ABUSE CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, as always, it is an honour for me to appear before the Commission on behalf of UNFDAC. You have all received our abbreviated report to the Commission prepared as of 31 October 1981. Additionally, you will have received our annual detailed report which we normally provide to the Secretary-General. I will not repeat the information contained in the reports. I will attempt to give an overview of the situation with emphasis on highlights of the year. And, of course, there are events after 31 October which should be brought to your attention.

We in UNFDAC have had a busy year. We signed a new five-year multi-sectoral agreement with the Government of Burma in June. In December we signed a new four-year agreement for the Buner crop substitution programme with the Government of Pakistan. Agreements were signed for two multi-year research projects in Thailand and Malaysia. A special trust-fund agreement was signed with the Federal Republic of Germany that will provide financing for most of the Buner project in Pakistan. We undertook multi-year agreements with both Turkey and Egypt to assist in their narcotics control efforts. We were solidly recognized by Member States as a development organization at the United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities in November. Yet, with all of these positive events we remain far from satisfied.

Notwithstanding the efforts made by the international community as a whole—including bilateral programmes of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany—the problem grows. The poppy continues to flourish in many countries; the coca bush grows unabated; and the rampant growth of cannabis makes it easily available to most of the world. The manufacture and marketing of psychotropic substances becomes more highly developed and refined with each passing year with an uncomfortably large part of the production somehow finding its way into the illicit traffic.

Last year following extended deliberations, the Commission approved a resolution setting forth the strategy and policies for drug control and a basic five-year programme for action, beginning in 1982. The General Assembly has since adopted the resolution. This year the Commission is reviewing the programme of strategy and policies. Although the five-year programme of action proposed for extra budgetary support does not start until 1982, UNFDAC closely adhered in its 1981 programme to the priorities expressed. The same is true for our planned 1982 programme.

Roughly three fourths of the 1981 and 1982 programme have been connected with the socio-economic problems associated with the opium poppy and heroin. Our activities have centered on multi-sectoral programmes emphasizing crop substitution in Thailand, Burma and Pakistan and control measures in Turkey, Egypt and Afghanistan.

UNFDAC-supported pilot programmes in Thailand, Burma and Pakistan are designed to develop income alternatives to the poppy. The problems in each country vary and it would not be fair to compare them. Nevertheless, a few words about each. In Thailand the project has met with great success in developing the alternative crops of coffee, kidney beans and potatoes. Although the project has not been as active in as many villages as originally planned, the pilot aspect of the programme can be successfully terminated in the foreseeable future. During 1982 the path to be taken in the future has to be discussed. To reduce opium production in a marked way additional efforts will have to continue in bilateral projects for the rest of the northern mountain area.

In Burma crop substitution is moving at a slower and more deliberate pace. We are hopeful that momentum will increase with the completion of the demonstration farm in Pekohn in mid-1982. The Government of Burma has an impressive record in providing assistance to farmers and in encouraging agricultural development. Development targets are now being established in the traditional poppy growing areas and a reporting system is being designed and will be established to measure achievements. In Pakistan great progress was achieved in the initial demonstration project. However, we found it necessary to work out, with the Government of Pakistan, a new plan of execution for the extended Phase II of the programme. The Government of Pakistan is assuming a major role in the direct execution of the programme. We are happy to be associated with the effort.

Reducing or eliminating the supply of opium through crop substitution and income alternative programmes is a long-term approach. Over the years it has been well proven by all assistance-giving organizations and countries that integrated development per se is a long, tedious and often painful process. Development will not succeed without patience. It will not succeed without complete commitment on the part of recipient governments. It will not succeed without the understanding and continued support of international organizations and donor countries. However, it is also clear that the objectives of the supply control programme will not be reached without the commitment to a law enforcement programme. The law enforcement programme must have a realistic plan for fighting illicit traffic and limiting and finally eradicating poppy cultivation. UNFDAC has supported such programmes and is supporting them through training, laboratory build-up, telecommunications and transport. Though eradication programmes have had resounding successes, it must be understood that unless the farmer has an income alternative it is necessary to repeat eradication over and over again.

At the invitation of the Government of Mexico, I visited that country in December. I was able to observe, first hand, the extraordinary success of the eradication programme there, which was the result not only of the commitment and financial resources of the Government, but also the very considerable support from the United States. Also I could review the development plans in the areas concerned aimed at giving work and income to isolated and poor farmers in places where a socio-economic consideration of the living standard is needed.

My comments illustrate some basic concepts. A development programme designed to provide alternative income must be balanced against a law enforcement programme if efforts of eradication are to have a lasting effect. Both bilateral and multilateral assistance are needed. Finally, both international organizations and individual countries have roles to play in narcotics control.

The coca/cocaine production problem has never been fully addressed. The magnitude of this problem is one that has clearly been beyond the modest resources presently available to UNFDAC. Also, the General Assembly has not provided the guidance—or financial resources—that we hoped might be forthcoming in this respect. However, it would appear that bilateral efforts will soon be undertaken in at least one country. It is my understanding that the Government of the United States is mounting a major development effort in Peru and we applaud that move. UNFDAC will continue to assist in the ancillary areas of health, rehabilitation and preventive education as well as in support of local and regional narcotics control organizations in Latin America.

There remains few resources from international or bilateral sources to combat cannabis growth and trafficking. This situation will continue until national governments take a firm stand on the abuse of this substance. The evidence increases each year as to the harmful effects of cannabis. However, as we all know, there has not been a strong, concerted international effort to combat this substance. In fact there has been, in my view, an alarming acceptance of the abuse of cannabis in many countries.

Psychotropics and their illegal spread are yet another problem receiving inadequate

attention. It is my hope that the INCB in conjunction with national governments, will be able to strengthen the control mechanisms. Such efforts are required nationally as well as internationally.

And speaking of areas to which little attention has been given, I must mention the continent of Africa. It is necessary for UN drug control organizations to keep themselves informed of drug abuse problems in all parts of the world. Accordingly, in October, to fulfill my part of this responsibility, I travelled to six East and Southern African countries to talk with government officials. Their biggest problem is not knowing the extent of their problem. I have committed UNFDAC to support assessment studies in these countries if assistance is desired. In December, we provided the first such assistance to Kenya. I believe that a similar information gathering mission should be planned for West Africa.

Permit me to turn now to the fund-raising and management aspects of UNFDAC. I believe I shared with you last year the news that UNFDAC would be permitted to be associated with the UN Development Activities Pledging Conference. We had wanted for some years to be recognized as a development organization. I am gratified that not only did the UN acknowledge our role in development, but so did Member States who pledged US$ 3.5 million. Most of the pledges are payable in 1982, but the fact is that in 1981 these pledges could be made.

As to contributions in 1981, UNFDAC received US$ 3.7 million in cash for the year end and US$ 2.3 million in pledges totalling US$ 6.0 million for 1981. This is not as much as we would have liked, in view of the rising costs of financial programmes. Nevertheless, the total exceeds contributions in cash and pledges for 1979 and 1980.

Certainly highlighting the year, from a financial point of view, are the multi-year commitments made by the Federal Republic of Germany for the programme in Pakistan and the Government of Norway for the programme in Burma. Commitments such as these permit rational multi-year planning and provide the assurances that funds will be available when needed. I regret that in 1982 some multi-year programmes will not have the funding which had been originally hoped for.

In its fund-raising activities, UNFDAC tried some different approaches. The Government of Yugoslavia requested assistance for its Customs organization. One of the principal trafficking routes from Southwest Asia to Europe and North America is through Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav seizure record is little short of phenomenal, 12% of seizures worldwide and 20% of the seizures in Europe. These seizures, to a very considerable extent, benefit countries other than Yugoslavia. Therefore UNFDAC agreed to seek funding for the proposed programme. To this end, I travelled to Brussels to make a direct appeal to the European Economic Community. Regrettably, this appeal was not successful due to the rules guiding EEC assistance projects. Just last week, UNFDAC hosted an informal meeting for representatives from permanent missions in Vienna for briefings by Yugoslav authorities. We are hopeful that European and North American countries will perceive the problem as one directly related to the supply of narcotics to their countries and that assistance will be forthcoming.

I must bring to your attention a problem area to which I have alluded in the past and which continues to persist. That is the rate of implementation of UNFDAC-supported programmes. We have devoted considerable time this year to analysis of the so-called delivery rate of our programmes, i.e., expenditures. For example, in 1981 the programme approved by UN New York was US$ 9.1 million. The amount UNFDAC actually made available for approved projects was US$ 9.5 million. However, we estimate only US$ 6.8 million was used.

We have approached this problem from the standpoint of project budgets. Are the project budgets too large or are they poorly estimated? When we reduce budgets or revise estimates, Executing Agencies and governments alike cry out in anguish. Yet, as of 30 September, with the year ¾ over, one Specialized Agency had utilized only 35% of the funds made available to it. The record speaks for itself. For all the progress made over the years, the performance is not what we had hoped for. Neither Executing Agencies not governments are pursuing aggressively enough for full implementation of the programmes that they themselves were instrumental in designing. Performance must improve.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone on longer than I planned, however, perhaps I can be forgiven as this—as you know—is my last statement to the Commission in my capacity as Executive Director of UNFDAC. My term of office expires on 28 February. The four years with UNFDAC have been stimulating and vastly interesting. I believe that they have been productive years, albeit with decisions that could not please everyone. The support I have received from the Commission and from so many of you sitting here today is much appreciated and will not soon be forgotten. If I may, I would like to publicly thank my staff—both professional and general service and those here and those who have gone on to other things—for their untiring efforts, their loyalty and their devotion to our objectives.

UNFDAC has fulfilled a useful role in international drug abuse control. There are still things to do and unmet needs that UNFDAC can do better than other organizations. I sincerely believe in the future of UNFDAC and extend my best wishes to my successor who will take up a difficult and exciting job.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.●

ENLIGHTENMENT ON ENTITLEMENTS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, at least one columnist for the Chicago Tribune continues in the tradition of its earlier Republican philosophy and conservatism. Joan Beck, who writes objectively and forthrightly on sensitive and vital current issues, has composed a column entitled "Who Is Entitled to How Much?"

Joan Beck's article pinpoints the problem of the multiple special interest groups, many of which attract our sympathy and support—but who at the same time contribute to the dilemma of spiraling entitlements, which make the Federal budget problem unsolvable.

I am pleased to attach Joan Beck's article for the edification of my colleagues and of all who peruse these pages:

WHO IS ENTITLED TO HOW MUCH?

(By Joan Beck)

At Yale, a student complains that cutbacks in federal student loans not based on need would be unfair to her father, who earns $60,000 a year. She's entitled to help, she says, because she wants to go to one of the nation's most expensive schools.

Representatives of kidney dialysis centers have held demonstrations about proposals that funds for patients' treatment be reduced slightly to encourage more dialysis at home. The nation's 72,000 victims of kidney disease are entitled to the full $1.8 billion, they say, because they have such an expensive ailment.

The working poor are entitled to food stamps and public aid because they don't earn as much as many people on welfare and proposed reductions would create a "work disincentive," their advocates are protesting.

As estimates of federal budget deficits zing higher faster then the scores in a pinball game—$120.6 billion in 1983, $128.9 billion in 1984, maybe $139.6 billion in 1985, according to the Congressional Budget Office—the trickle of indignant news stories about victims of cutbacks—real and anticipated—has turned into a turrent.

A sense of entitlement has infected the nation and everyone—from touring ballet dancers to cancer researchers to unemployed auto workers—is afraid the Reagan administration and a deficit-leery Congress may try to reduce the amount of money they feel entitled to take out of taxpayers' pockets as a matter of right.

Kids, for example, should be entitled to a subsidized lunch because they might be hungry, the arguments against reducing school lunch subsidies go. College students should be entitled to financial help to go to any school for which they are qualified, whether or not they can afford it, because they are entitled to freedom of choice.

The handicapped are entitled to barrier-free buildings and transit facilities regardless of cost because they are handicapped. Artists of all kinds should be entitled to at least a trickle of support because culture is important and they should have opportunity to use their talents, they contend. Tobacco farmers feel entitled to price support help so they can continue to make a living by growing carcinogens.

Chrysler claims entitlement to federal help because it has made so many management mistakes. People who live near toxic waste dumps are entitled to have the government clean them up because no one else will. World War I veterans should be entitled to a $10,000 bonus, according to a bill introduced in Congress by Henry B. Gonzalez (D. Tex.).

Indians are entitled to federal help because their ancestors were here before ours. Admirals and generals are entitled to fancy perks because they are admirals and generals. Enlisted personnel are entitled to early pensions, educational benefits and subsidized shopping because they might not sign up otherwise. States and municipalities are entitled to financial subsidies because they don't like to raise their own taxes.

Businesses are sometines entitled to federal help because they are small and struggling or big and failing, or owned by minorities or essential to defense. Coal miners are entitled to black lung benefits, whether or not cigarette smoking contributed to their disability. Textile workers say they should be entitled to the same breaks because brown lung disease is just as bad. Victims of other catastrophic illnesses argue that they should be entitled to financial help because kidney dialysis patients get it.

The elderly are entitled to Social Security because the government promised, whether or not they ever paid enough to support their claims. The poor are entitled to first-class health care, because they are poor. The unemployable are entitled to job training because they have no work skills.

Poor, single mothers are entitled to welfare because they aren't married and their children shouldn't be penalized. Teen-agers are entitled to family planning services because they can't wait for marriage.

Oil companies feel entitled to tax breaks because they are oil companies. Former presidents have become entitled to millions of dollars in Secret Service protection and lavish expense accounts because they are former presidents. Members of Congress consider themselves entitled to enormous tax breaks because they make the rules. Business executives are entitled to lavish expense account breaks because they generate business.

Scientists consider themselves entitled to research grants because a few of them might come up with something useful. The unemployed are entitled to compensation because they aren't working. Urban transit services are entitled to federal help so their unions can continue to insist successfully on higher wages.

All in all, current entitlement programs cost the federal government $305.8 billion in 1981 and will increase to $458.9 billion by 1987, even without adding any of the new entitlements for which strong political pressures already exist.

One reason Ronald Reagan continues to be popular, I think, is that he is giving at least indirect recognition to the one entitled group everyone else has ignored: the taxpayers. Their claim to be entitled to a little more of the national pie is based on a very simple argument: They made their money the old-fashioned way. They earned it.●

IDA NUDEL

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1982

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, about 1 month ago I received a letter from Ida Nudel's sister, Elena Fridman, who now lives in Israel. She desperately seeks to be reunited with her only living relative and she wrote to see if I could help. I believe this special order is an excellent way for us to express our disapproval of Soviet actions toward Ida Nudel and I would like to thank Congressman NORMAN LENT for taking the time to organize this event.

It has been 10 years that Ida has tried to emigrate to Israel and still she is turned only a deaf ear from Soviet authorities. Last year she celebrated her 50th birthday in Siberian exile. This month she is scheduled to finish her term in exile. My question to the Soviets today is what is going to happen to her this spring. We cannot allow the Soviets to think that we have forgotten Ida after almost 4 years in Siberia.

For some time now I have admired the courage Ida has had over the last 10 years. But frankly, Ida has more than courage alone. To have survived almost 4 years in Siberia would have to take a supreme desire to live and to be free. As citizens of the United States of America, we must search for and recognize that desire wherever it rests. Even more importantly we should do everything possible to allow that desire to be fulfilled.●

SOCIAL SECURITY COMPUTER PLAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Social Security Commissioner unveiled a 5-year plan to update the social security automatic data processing system. Congressman BILL ARCHER, ranking minority member of the Social Security Subcommittee, and I issued a statement regarding that plan which I would like to share with the Members. The statement follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY COMPUTER PLAN

Social Security Commissioner John Svahn took a courageous step today in putting forward a complex and far-reaching proposal to update the Social Security Administration's antiquated computer system. The mammoth social security computer program was many years ago a showcase of then-modern technology. In hearings before our Subcommittee February 18, 1981, however, four former social security commissioners listed the degeneration of the social security computer system as a major problem in the agency. Today the social security agency is slow to issue social security numbers, years behind in posting wages and in calculating benefit recomputations, unable to perform many needed audits of the rolls, and barely able to perform routine functions such as implementing cost-of-living increases because the computer system is outdated and cumbersomely constructed.

The updating of the social security computers will be a slow, costly process. We simply cannot jack up the old model and put it on a side track and run in a new one. But it is terribly important that we make an effort to update the system at social security. We endorse the concept and applaud the straightforward and open manner in which the Commissioner and the agency are addressing this critical problem.●

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, March marks the 104th anniversary of Bulgarian independence. On that date the Bulgarian people achieved autonomy from their Turkish overlords after a long and brutal struggle. The oppressive character of Ottoman rule was typified by the devshirme, a system which took one-quarter of Bulgarian males—between 10 and 20 years old—away from their families. These children were then converted to Islam and served the empire in an administrative or military capacity for the rest of their lives. The effects of this policy on the psychology of the Bulgarian family and nation can well be imagined.

In April of 1876 the Bulgarian people rose up against their oppressors and revolted. Tragically the rebellion failed and around 15,000 Bulgarians were massacred. The enormity of this atrocity aroused worldwide sympathy for the Bulgarian cause, typified by the British statesman William Gladstone's publication "Bulgarian Horrors." Hence, the world quickly extended de jure recognition to the newly formed Bulgarian States, in 1878, both in the Treaty of San Stefano and the Treaty of Berlin. The new States of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, although free, did not satisfy the Bulgarian craving for unity and merged a few short years later, in 1885, following an upsurge of patriotic fervor in Eastern Rumelia which was climaxed by a revolt. The ensuing years were ones of freedom and hope as Bulgaria severed its ties with its feudal Ottoman past.

The years of independence and liberty came to an abrupt end after World War II. The Soviet Union invaded this small Balkan State and made it a part of its colonial empire. The Soviet actions were particularly reprehensible because Bulgaria, alone among the Axis Powers, refused to participate in the invasion of Russia. In addition, Bulgaria was the only Eastern European country which did not allow the Nazis to exterminate its sizable Jewish population. Unfortunately, justice alone proved insufficient to thwart the Soviet Union's designs, and on September 5, 1944, liberty was dealt a blow when the Red army invaded Bulgaria. A few days later, on September 9 a revolt by the Russian-manipulated fatherland front seized control of the government. The same sad tale of mass arrests and the imposition of a totalitarian environment, which has

plagued all of Eastern Europe, followed as the Soviets installed a new leadership beholden to them.

Bulgarian Independence Day is more than just a tribute to a glorious day in the past. It is concrete evidence that Bulgaria's present day subjugation is not inevitable and will someday end, just as Ottoman rule did. The tanks and bayonets of Soviet power cannot control the hearts and minds of the Bulgarian people and therefore cannot extinguish that nation's longing for freedom and liberty. Let us all remember and commemorate this day so that the Bulgarian people know that they do not stand alone in their daily struggle for individual and national dignity.●

IDA MAYER CUMMINGS AUXILIARY—53D ANNUAL PARTY

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the 53d annual party, and tea dance on Sunday, March 14, 1982, sponsored by the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary of the Jewish Homes for the Aging, tribute will be paid to three giants of humanitarian work: May Mann, Charles "Buddy" Rogers and Rabbi Abram Maron.

For more than 50 years, the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary has helped support the residents of the Jewish Home of the Aged. Through merger with Menorah Village, 700 residents now benefit from the dedication, energy and talents of the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary membership.

May Mann is a noted Hollywood author and columnist. She has continuously drawn on her extensive contacts in the show business, social and civic worlds to arrange celebrity guest appearances at the auxiliary events which have attracted large audiences, generous contributions and new members. Some years ago, the auxiliary established its "May Mann Award" to honor her and to acknowledge others in the entertainment world known for their humanitarian work. Among the recipients have been George Hamilton, Robert Stack, Fred MacMurray, James Stewart, Bob Hope, Jimmy Durante, Jack Oakie, Pat O'Brien, Barbara Stanwyck, Glenn Ford, Joey Bishop, and Rudy Vallee. In 1973 Ms. Mann was honored by the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary with its coveted "Humanitarian Award."

May Mann's philanthropy extends beyond the needs of the Jewish aged. Raised as a Mormon in Utah where her grandfather was one of the presidents of the State's Mormon Church, she has lived by its principle, "never turn down worthy requests for help." She has been recognized and honored for her voluntary civic and philanthropic contributions by the Los Angeles City Council, the city of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, the city of Hope, the Elks Benevolent Brotherhood, the All Youth Symphony, Mount Sinai Hospital and Cedars of Lebanon Hospital; she has received a U.S. Presidential pin and the California State seal.

A Mexican American, May Mann Scholarship was established a decade ago in East Los Angeles.

In her 25 years of leadership in the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary, including the past 3 years as vice president, May Mann has personified its two principal goals—"Honor Thy Father and Thy Mother" and "Cement Friendship Among All Peoples."

Charles "Buddy" Rogers will be honored for more then four decades of continued devotion to the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary and Jewish Home for the Aged.

As a distinguished actor, Hollywood film star and musician, the career of Buddy Rogers includes the 1928 film, "Wings"—the first film to win an Academy Award, musical comedy and dramatic roles, as well as working as a movie producer and band leader.

For 4 years during World War II, Rogers served in the U.S. Navy as a test pilot and in the Ferry Command. He also appeared in many USO shows and fundraising events connected with the war effort. His interest in the Navy continued after the war through service with the Beverly Hills council of the Navy League and his support of both the sea cadet program and the Navy Relief Society. He has appeared many times in the USO Celebrity Golf Tournament for the benefit of servicemen. His civic work was recognized by the city of Los Angeles who presented Mr. Rogers with a certificate of commendation.

Together with his wife, Mary Pickford, who was the auxiliary's honorary chairman from 1939 until she passed away in 1979, Charles "Buddy" Rogers helped create the seven-story Mary Pickford Building on the former eastside site of the Jewish Home, and together they turned over their estate, Pickfair, to the auxiliary for numerous membership parties. After Mary's passing, Buddy Rogers continued his involvement through his many appearances at various auxiliary events and through gifts from the Mary Pickford Foundation which to date total $85,000.

At the event on March 14, Charles "Buddy" Rogers will be installed as the 31st vice president of the auxiliary (succeeding his four decades of service as 32d vice president). He will be honored in conjunction with a special memorial tribute to his wife, Mary Pickford who was known to millions of movie fans as "America's Sweetheart."

Charles "Buddy" Rodgers, through his life and work, has proven that true brotherhood and caring know no boundaries.

Rabbi Abram Maron will be honored as the auxiliary's 1982 "Man of the Year" in recognition of almost a half century of support of the Jewish Home as well as his religious and civic contributions on behalf of troubled youth, the mentally disturbed and the inmates of penal institutions.

Born in Sioux City, Iowa, Rabbi Maron was ordained at the Hebron Yeshiva in (then) Palestine. He came to Los Angeles in 1936 as spiritual leader of Congregation Mogen David—and still serves in this synagogue today. Mogen David has grown from about 30 families to its present 1,300—which is testimony to Rabbi Maron's leadership and influence.

In 1949, Rabbi Maron helped create the Jewish chaplaincy in Los Angeles. His volunteer work has continued on an almost daily basis for 17 years as increasingly he became aware of the value of bringing spiritual counseling and friendship to those in juvenile halls, county jails and mental institutions.

Joining Rabbi Maron on his rounds were many women volunteers and from their activities the Gateways Hospital group was formed. Though the increase demands of his synagogue prevent Rabbi Maron from continuing his daily visits to the forgotten in institutions, his efforts have resulted in rehabilitation of lives and spirits of those who have been reached and touched by this remarkable man.

Rabbi Abram Maron, in addition to being a life member of the Ida Mayer Cummings Auxiliary, has been active in many other religious and community organizations. Among his leadership roles, he has been president of the Board of Rabbis of Southern California, has served on the board of directors of the Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles and a secretary of the orthodox rabbinate.

The love and respect Rabbi Abram Maron enjoys among his congregants extends throughout the entire community. For almost half a century he has been beloved and admired as a gentle, kind, perceptive, spiritual leader who cares for all humanity without regard to color or creed.

I ask the Members to join with me in saluting May Mann, Charles "Buddy" Rogers, and Rabbi Abram Maron for their humanitarian contributions and leadership. We have all benefited from their work and the laudable example of service which their efforts represent.●

DON'T CUT FOOD SHIPMENTS TO POLAND

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for inclusion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding article that recently appeared in the Boston Globe. The article describes a lesson of history which Members of this body would do well to keep in mind as they consider the plight of Poland. When a country is suffering from both a scarcity of food and political strife, food goes to the powerful—in this case the military. This fact is especially disturbing in light of the Reagan administration's decision to halt food shipments to Poland. By denying much-needed food to Poland, this administration is inflicting further suffering on an already beleaguered population.

The article, "Don't Cut Food Shipments to Poland," was written by the respected president of Tufts University, Jean Mayer. I strongly urge my colleagues to read this superb piece and to keep it in mind as they evaluate the administration's policy with respect to Poland:

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 12, 1982]

DON'T CUT FOOD SHIPMENTS TO POLAND

(By Jean Mayer)

American's food surpluses are our most striking resource, one of great strength, and once again we have chosen to exert it by denying food to an adversary, this time the military regime in Poland.

While issuing reassurances that economic life is returning to normal, the government admits that stockpiling of winter food supplies has fallen far short of meeting projected needs.

Yet while we are still debating other economic measures, the President has made the decision to stop all food aid except the small amounts from private sources, on the grounds that we cannot detect whether it will go to the people who need it or to the armed forces. We will not send the $100 million in emergency feed grains that had already been committed, or consider Poland's request for $740 million in food aid over the next year, until the military government drops martial law, frees those imprisoned in the crackdown and restores the legal rights of trade unions.

Where there is money, other sources of supply can always be found, as we learned after the Russian embargo. The Polish government is close to bankruptcy, and we are denying food, not to the people and farmers of an invading nation (however clearly we see the hand of the Soviet Union) but to the Poles themselves, whose cause we are supposedly defending.

A long series of historical examples should have taught us that when a nation is embattled and food is scarce, it will go to those in power, particularly to soldiers. Those who suffer are in every case the most defenseless-babies and young children, pregnant and nursing women, the elderly, the very poor and defiant civilians who have no weapon save their determined resistance to oppression. Armed men never starve.

The hunger blockade initiated by the Allied powers in 1914 to bring a quick end to World War I ended four years later with the military defeat of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Many men in their armies enjoyed better food than they had as civilians, while the war-related civilian deaths totaled well over 700,000.

By the end of the siege of Leningrad in World War II, 18,000 people were dying each day; but the soldiers of the Red Army held the city, and were able to break out of the siege to join advancing Soviet forces.

Finally, we can remember all too vividly the suffering caused by our food interdiction policy in Vietnam, and the total lack of effect on the war's outcome.

The lesson is very clear: whenever there is strife coupled with food shortages and food is denied, the strong will eat and the weak will go hungry.

By cutting off food shipments we are not directly harming the regime but rather the people whose cause we are trying to defend. Further, by continuing to send food to the Soviet Union we are giving them the opportunity and the propaganda advantage of using our grain to feed the Poles. If we are going to embargo food, we should embargo it to both. The net effect of our present policy is that we are feeding the Russians and starving the Poles.

A better and more effective course would be positive, affirmative strategy for the political use of food. During the 1974 world food crisis, there was strong criticism of our continuation of food aid to Egypt, but it paid off handsomely in the friendship for and trust in America that brought Anwar Sadat to Camp David.

Let us by all means use every economic weapon that will strike directly at the Polish regime, that can actually assist our friends. Let us deny the Russians the complex technology their industry (and their armed forces) need, including pipe-laying vehicles, computers, chemicals and oil equipment. But as long as the Polish government or, better, the Church, is ready to distribute food, let us see that they have it to give.

Let us also see that we get full credit for the fact that we are giving. Let us be certain that the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and every other appropriate communications vehicle sends the word: The United States will support the brave people of Poland with the food aid they need to get through the cold winter and the bitter year that lie ahead.●

THE LAW OF THE SEA AND MINERALS VULNERABILITY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation suffers from a dependency of critical minerals—minerals vital to our national economy and national security—far greater than our dependency on energy resources. I am placing in the RECORD excerpts from several articles which address the seriousness of this national problem.

America's dependence on foreign sources for critical minerals demands that Members of the House, the Senate, and the administration speak out strongly and persistently against the Law of the Sea Treaty which will have the effect of maintaining our minerals dependency or increasing that dependency in the future through the political actions of the radical states of the Third World and the Soviet bloc.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union has made known its goal of capturing what Mr. Brezhnev has aptly termed "the two great treasure houses on which the West depends." One of those "treasure houses" is the mineral resources of central and southern Africa. Soviet intentions and purposes in this respect are as openly and blatantly stated as those of Adolf Hitler were before World War II. Few listened to Hitler until it was nearly too late. We must not repeat that error with regard to the imperialist designs of the Soviet Union and its client states.

Mr. Speaker, the rich and abundant minerals—more of which are being discovered daily—of the ocean beds offer minerals independence for the United States and other Western nations, and a vital foil to the Soviet Union's goals of global conquest.

[From the Retired Officer, March 1982]

OUR GRAY WAR WITH RUSSIA

(By Capt. Joseph C. Fox, USCG-Ret.)

Too great a dependence on foreign sources for strategic minerals and fuels causes grave risks to our economy and national defense.

As though awakening to a gray Russian winter morning, we are awakening to a gray Russian war. It is neither black nor white, neither peaceful nor often blatantly hostile, but it is there—ominous, threatening, dangerous. The booty: strategic minerals and fuels. The battlefields are southern Africa and the Persian Gulf.

Vladimir Lenin gave "the war" theological birth. Ever since, the Soviets have sought to deny the West control over economic resources of the Third World—resources our industrialized, democratic nation needs to survive.

MANY MINERALS IMPORTED

All told, 36 strategic minerals are used extensively by U.S. industry for manufacturing. We are critically dependent on foreign countries for over half of these.

Chromium is used extensively in oil refining, the manufacturing of aerospace components, petrochemical production and in stainless steel manufacturing. Yet we must import over 91 percent of all chromium used in this country.

Manganese, a light, strong mineral needed in the manufacturing of steel, is not available domestically. We import all that we use.

Bauxite, the raw material from which aluminum is produced, is imported at the rate of 94 percent.

Cobalt is used in nuclear propulsion systems, jet engines, steel manufacturing and synthetic fuel production. We are totally dependent on imports for this strategic mineral.

And we face ever-increasing demands for defense and energy programs requiring chromium, cobalt and platinum because of their resistance to high temperatures, corrosion and erosion.

Our main suppliers of many of these minerals are the southern African nations—particularly South Africa—a region referred to as the "Persian Gulf of Minerals." In 1973, Leonid Brezhnev warned of Soviet interest in this region, saying "Our aim is to gain control of the two great treasure houses on which the West depends: the energy treasure house of the Persian Gulf and the mineral treasure house of central and southern Africa."

Even though such a blatant comment was widely publicized, the United States has watched with quiet apathy while the Soviets plodded along toward the completion of their goal. So far, the Russians and Cubans have established land and sea bases in Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique and South Yemen, and a marxist government now exists in Zimbabwe.

Dr. James A. Miller, editor of Alarm (Alert Letter on the Availability of Raw Materials) states in an article on strategic minerals that more than 13,000 African military personnel were trained in the Soviet Union between 1955 and 1978. From 1973 to 1977, he notes, Russia transferred arms to 20 nations on the African continent with the largest recipients being Madagascar, Algeria, Angola, Ethiopia and Somalia.

During this same period the Soviet merchant marine, fishing fleet, maritime research teams and navy have continued an unceasing escalation. In July 1976, Admiral of the Fleet Sergei Georgiyevich Gorshkov said, "The strengthening of naval might depends on developing all its components, including the transport, fishing and scientific research fleets, with which military sailors have had a long friendship."

Sen. James McClure (R-Idaho) views with alarm the Soviets' "ever more powerful global fleet," with which they can "interdict tankers carrying oil from the Persian Gulf to the United States . . . ." He continues, "We face the prospect of our supply of many critical minerals being cut off or at least sharply reduced."

Rep. Jim Santini (D-Nev.) has worked five years to bring this plight to the attention of Congress, the Administration and the public. Now the people are listening.

[From Metal Producing, January 1982]

NOW IS THE TIME FOR STEEL TO RALLY AROUND AN IMPORTANT AND VITAL CAUSE . . . MINERAL AVAILABILITY—REPRESENTATIVE JAMES SANTINI

Without adequate and dependable mineral supplies, the most fundamental needs of America's highly interdependent industrial society could not be met. The nation's very life support systems would collapse and the security of the free world would be jeopardized. Without minerals, there would be no materials such as steel to underpin modern agricultural requirements, energy production needs, transportation systems, communication networks and weaponry for national defense.

All of the country's metal producers would be severely impacted by any sudden shortage of critical materials and minerals. This is why the domestic steel sector must realize that the issue of strategic mineral availability should now rate even higher in importance than foreign steel import problems, capital formation measures and environmental considerations.

The consequences of our dependence on foreign oil, which amounts to only about 40 percent, have been felt by all of us. Few people realize, however, that Americans consume an average of 41,000 lb of minerals per person each year.

More specifically, the US imports 91 percent of its chromium, 97 percent of its tantalum and 93 percent of its domestic cobalt needs. Not only are these minerals absolutely necessary for defense-related applications, but their availability is imperative for specialty steel production.

To date, the nation's specialty steel producers have, in fact, been very concerned about mineral availability and have done much to raise the consciousness of key Washington officials regarding this issue. Naturally, the specialty steel sector has a vested interest since they are producing the more exotic, alloyed types of steels mandated by a modern industrial society.

But given the industry-wide push toward more value-added steels, items which will demand additional supplies of strategic materials, now is the time for the entire domestic steel sector to rally around an important and vital cause . . . mineral availability.

Over the past three years, the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, of which I am chairman, has investigated the importance of a long-term national minerals policy. Such a policy is the backbone for a stable economy and secure national defense.

Basically, the Subcommittee examined all aspects of mineral-related issues including public land policies, tax and capital formation, foreign policy and environmental regulations. And we found an interesting contrast between the respective treatments afforded mineral supply and environmental issues.

Over the past decade, Congress has enacted a myriad of "environmental" laws ranging in scope from the National Environmental Protection Act to the Alaska National Interest Lands Act. I could cite at least 12 such laws—all having negative impact on the exploration, processing or manufacturing of minerals or mineral products.

On the other hand, there have been only two principal laws with positive statements for minerals: the 1970 Mining and Minerals Policy Act and the 1980 National Minerals and Materials Research and Development Act. Both laws are excellent legislative expressions of the importance of minerals to our society, but an expression of good intent every ten years cannot eliminate the impact of 12 environmental laws. The country must have a specific permanent policy in place to allow the necessary long-term planning for minerals.

Although I believe the current Administration is sympathetic to this imbalance and understands the significance of a healthy minerals industry, I do not believe a long-term, permanent national policy can be established by administrative changes. Based on my belief and on the factual background gathered by my Subcommittee, I introduced HR 3364, the National Minerals Security Act. The legislation currently has the support of 55 other members of Congress.

Briefly, the bill provides for a Council on Minerals and Materials to be established that will allow an ongoing minerals voice within the executive branch. Currently, there is not one central body to oversee minerals availability; that responsibility is divided between a vast number of governmental entities.

And, with one-third of our land in federal ownership, governmental policies on utilization are important. HR 3364 revises many of those policies to give mineral development equal status with other land uses and emphasizes the important roles of the Bureau of Mines and the US Geological Survey within the Dept. of the Interior.

The legislation is also designed to provide for revisions of the tax laws to assist mining ventures, reform of the regulatory process and to establish improvements in the stockpile program.

CRITICAL MATERIALS: THE PENDULUM SWINGS IN A DECIDEDLY POLITICAL ARC

It's a simple case of the "haves" versus the "have-nots" but with a very unique twist. This time, America has come up short.

Botswana, Gason, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe. The names may mean nothing to you now, but neither, then, did that of the obscure Islamic holy man who held this nation hostage for more than a year with little more than a genius for discord and the rhetoric of hate. Under the Shah, Iran was oil, under Khomeini, an embarrassment. And the US stood helpless.

Like Iran and OPEC, which exploited America's vulnerability in an entirely different arena, the emerging nations of central and southern South Africa are fully capable of playing their own particular brand of social reform and geopolitics. Were they to do so, however, the first hostage taken would be neither a collection of career diplomats not the guy on the gas line, but rather the domestic specialty steel industry and, soon thereafter, the high technology customer base it serves. There's a very real reason this particular part of the globe is being referred to increasingly as the "Persian Gulf of Strategic Metals."

Mineral rich, the five South African nations cited at the top of this column collectively account for 95 percent of the world's chrome, 86 percent of its platinum, 64 percent of its vanadium, 53 percent of its manganese and 52 percent of its cobalt. "Contrast that with the fact that the OPEC nations control 52 percent of the world's oil supply," Eugene A. March, group vice president, Colt Industries Inc, Crucible Materials Group, Pittsburgh, challenged an audience gathered at last year's annual meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute in an address entitled Needed: A National Strategic Metals Policy.

"The problem for us is not so much the availability of these critical raw materials as their accessibility and the reliability of the sources," March zeroes in on what makes the critical materials issue critical.

"Although ample supplies of most raw materials exist," Claude F. Kronk, vice president, Specialty Steels Div., Jones & Laughlin Steel, Pittsburgh, picks up where March leaves off, "many are located in politically unstable areas of the world. As a result, a vulnerability exists for interruptions in the supply line as occured with cobalt because of the conflict in the South African nation of Zaire."●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, last month marked 64 years since the

nation of Lithuania obtained its independence. Just more than 22 years later, the proud and resolute Lithuanians were overrun by Soviet Union forces, which have ruled over Lithuania and her sister republics, Estonia and Latvia, ever since.

To its credit, the United States has never recognized the Soviet conquest of the Baltic States. To this day, we maintain a Lithuanian Embassy in Washington: It is a testimony to our commitment to freedom in the Baltic region and everywhere.

Our basic freedoms are an intrinsic dimension of our everyday existence as Americans. Last Sunday, millions of Americans prayed in the church of their choice, professing their religious beliefs. Just 2 days ago, several student groups protesting higher education cuts outside of this building were filmed on national television; viewers witnessed those students exercising their right to speak out against Government proposals they feel are unfair, as well as the freedom of the people to use the air waves to express their views. We have the right to come and go as we please and to pursue our chosen careers and lifestyles. We have the independence to make our own decisions, both as individuals and, more importantly, as a Nation. Here in America, if we have the inclination to dream big dreams, we have the freedom to make them come true. We must remember how important these rights are. And we must not forget those who are struggling to attain that which we take for granted.

The Lithuanian people have proved themselves to be strong and spirited; they have refused to let the candle of hope die in the harsh winds of reality. At this time of silent celebration for a goal once reached, we join them in commemorating the short-lived freedom of Lithuania, and reaffirm our commitment to assist in their struggle for freedom.●

BROWARD SCHOOL SYSTEM NOW AMERICA'S LARGEST FULLY ACCREDITED SCHOOL SYSTEM

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, only nine school districts in the Nation have more pupils than the school system in Broward County, Fla., which serves the individuals I represent as the U.S. Representative from Florida's 12th District.

I rise today to recognize and applaud the commitment to quality and excellence in education made by this massive school system, which is now the Nation's largest fully accredited school system. Our students are well served by this outstanding system.

All 160 schools and centers in the Broward County School District have been fully accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, as of their last meeting last month; this means that all elementary, middle, and high schools, all vocational and technical centers, all adult education centers, and all exceptional educational centers in the Broward County school system have met the dozens of standards of a quality educational program developed by the association.

Because of this singular and exceptional distinction, the Broward County School Board has proclaimed this school year to be a "Year of Pride," to emphasize the dedication and inspiration which have made this accomplishment possible.

I am pleased to share in this pride, and to encourage and support the system's school-based management, in which principals, teachers, and staff, as well as parents and students, assume the responsibility for meeting the standards of quality education in their own schools.●

HEART AWARD

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to stand before this body today to pay tribute to one of America's most-loved entertainers, now retired from the profession, Harry Babbitt, and his wife, Betty, both of whom are being honored by the Costa Mesa, Calif., Chamber of Commerce with their annual "Heart Award" on March 24, 1982.

Who among us can forget the popular songs of the late 1930's and early 1940's which Harry Babbitt sang for our enjoyment while a member of the famed Kay Kyser Orchestra? Even those who had not arrived in those days will recall the pleasant lyrics of "Three Little Fishies," the toe-tapping melody "I Got Spurs that Jingle, Jangle, Jingle," and the patriotic World War II tune "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition."

What many of us do not know and what I am here to relate is the fine service that Harry and Betty Babbitt have given to their community in their musical retirement, working as a team for countless worthy programs, projects and causes which have contributed to a great extent to the betterment of the area in which they live, and which I have the honor to represent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Harry Babbitt was a key member of Kay Kyser's Kollege of Musical Knowledge, which was one of the hit radio shows on NBC from 1938 through 1944. After a stint in the Navy during the war, Harry hosted a long-running radio show on CBS called "The Second Cup of Coffee," later was on television as singer on two programs, had a recording contract with Decca Records, and was host on the NBC network program "Glamour Girl."

More than 20 years ago, after touring with a nightclub act, Harry and Betty Babbitt settled in Newport Beach, Calif., where he launched a new career in real estate. But it was not long before Harry stepped forward at every opportunity to devote many hours of service to his community.

He has been active in such organizations as the Hoag Hospital 552 Club, the United Way, YMCA, March of Dimes, Spastic League, Child Guidance Clinic, and the Boy Scouts of America. He has received the Silver Beaver Award for service to Scouting, two of his three sons have become Eagle Scouts and he has been a Scout Master.

At the same time Betty Babbitt, the daughter of a Congregational minister, has done more than her share for her community. She has been a Scout Den Mother for each of their three sons, organized and directed three children's choirs at the Brentwood Presbyterian Church, was active in the PTA and was a full-time staff accompanist on the piano and organ at Orange Coast College in Costa Mesa.

The 90-voice college chorale performed across the Western United States and Canada and during this same time, Betty was organist for the Laguna Hills Methodist Church and since 1974 has been active in the music department of St. Andrews Presbyterian Church in Newport Beach, where she also serves as a deacon.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I could search this country far and wide and find no greater example of two public figures who have contributed so much of themselves while raising a fine family during the 47 years of their marriage.

It is most fitting and proper that this body recognize Harry Babbitt and his lovely wife Betty, both of whom have been my good friends for the many years they have lived in the coastal area of Orange County. I praise them for the work they have done and commend the Costa Mesa Chamber of Commerce for its excellent choice of two fine citizens to be given the "Heart Award."●

SALVADOR DALI MUSEUM AND INSTITUTE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1982, the city of St. Petersburg will welcome a unique cultural experience into its midst. The Salvador Dali Museum & Institute, which includes the largest collection of art works by a living artist, Surrealist Salvador Dali, opens on that date with a gala celebration.

The museum will feature, on a rotating basis, 93 oil paintings, 200 watercolors and drawings, 1,000 graphics and sculptures, and a 2,500 volume research library, as well as speakers and films on Dali and Surrealism. Valued at approximately $35 million, the collection was donated to the State of Florida by Cleveland industrialist A. Reynolds Morse and his wife, Eleanor R. Morse, after a Wall Street Journal article about their collection without a home was read by St. Petersburg attorney and newly appointed city councilman James W. Martin.

The city of St. Petersburg, an enthusiastic supporter of this latest edition to its cultural community, provided and renovated a city-owned building on local waterfront property and leased it for 30 years at $1 per year. A $2 million grant from the State of Florida was used to develop the facility and an adjacent park.

A group of community leaders, dedicated to establishing the Dali collection in St. Petersburg, have worked for almost 2 years to realize their dream. The museum site is on Bayboro Harbor, adjacent to the Bayboro campus of the University of South Florida and future plans for the museum include the availability of research, work study programs, and internships to students and faculty of the State university system, which represents nine universities and their branch campuses throughout the State of Florida.

I applaud the efforts of everyone involved in securing this important acquisition and urge both visitors and local community members alike to visit the Salvador Dali Museum & Institute at their earliest opportunity.●

U.S COAL EXPORTS: THE BUYER'S VIEW

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, a substantial portion of this Nation's coal exports goes to the European market and it is expected that the United States will supply even more steam coal to this market in the future. This is beneficial to the Europeans in that they gain a measure of energy security through a stable source from an allied nation, and, it benefits this Nation by creating employment in the mining, rail, and port industries in addition to contributing toward a favorable balance of trade.

Recently, I met with representatives of the Association Technique De L'Importation Charbonniere (ATIC) which buys coal for France. One of the major concerns of ATIC, and of all European buyers, is the ability of this Nation to keep its ports competitive with those of other coal exporting countries. Deeper port channel drafts allow the use of larger coal vessels which can transport coal at less cost. Obviously, this is a factor which coal buyers take into consideration when determining with whom to sign long-term contracts.

Following is a memorandum from ATIC on the issues raised during our meeting. I believe the information contained in it will be of use during our deliberations on port improvement legislation.

ASSOCIATION TECHNIQUE DE L'IMPORTATION CHARBONNIERE (A.T.I.C.), DELEGATION IN NORTH AMERICA,

New York, N.Y., February 24, 1982.

Memorandum on issues raised by Mr. Albert Viala, Vice Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Association Technique De L'Importation Charbonniere, Paris (A.T.I.C.) in Washington on February 4, 1982, in relation to the competitiveness of U.S. steam coals.

1—PAST AND FUTURE SITUATION

1.1 In the year 1980, and especially in 1981, high vessel demurrage, up to $15.00 per ton of coal loaded, for vessels sailing from East coast ports was experienced. This factor had a direct bearing on world prices for steam coal. As a matter of fact, competitors outside the USA have taken advantage of this situation by increasing their sales prices by demurrage we paid in the U.S. without any real justification in any increase in their costs to deliver coal. This demurrage paid to the ship owners has not produced any improvement in the financial condition of the American coal producers, with the possible exception of exports through ports where the waiting time was less than that experienced on the East coast.

1.2 The strong world steam coal demand witnessed during the years 1980/1981 is likely to stabilize in 1982, at a much lower level. Taking into account the present world economic situation we can assume that the future prospects for improvement in exports for the American coal producers cannot be foreseen before the years 1985/1986.

The reasons for this forecast are:

Excess production capacity, the world capacity having been based on inflated consumption prospects made in the years 77-79;

Worldwide weak economy;

Conservation;

The oil glut.

1.3 In the coming 4 to 5 years the American coal industry is going to face increased competition but, in the meantime, it should work very quickly on getting ready for future better years.

2—ATIC'S POSITION

2.1 We are very much in favor of purchases from the USA for the following reasons:

The political situation in the country and the relatively stable labor situation;

No interference on the part of the government on exports and on pricing;

The free pricing situation in the USA, with competition between producers of all sizes, as well as between traders and brokers, is a definite advantage to us. Such commercial freedom in the international coal business cannot be found in all exporting countries by foreign consumers;

Great number of ports.

2.2 Measures likely to improve the competitiveness of American coals to the export markets.

Dredging of channels and ports to accommodate ships of minimum 150,000 TDW drawing 55 feet;

Development of terminals with storage and throughput capacity available for small producers and not only private terminals belonging to and operated by large producers. ATIC is very much in favor of the VSPA project in Norfolk, the port of New York terminal and of the type of terminals in existence and planned in New Orleans;

Opposition to total deregulation of export rates by the railroads;

Close and permanent review of the consequences of the Stagger's Act and its deregulation on the survival of small mines;

Incentives to purchase French manufactured products and equipment in order to improve the balance of trade situation for France (deficit: 1980 FF 24.5 billion/US $5.3 billions 1981 FF 22.9 billions/US $4.2 billions).

About 8.5 million metric tons of coal are to be purchased by ATIC in 1982 for a total value of about 600 million dollars.

N.B. The above considerations regarding ATIC's position on steam coals (part 2) and their competitiveness are also valid for metallurgical coals.●

RESOLUTION SUPPORTS LITHUANIAN LIBERTY

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, last month marked the 64th anniversary of the reestablishment of Lithuania's independence and the 731st anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State.

On that occasion, the Lithuanian Club of Buffalo passed a resolution commemorating these anniversaries and renewing its support for the freedom-loving people of this Baltic nation * * * one of the first victims of Soviet aggression, one of the first captive nations.

By joining in these observances, we continue to signal those working for

freedom inside and outside the Iron Curtain of our continuing support of the proposition that all people should have the right of self-government and self-determination.

The Lithuanian Club of Buffalo resolution was brought to my attention by the club's secretary, Mrs. Akvilina Musteikis, and I would like to share it at this point in the RECORD with my colleagues.

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of The Lithuanian Club of Buffalo assembled this 21st day of February, 1982 at Buffalo, New York to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

That February 16, 1982 marks the 64th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State;

That Lithuania was recognized as a free and independent nation by the entire free world, she was a member of the League of Nations, however, she was by force and fraud occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union disregarding the Peace Treaty of 1920 in which Moscow had guaranteed Lithuania's independence forever and disregarding the Non-Aggression Pact of 1926 with the Soviet Union;

That the Soviet Union is an imperialistic, aggressive colonial empire, subjugating each year new countries; Lithuania was one of its first victims. The colonies of western countries have regained their independence, even underdeveloped nations of Africa and Asia, while Lithuania is still exposed to the most brutal Russian colonial oppression and exploitation;

That the Soviet invaders, even though using tortures in jails, concentration camps, psychiatric wards are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-government and the exercise of their rights to self-determination, as is highly evident from the numerous underground press and strong dissident activities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are grateful to the President of the United States who instructed the U.S. delegation to raise at the Madrid conference the right of the Baltic States for self-determination;

We are grateful to President Reagan and the Department of State for statements that an official diplomatic non-recognition of the forced incorporation into the U.S.S.R. of the three Baltic nations will continue to be policy of his Administration also;

We urge the United States of America and other nations of the free world to use diplomatic and other possible pressures that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, secret police apparatus, foreign administration, and release from jails, concentration camps and psychiatric wards people who struggle for human rights and liberty;

That we express our most sincere gratitude to the U.S. Congress for non-recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and for the impressive annual commemoration of Lithuanian independence.

That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to Senator Patrick Moynihan, Senator Alfonse D'Amato, Congressman Jack Kemp, Congressman Henry Nowak, Congressman Dante B. Fascell, chairman of the Helsinki Committee in Washington, and to the news media.●

REAGAN SHOULD RETREAT FROM STUDENT AID PROPOSALS

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the President recently sent to this Congress his recommendations for spending in fiscal year 1983. Contained within these recommendations are massive reductions for Federal support of postsecondary educational institutions in our Nation.

The Reagan proposal that has received the most notice in the education area is, of course, the drastic cuts in aid to college students. In a departure from over a 25-year commitment to student aid, first stated by President Eisenhower, the President has asked for draconian cuts in vital economic support to students. In my State alone, over 61,000 students would be affected, about 50 percent of all students enrolled in postsecondary programs in Iowa. The need for a well-educated population is greater today than ever. I am especially concerned over the impact of the proposed changes in the guaranteed student loan program, not only is the administration planning to further restrict access to this program by the middle-class undergraduate, but is now including a wholesale exclusion of all graduate and professional students.

The elimination of this program for graduate studies will stunt the training of needed professionals in engineering, medicine, veterinary, dentistry, and law; in short, in many of the professions where the manpower shortage question is just beginning to be addressed adequately.

The commitment to student aid has spanned both Democratic and Republican administrations and has enjoyed strong bipartisan support in Congress. I cannot imagine that today's Congress is willing to turn its back on students wanting to pursue an education, especially in today's troubled economic times when almost half of all American families earn less than $20,000 a year and many of our public 4-year colleges cost more than $4,000 a year. How can we ask these families to spend almost 3 months of their annual earnings—before taxes—to send a student to college?

Mr. Speaker, the proposal to eliminate three traditionally important student aid programs, the NDSL, SEOG, and SSIG programs, is disconcerting. These programs have allowed millions of nontraditional students access to higher education. The wholesale cut of campus-based aid will remove the most flexible means available for student financial aid officers to meet the extreme need of students.

College costs in my home State of Iowa have increased by an average of 35 to 40 percent since 1977. It is unthinkable to inflict this kind of massive reduction on our financial investment in the future of our Nation. To cut student financial aid any further would signal the beginning of an erosive effect on the long-term national commitment to postsecondary educational opportunities. It has been our proud heritage that education should be available to a broad range of our society; unfortunately, the Reagan administration seems to be signaling with these proposals that higher education institutions will once again become the polarized bastions of the very rich and the very poor. We must not and cannot let this happen. We cannot limit the access of the broad middle class to the opportunities of a college education.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to continue the commitment started over 25 years ago, we must maintain access to higher education and demand that the President retreat from his proposals on student aid.

ELECTRONICS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SUPPORTS INNOVATION BILL

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, over the past few days, the Electronics Association of California has been visiting Members of Congress urging them to support H.R. 4326, the Small Business Innovation Development Act. EAC's activity is very significant. The group, which represents over 400 high technology firms in California, not only endorsed the Small Business Innovation Development Act but believes that its enactment is so important that it sent Jim Conway, its president, and Terry Bibbens of Itek to Washington to personally lobby for it.

EAC's action demonstrates how crucial the innovation bill is to America's high technology companies and the position those companies would take if they are given the opportunity to express their views. Oddly enough, the American Electronics Association, which has testified against H.R. 4326, never made the effort that EAC did to poll its members on the bill. The EAC poll, which was completed recently, showed 2 to 1 support among the association's high technology members for the bill.

To those of us who support H.R. 4326, this is a clear sign of the high technology sector's position on this bill. EAC and its president, Jim Conway, are to be congratulated for

their vocal and vigorous support of the bill.

I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement issued by EAC endorsing the innovation bill. In addition, I am including a column that appeared in the San Jose Mercury of February 10, 1982, on H.R. 4326 and the high technology industry.

POSITION OF ELECTRONICS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA CONCERNING SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION (H.R. 4326)

The Electronics Association of California (EAC) represents over 400 rapidly growing high-technology firms in California. Founded a little over five years ago specifically to serve the needs of small and medium-sized high-technology companies, the Association has experienced dramatic membership growth.

The EAC wishes to go on record supporting legislation to encourage and support Small Business Innovation (H.R. 4326 and S. 881). This decision was reached by the EAC Board of Directors after responses to a membership survey reflected an almost 2 to 1 edge (65%) in support of the legislation. Our full membership was polled by the survey (copy attached) after the EAC was asked by various Congressional members and staff to present our views on this legislation. We received written responses from one-third of our members in less than 10 days and the survey results are provided herein.

The thirty-seven page Report issued by the House of Representatives Committee on Small Business clearly identifies, with substantial research and documentation, the potential advantages of this legislation. The key issue addressed was, "Will this legislation, if enacted, effectively aid in the advancement of technology in America?" There is no issue of more importance to the long-range economic and defense strengths of the U.S.

H.R. 4326 and S. 881 are aimed at stimulating innovation in general and at stimulating the technological and innovatively oriented small business sector. Past studies, as reflected in the Small Business Committee report, have shown that (1) small firms with up to 1,000 employees produce about 24 times as many major innovations per R&D dollar as large firms with over 10,000 employees, and four times as many as medium-sized firms, and that (2) the ratio of innovations to sales is one-third greater in small, high-technology firms than in their counterparts.

Assuring this important segment the opportunity to actively participate in the Government's R&D work would prove beneficial to America and properly complement the work of universities, the private venture capital community (short-term commercial dollar return) and contributions by the larger companies in the industry. This legislation would provide a unique opportunity for small high-technology companies to present their products, services and capabilities to the Government. Almost all R&D requests currently advertised by the U.S. Government are stated in terms of requirements defined by the Government program managers, often without a good understanding of capabilities or products available from industry. This legislation will require the Government personnel to review the best innovative ideas presented by small industries and the most advanced work will have a forum for presentation that does not now exist.

Special legislation affecting research and development is not a new concept. In fact, similar laws regarding small business set-asides for production contracts exist today. R&D set-asides for smaller firms will create a more competitive environment to insure that production contracts contain the newest and most advanced technology.

Regarding implementation of the legislation, we suggest the following for consideration:

(1) S. 881 calls for a 1 percent set-aside annually while H.R. 4326 calls for set-aside starting the first year at .5 percent with annual increases reaching 3 percent in 1986. We realize the House and Senate will eventually have to reach agreement on the amount of dollars to be allocated for this program and the 1 percent level seems appropriate to us at this time. Tied to the dollar allocation should be a periodic congressional review of the legislation to insure that the initial objectives are being accomplished.

(2) To minimize abuses of the program we might suggest that SBIR contracts be limited to a small percentage of a firm total sales (i.e. 20 percent for on-going businesses). Further we recommend that firms be limited to 10 percent of the funds of any one funding agency.

(3) It is important that effective implementation of this legislation not be hindered by undue Government regulations. Innovation requires flexibility more so than production contracts. This must be recognized by the program administrators if we are to realize maximum innovation and technological advancement from the legislation.

(4) Government paperwork, desire to overcontrol, added bureaucracy and inefficient administration were the major reasons cited by companies opposing this bill. Since this program is intended to foster development, we recommend the contract reporting mechanism focus on progress of the work and minimize ancillary reports, including financial reports.

Further information may be obtained by contacting: Electronics Association of California, 185 San Gabriel Drive, Sunnyvale, California 94086. Phone: (408) 736-7600 President: James J. Conway.

[From the San Jose Mercury, Feb. 10, 1982]

WHY THE AEA OPPOSES A BILL THAT HELPS 80 PERCENT OF ITS MEMBERS

(By Bruce Entin)

The American Electronics Association is staunchly opposing a bill that would benefit 80 percent of its 1,800 members.

Yes, you read it right. In fact, that controversial stance is causing some dissension among the ranks of electronics executives in Silicon Valley.

Here's the situation.

To help spur innovation, Congress is mulling over a bill to grant more research and development contracts to small companies, including high technology firms in Silicon Valley.

Executives at small electronics companies in California support the bill by a stunning 2-1 margin, according to preliminary findings of a poll taken by the Electronics Association of California, a trade group based in Sunnyvale.

Moreover, this newspaper published a strong editorial last week urging passage of the bill, saying the U.S. would do well to borrow a page from the Japanese book by supporting critical industries.

Naturally, with that backdrop, you'd think the AEA would be leading the drive to get the Small Business Innovation Development Act enacted. But that's not the case at all.

"The proponents of this bill are trying to help young high technology companies. We sincerely appreciate that . . . but please don't do it," pleaded Randy Knapp, president of Wespercorp, a small high tech firm in Southern California. He made those remarks in testimony before the House Committee on Science and Technology late last month.

The AEA believes the bill, which would require federal agencies to set aside a certain percentage of their research and development budgets for small firms, is an affront to the free market system.

Moreover, the AEA claims the program would be a bureaucratic nightmare, cost $193 million to administer through 1986, open the door to abuse and waste and draw badly needed research dollars away from universities.

Ed Zschau, System Industries president who also is running for Congress in Silicon Valley, testified that recent changes in tax laws have generated enormous amounts of venture capital that make such government support unnecessary.

Zschau also is not convinced that small companies have the R&D manpower to handle additional contracts.

If Congress is intent on helping small high technology firms, Zschau would like to see politicians pass R&D tax breaks for startup companies.

But not everybody sees it that way.

Some executives, such as Terry Bibbens of Itek, argue the AEA is speaking for large companies only "I think the AEA didn't solicit their smaller companies, and it's wrong for the AEA to take a policy stand dealing with less government on an issue that affects only small firms," said Bibbens.

The AEA, a Palo Alto trade group, counters by saying its committee of executives from small businesses unanimously opposed the bill.

Bill Byars, president of Viking Labs of Mountain View, believes the U.S. can maintain its technology lead over other countries only by supporting small, innovative companies.

Small companies, Byars says, create 70 percent of all new jobs and countless technological innovations.

The Senate already has passed the bill 90-0 and the House is expected to vote on its version of the measure in March. The Reagan administration supports the more conservative Senate version.

Meanwhile, the AEA is gearing up a massive lobbying effort to defeat the measure, and sources say the trade group already has convinced the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to backpedal on its support of the bill.

Stay tuned.●

COMMITMENT TO SUPPLY DEFENSIVE WEAPONS TO TAIWAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 gives the

full force of law to the American commitment to supply adequate defensive weapons to the Republic of China. As a major trading partner of the United States, Taiwan is a strategically located island. Its survival as a prosperous, viable nation is of obvious importance to the United States.

The subject of providing modern defensive fighter aircraft to the Republic of China of Taiwan was addressed in an article by Prof. Parris Chang, chairman of East Asian studies and political science at Pennsylvania State University, the author of "Power and Policy in China" and numerous other writings on Asian affairs. In light of the recent decision by the administration not to sell these aircraft to Taiwan, I wish to insert Professor Chang's article for the Members attention:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 2, 1982]

WHAT THE UNITED STATES OUGHT TO TELL MR. DENG

(By Parris H. Chang)

After months of debate and indecision inside the government, the Reagan administration has finally decided against the sale of advanced aircraft like the FX to Taiwan, but would allow Taiwan to continue to buy more F-5E fighters. The decision was conveyed to the Chinese leaders recently by Mr. John Holdridge, US assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, who went to Peking on a secret mission. The compromise decision, reached under intense Chinese pressure, has failed to mollify the Chinese leadership, however. During and after Mr. Holdridge's visit, communist officials have reiterated Peking's strong objection to the sale of any American weapons to Taiwan and warned the US of a diplomatic breakdown if the issue is not resolved.

By rejecting sale of the FX to Taiwan, President Reagan has shown considerable sensitivity to the feelings of Peking leaders, even if the move inevitably incurs criticism from some members of Congress who are his key supporters. Yet Peking's continuous intransigence could provoke a US-Sino diplomatic crisis that neither side desires. It is high time that we point out to the Chinese that:

(1) President Reagan has already met China's demand more than half way. As the US President, he has the constitutional obligation to carry out provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act. No president, not even Jimmy Carter, could agree to Peking's demand that the US end all arms sales to Taiwan. Don't push Mr. Reagan too hard, he is not someone who easily knuckles under.

(2) The Reagan administration wants to stand firm against Moscow and project strength and decisiveness in American foreign policy globally. An active, strong and reliable America is in China's best interests. Hence, Peking should not expect the US to bow to China's pressure and still be able to stand up to the Soviets.

(3) For Peking to place the issue of arms sales to Taiwan ahead of the global strategic cooperation against Moscow, especially during the Polish crisis, would make a mockery of all the talk of US-China parallel interests and strategic partnership. This is an opportune moment for chinese leaders to show their statesmanship and prove the "strategic imperative" of a close US-China relationship, lest China's credibility as a valuable partner against Soviet hegemonism be destroyed.

(4) The US does not seek Taiwan's permanent separation from China, nor are the arms sales to Taiwan the cause of such division. The truth is that Taiwan does not wish to be reunified with the mainland, so it has tried to obtain arms to defend itself against a possible use of force by the communists. Hence pressuring the US to end arms sales to Taiwan is not really helpful to the cause of reunification.

(5) China's reunification proposal is a positive step—indeed a highly skillful diplomatic move, as it makes Peking look flexible, reasonable, and magnanimous and puts the nationalists in Taipei on the defensive. The offer to let Taiwan keep its socio-economic system and armed forces is even more reassuring if Peking can convince people on Taiwan of its sincerity. In this connection, Peking's objection to Taiwan's purchase of arms from the US is an enormous political mistake, for it makes the reunification offer an empty gesture. Unless people on Taiwan can feel secure about their life, freedoms, and high living standards, the nationalist government will never respond to Peking's peace gesture.

(6) Besides, if the US ceases to provide selective defensive weapons and Taiwan turns elsewhere for its arms, or if in desperation for its survival Taiwan seeks to develop nuclear weapons, the consequences could be a lot worse.●

THE PLIGHT OF THE FALASHAS

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. LEBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union—as part of their colonialist policy—practices their campaign against Judaism both at home and abroad.

The oppression of the Falasha Jews of Ethiopia is little-known but nevertheless troubling act of anti-Semitism that the world community ought to be more aware of, and concerned about. Benjamin Vinar, who is president of the Queens, N.Y., Jewish Community Council, has devoted a great deal of study and work on behalf of the Falashas of Ethiopia.

The conditions and sufferings of (the Falashas),

Mr. Vinar wrote me recently,

in microcosm, epitomize that European Jewry during the first half of this century.

Like the Jews of prewar Germany and of Nazi-dominated Europe, the Falasha Jews of Ethiopia have no citizenship or protected status of any kind other than as social castaways and scapegoats for governmental misadministration. This is despite the fact that they have been residents of Ethiopia for over 2,500 years. Use of the word "Falasha" graphically denotes their status: "Falasha" means "alien" or "stranger".

In this post-Selassie era in Ethiopia, the Cubans—masterminded, of course, by the Soviets—have established a military beachhead in the country. Ethiopia itself is in deep turmoil due to Soviet-backed forces fighting for absolute control. The governing apparatus of Ethiopia, an open proxy of the Soviet Union, demands that all black Jews of Ethiopia join avowedly pro-Arab, anti-Zionist organizations and even to participate in anti-Zionist activities. Refusal to do so results in arrest and removal from families and even, in some cases, death.

It is my hope that the plight of the Falashas will become better known, and that the public outcry will be so great that the Soviet Union will be forced to leave them alone. It is also my hope that they will find it easier to emigrate, and that the religious beliefs of these poor and oppressed people will be firmly respected.

There are approximately 20,000 Falashas, and a potential holocaust is in the making. But their numbers are not at issue here—these people need action now.●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEWPORT BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was 75 years ago, on March 12, 1907, when a hardy band of 16 men joined to put $5 each into a pot for seed money to start the Newport Beach Chamber of Commerce.

During the early years of Newport Beach, Calif., my hometown in the 40th Congressional District, the chamber was disbanded, reinstated, merged with another chamber and, finally, became the most thriving chamber of commerce in Orange County.

Today a group of 16 founding members has grown to almost 1,500 members, the largest in the county. The organization now known as the Newport Harbor Area Chamber of Commerce, is supported entirely by membership dues and provides an excellent umbrella of activities for the betterment of the community through the work of an excellent professional staff and active members serving on a wide variety of committees and divisions.

I am proud to salute the Newport Harbor Area Chamber of Commerce as it prepares to celebrate its diamond jubilee on March 12, 1982, at breakfast and dinner meetings to be held in the city.

While there are a number of cities in Orange County with greater population and a chamber of commerce representing the entire county, it is a tribute to the movers and shakers of the

Newport Harbor area that its chamber stands head and shoulders above all the rest.

But it has not been easy. After the humble beginnings in 1907, a rival chamber of commerce was formed in the Balboa section of the city in 1919 and this uneasy coexistence continued for several years until a third chamber of commerce was organized in 1923, ostensibly to cover the harbor and its development.

Finally, in 1927 the third chamber went out of business and the two rival bodies joined hands to form the present chamber, at that time operating as the Newport Harbor Chamber of Commerce with the city divided up into six districts, with directors elected from each.

Now the Newport Harbor Area Chamber of Commerce has four main divisions in addition to its committee structure. Each year there is a character boat parade, festival of lights boat parade at Christmas, sandcastle building contest, scholarship and athletic awards program and numerous other activities involving attractions for tourists and recognition of local citizens and young people.

It is my pleasure to call the attention of this body to these activities and to the solid achievements and programs put forth by the Newport Harbor Area Chamber of Commerce, which has set an example all communities should be proud to follow.●

MERIT BADGE FOR TYRANTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in today's RECORD an excellent article by Anthony Lewis which recently appeared in the New York Times, revealing once again the Reagan administration's absolute abandonment of respect for human rights.

Having certified the "good behavior" of El Salvador (while closing its eyes to the massive human rights abuses in that nation), the administration is now preparing to certify that the Government of Chile has made similar significant progress in respect to human rights. This flies in the face of reality; the brutal regime of Gen. Augusto Pinochet is one of the worst human rights offenders in the world.

By certifying that Chile has made progress in respecting human rights the Reagan administration would once again have us become the champions of the oppressors, while making the Soviets the champions of the aspirations of the oppressed. As Mr. Lewis notes in his article, this policy can only have devastating consequences:

This week the U.S. tried to get the U.N. Commission on Human Rights to put a special item about Poland on its agenda—and had thrown back at it the argument that it would be wrong to single out one country.

I commend Mr. Lewis' article to the attention of my colleagues:

MERIT BADGE FOR TYRANTS

(By Anthony Lewis)

BOSTON, February 3.—Having certified the good behavior of the El Salvador junta, President Reagan is ready for the next logical step. Unless there is a last-minute change of mind, he will shortly certify that Chile's dictatorship and its torturers are making "significant progress" in respect for human rights.

Some thought it was Orwellian to give a stamp of approval to El Salvador's armed forces immediately after evidence surfaced that they had carried out another massacre of civilians. To declare that Chile has met the test laid down by Congress for U.S. aid would be if anything more cynical—and more humiliating to the United States.

It would be humiliating because the Chilean Government, over the last six months, has made a point of expressing its contempt for this country's human rights concerns.

Item: Jeane Kirkpatrick, U.S. representative to the United Nations, visited Chile last August to express the Reagan Administration's intention to improve relations. The president of the Chilean Commission on Human Rights, Jaime Castillo, asked to meet her; she said she was too busy. Two days after she left, Mr. Castillo, a distinguished lawyer and former Minister of Justice, was expelled from Chile.

Item: Last Dec. 4 in a U.N. committee Mrs. Kirkpatrick's deputy, Carl Gershman, opposed a resolution to continue paying special attention to the human rights situation in Chile. He said it was wrong to single out Chile. Six days later two other leading officials of the Chilean Human Rights Commission were arrested and held without charges. They are still in prison.

One of the human rights spokesmen arrested in December, Pablo Fuenzalida, was gruesomely tortured. He was seen in a Santiago prison last month by a U.S. visitor, Aryeh Neier of the Americas Watch Committee, a private group that monitors conditions in this hemisphere. Mr. Fuenzalida described what had been done to him.

He was tied, naked, to a metal bedframe. Wires were attached to his legs, testicles and chest. As electric shocks were applied, a man asked him questions about Human Rights Commission, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, politics. Later he was dressed and questioned in front of a movie or television camera; when his answers were not satisfactory, the camera was turned off and an electric prod applied to his body.

When Mr. Neier saw Mr. Fuenzalida, his body showed the effects of trauma. His right side was partly paralyzed, and he could not use his arm sufficiently to shake hands.

Congress banned U.S. arms aid to Chile in 1976 because of the brutal repression there. Last year the Reagan Administration asked Congress to lift the ban. It did, but required President Reagan to certify certain things before arms could be given or sold to Chile.

Mr. Reagan must declare that Chile "has made significant progress in complying with internationally-recognized principles of human rights." He must also find that Chile has cooperated in "bringing to justice" Chilean intelligence agents indicted by a U.S. grand jury for the assassination of Orlando Letelier, the former Chilean Foreign Minister, in Washington in 1976.

It will take even greater cynicism to certify the second point than the first. The Chilean Government has crudely blocked all efforts to extradite the accused conspirators. Last month, in a transparently fraudulent gesture, the Chilean supreme court declared the case still open. But no proceedings are pending or planned.

Despite the formidable obstacle of truth, State Department officials have drafted a certification for President Reagan. There is pressure to hurry because some American companies want to display their products at an air show in Chile next month.

As the examples of Chile and El Salvador show, the Reagan Administration's evident willingness to certify just about anything has the effect of weakening American influence. Gen. Augusto Pinochet, the Chilean President, believes that his Government will not really be called to account, so he feels free to mock the United States on human rights.

The U.S. is also being hurt in international forums. When we opposed the U.N. resolution on Chile, our European allies voted for it and it passed easily. This week the United States tried to get the U.N. Commission on Human Rights to put a special item about Poland on its agenda—and had thrown back at it the argument that it would be wrong to single out one country.

There is reason to think that all this is clear now to the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, Elliott Abrams. But American influence will be restored only if his superiors actually draw the line somewhere. In Chile there should be no certification unless General Pinochet agrees at a minimum to let exiles return and stop official torture. Otherwise the United States will be in the position of demanding decency and then giving a certificate of good behavior to the indecent.●

TRIBUTE TO J. MICHAEL GRAEFF

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the heroic efforts of several individuals, who together may have saved the life of a young man from Berks County, Pa.

On Saturday, February 20, Mr. J. Michael Graeff, of Shillington, Pa., arrived at the scene of an accident and stopped to offer help. A young man, Mr. Michael Zerbe, had been traveling on the road when his auto ran off the highway, hit an embankment, collided into a concrete wall and flipped over. The young man was thrown from the car during the impact and the automobile landed on top of him.

Mr. Graeff's quick thinking and compassion for the accident victim were truly commendable. He immediately ascertained where the victim was, felt for a pulse and recognized the necessity of lifting the car off the

young man. It was at this time, that my son and I arrived at the scene. Together with four other men who stopped to help, we were able to lift the car and pull Mr. Zerbe from the wreckage. At this time, Mr. Graeff administered initial first aid and cleared the victim's throat.

The rescue service then arrived with the police, and Mr. Zerbe, after being given emergency treatment, was taken to the hospital. The efficiency of the police, the southern Berks County paramedics, the Governor Mifflin Ambulance Service, and in particular, a student nurse, Debbie Dark, were outstanding and highly commendable.

All too often our society emphasizes what is wrong in our Nation and points to the lack of compassion for our fellow man. It is times like this, times of people working together, with their only motive a desire to help, that are often overlooked. But it is precisely acts like this which underline the true spirit of America and as such should be recognized.

Unfortunately, I do not know the names of all the individuals involved in this heroic rescue. I consider myself privileged to have witnessed their courage and their willingness to extend aid to one who was in great need. I was particularly impressed by the actions of Mr. Graeff, whose quick intervention was instrumental in removing Mr. Zerbe from underneath the car.

I know that my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to Mr. Graeff, and the other individuals involved, and in sending our best wishes to Mr. Zerbe, for a quick and complete recovery.●

COAL PIPELINES: FREE MARKET COMPETITION

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that coal is the key to America's self-sufficiency in the energy arena. Coal is an abundant natural resource, inexpensive to mine, and when burned with the appropriate environmental safeguards, is safe to the environment.

The most common transportation modes for coal are rail and barge. But clearly, those are not the only ways of transporting coal. Slurry pipelines can facilitate the transport of millions of additional tons of coal for worldwide as well as domestic use, to ease the way for our allies as well as ourselves to freedom from overdependence on petroleum resources. Absent cost-efficient coal pipelines to aid growing coal exports, our allies in Western Europe will feel compelled to rely on the Soviet Union for secure energy supplies.

The only effective alternative to captive rail haulage for long distance transport of coal, in most cases, will be coal pipelines. Without effective competition, the high cost of moving coal by rail over long distances will surely retard coal conversions and future utilization. Regulatory reform has given railroads the rate flexibility needed to make a sound profit. There is every good reason to let the coal pipelines begin to compete. The need for healthy competition is the reason why I have cosponsored H.R. 4230, the Coal Pipeline Act of 1982. This bill, granting Federal eminent domain to coal pipelines, would provide competition and help hold down the cost of electricity to millions of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD a recent article from The Journal of Commerce, dated February 22, 1982, which tellingly demonstrates problems which ensue from the lack of competition.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Monday, Feb. 22, 1982]

MOVEMENT OF COAL BY RAIL HAS PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED

(By Chris Barnett)

Bob Delaney missed the boat—literally. The traffic manager of D. B. Trade recently moved 25,000 tons of coal on the Norfolk and Western Railroad up to Newport News for shipment to Europe, but the unit train wound up six hopper cars short. "The railroad lost them, but it happens all the time," he shrugs. "We can always guarantee they'll lose six or seven cars—we call them stragglers—that don't make the vessel and have to be sold off later."

Mr. Delaney, whose company, a division of Dusseldorf-based Deutsch Babcock International, buys and ships domestic steel and coal to Europe, hadn't found the stray hoppers 21 days after they left the eastern Kentucky mines. But, he's fighting back in one way he figures will make the rails squirm. He's barging coal down the Mississippi River for midstream loading at New Orleans on to charter vessels working out of the Gulf.

Some rails, Mr. Delaney alleges, are killing the golden goose. They have an inability to get the rail cars to the vessel on time, he says flatly. "Plus there is a lack of communication and coordination by the rails."

As he explains it, the railroad issues a permit valid for 15 days to the customer. Theoretically, the train should arrive at Norfolk or Newport News within that time. But if the train does not arrive by that date, chartered vessels at the congested ports are socked with demurrage fees ranging from $10,000 to $12,000 a day.

"The rails don't guarantee anything," he charges. "There is no onus on them to perform. If they don't get there on time, it's just tough luck." If a unit train is short, Mr. Delaney says, he has to scramble and buy hopper cars from other sources in order to deliver the amount of coal that is promised the customer. It's not that easy. "You have to find hopper cars with coal that have the identical specs (specifications and characteristics of the missing coal). What's more, when the stragglers turn up, Mr. Delaney has to find a buyer for them."

"You just can't get information from the railroads. They don't give out car numbers until the stuff is dumped, so you don't know which cars are missing. It's time consuming to trace cars, time consuming to purchase coal from another source." On the other hand, Mr. Delaney points out, "when the system works, it works very, very well. When the system breaks down, it's dreadful."

To cut its losses, D. B. Trade has been shaving the size of its coal purchases. Plus, Mr. Delaney says, there is a "glut" of stokker coal in various parts of Europe, thus causing it to whittle down its shipments. While the company buys coal from eastern Kentucky, Oklahoma, southern Indiana and the Illinois Basin, railed shipments have dwindled to 25,000 tons, 134-car unit trains from 63,000-ton shipments that required 900 car unit trains to move.

"There is so little control shipping in such massive proportions," he sighs. On top of that, Mr. Delaney claims the frequent rate increases and surcharges makes it difficult to "cost/out" the precise price charged for shipping coal by rail.

"It's hard to pin the railroads down because there are so many price fluctuations." The D. B. Trade traffic manager has been slowly switching over to barges. "We're moving the SAE coal by the Louisville and Nashville Railroad to Louisville and Ghent where the train can dump (the coal) into the designated barge."

He contends the barge companies "are hustling for business" and transit costs can be pared. For example, barging coal from Kentucky down the Mississippi to a midstream loading point at New Orleans ranges from $6 to $9 per ton. Barging Oklahoma and Arkansas coal to New Orleans is approximately $7-$9 a ton.

Fierce competition is largely the result of excess barge capacity piled up when the grain trade fell on hard times and did not "take off as projected," notes Mr. Delaney. Shipping out of New Orleans has other advantages. "There is no congestion there compared to Newport News and Norfolk and coal handling facilities are modern at New Orleans," he stresses there are some drawbacks, though. Mr. Delaney concedes coal barged downriver, exposed to natural elements, loses some BTUs. "The exposure to the water increases the moisture content of the coal."

Yet the BTU loss is more than offset by the greater reliability of barging and shipping out of New Orleans plus an overall net reduction in transit time. Barging takes seven to 10 days compared with up to 21 days by rail to get coal to a vessel for loading. Shipping across the Atlantic takes two days longer from New Orleans than from the Virginia ports.

"Actually," says Mr. Delaney, "it could wind up being up to 20 percent cheaper so our European customers don't mind waiting a couple extra days."

As Mr. Delaney puts it, customers would rather know the shipments will take two days longer to make the Atlantic crossing than expect them two days earlier, get ensnarled by port congestion and train delays, and get stuck with unexpected demurrage costs.●

THE INFORMATION AGE SPAWNS THE JOBS OF THE FUTURE

HON. NEWT GINGRICH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, a characteristic of America has always been innovation. Recent innovations in the fields of space, biology, and computer science have thrust us into an exciting era of progress.

While the Japanese and the Europeans may be excelling in managing existing industries, America has long been the leader in developing new industries. That leadership continues with the innovations of the information age.

Time magazine's cover story last week presents a positive outlook for American innovation. Daring men and women still risk pursuing the American dream of owning their own business.

That article follows:

[From Time magazine, Feb. 15, 1982]

STRIKING IT RICH—A NEW BREED OF RISK TAKERS IS BETTING ON THE HIGH-TECHNOLOGY FUTURE

(By Alexander L. Taylor III)

It is among the most durable of American dreams. The young man with a bright idea for a new product or service decides to form his own company. He invests his family's savings in the new venture. He is soon working 18-hour days but does not mind because the company is his own. Sales start sluggishly, and he makes enough mistakes to fill a textbook. Eventually it all pays off. Profits boom; he makes it big. He becomes wealthy beyond his wildest hopes.

That is not just some Walter Mitty fantasy. New businesses are being created in the U.S. today as never before. Last year some 587,000 companies were incorporated, 80 percent more than in 1975 and 53,000 more than in 1980. During the past 18 months, hundreds of people became millionaires or multimillionaires when shares in their new companies were sold to the public for the first time. Among the stock winners: Bill Saxon, 53, of Saxon Oil Co. ($212 million); Philip Knight, 43, of Nike athletic shoes ($178 million); Herbert Boyer, 45, and Robert Swanson, 34, of Genentech ($32 million each).

Some of these successful new capitalists are tinkering innovators in blue jeans, while others are button-down bankers with M.B.A.s. Some are immigrants or the sons of blue-collar workers, while others are from old established families. Most are still little known outside their own fields. Frederick W. Smith, 37, is just another guy named, well, Smith. Yet his company, Federal Express Corp., has become a $600 million firm by delivering packages that "absolutely, positively have to be there overnight," as its ads claim. Nolan K. Bushnell, 39, invented Pong, the first video game, in 1972. He then sold his company, Atari, to Warner Communications in 1976 for $28 million. Steven Jobs, 26, the co-founder of five-year-old Apple Computer, practically singlehanded created the personal computer industry. This college dropout is now worth $149 million.

Even though the U.S. languishes in its third recession in ten years, and industries like autos and steel seem incapable of competing with the Japanese, the bright, bold and brassy risk takers are not only thriving; they are leading the U.S. into the industries of the 21st century. Writes George Gilder, a supply-side theorist, in Wealth and Poverty: "Entrepreneurs are fighting America's only serious war against poverty. The potentialities of invention and enterprise are now greater than ever before in human history."

New companies have become a vital source of American economic growth. According to Stanley Pratt, editor of the Venture Capital Journal, small businesses created 3 million jobs in the past ten years. The largest 1,000 American firms, on the other hand, recorded virtually no net gain in employment during the same period. Says Benjamin Rosen, an electronics industry analyst and a financial backer of new enterprises: "These companies represent the true vitality of the American economy. We are wasting too many of our resources trying to keep alive dying industries like steel and automobiles rather than paying attention to and helping these new firms."

The odds against success, of course, are high. In 1981 the number of U.S. business failures was 45% higher than 1980, reaching a 20-year high of 17,040. Indeed, only one in ten investments in a new company may ever return a profit. Investors are already wondering whether the early promise of some gene-splicing firms will pay off.

Nonetheless, its entrepreneurial spirit is perhaps the greatest advantage the U.S. has in the highly competitive world marketplace. Neither Europe nor Japan has a strong tradition of adventurous small businessmen starting up their own firms, and neither has matched the American record for developing revolutionary new products. Financial backing for such ventures in Europe is more difficult to get. Says Alan J. Patricof, who is forming a British venture-capital fund: "The attitude in Europe has been much more paternalistic. Stories about big killings by 26-year-olds just aren't known."

Japan is skilled in the mass production of high-quality goods and has become a formidable competitor in established industries like memory chips and home electronics. But Japan encourages corporate development at the expense of individual initiative. Says Kenji Tamiya, president of Sony Corp. of America: "Japanese society is more highly organized, and big organizations tend to avoid risk. Particularly in new fields like personal computers or video games, you must take risks and make decisions quickly. This gives the U.S. an advantage."

Only a few years ago, American risk taking almost dried up. In 1969 Congress increased from 25 to 49 percent the maximum tax on long-term capital gains—the profit made by an investor on the sale of stocks, real estate and other property. The effect was devastating. The amount of money that Americans were willing to gamble on a long-shot business dropped sharply. In 1969, $171 million was amassed in venture capital. By 1975 the amount had fallen to just $10 million.

In 1978, however, Congress rolled back the capital gains tax rate to 28 percent. With the potential payoff increased, investors were again willing to take a risk. Last year $1.3 billion in venture funds was accumulated, more than 100 times the amount of only six years earlier.

Throughout American history, the nation's entrepreneurs have been the catalysts that sparked the formation of new industries. Three of those pioneers:

In 1813, Francis Cabot Lowell, a Boston merchant, created the first modern textile factory to combine yarn spinning and cloth weaving under one roof. He traveled to Britain to study established operations, took on some partners and raised $400,000 in venture capital from family and friends. Lowell then sold his cloth through a few large wholesale outlets in New England. He added to his profits by selling copies of the machines he developed to make the cloth. By 1817 his business had annual sales of more than $34,000, and Lowell paid his investors a dividend of 17 percent.

George Westinghouse, the son of a farm-equipment manufacturer, speeded the growth of two modern industries. The air-brake that he invented in 1869 at age 22 made high-speed railroad travel safe for the first time. Then, 17 years later, he formed the Westinghouse Electric Co. to develop alternating current and make the first big generators and transformers. These made possible the wide-scale use of electricity. By 1900, Westinghouse's enterprises were valued at $120 million and employed about 50,000 workers. Then, as now, risk takers can run into trouble. Westinghouse was forced out as head of the companies during the financial panic of 1907.

Edwin Land, a tinkering scientist, founded the Polaroid Corp. in 1937 to make nonglare lenses. In 1948 he marketed a new camera that could produce pictures immediately. Competitors like Eastman Kodak thought it was a gimmick, but the product was an overwhelming success and opened up a whole new industry. When Land retired as head of the company in 1980, he had accumulated Polaroid stock worth more than $75 million.

Certain regions of the U.S. have always seemed to lure venturesome people more than others. At the beginning of the 20th century, many automotive pioneers came to Detroit. There they found a deepwater port and a good railroad system that gave access to supplies of coal and iron and a convenient way to ship their new cars back to local markets. They also found a prosperous wagon-making industry with a pool of skilled craftsman, as well as a bustling atmosphere that encouraged innovation and manufacturing.

In today's high-technology industries, proximity to raw material or water transportation is not as important as it was for the auto industry. The entrepreneurial spirit now seems to flourish best near universities. There companies just getting started can find research help for their projects. In addition, discoveries made in laboratories frequently have a commercial application in new products.

One such place is Minneapolis. Engineering Research Associates, a pioneering computer company, was founded there in 1946. After the firm was absorbed by Sperry Rand, William Norris, one of its founders, left to start Control Data Corp. in 1957, which he financed by selling 615,000 shares of stock for $1 apiece. Today a share of the original stock is worth $324. Another alumnus of Engineering Research was Seymour Cray, who built the world's fastest computers at his company, Cray Research. Both firms thrived in the Minneapolis area, and many other high-technology companies have sprung up near by, where they have benefited from a steady supply of new engi-

neers from the University of Minnesota and an established system of local financing.

Other pockets of entrepreneurial activity are found along the Boston beltways of routes 128 and 495, at the foothills of the Rocky Mountains in Colorado, and to the north and west of Dallas. Several former employees of Dallas-based Texas Instruments have set up their own companies specializing in communications, including Digital Switch Corp., Intecom and Danray. Gordon Matthews, 45, worked for IBM and Texas Instruments before starting companies of his own. His third and latest venture is ECS Telecommunications, which sells a computerized system that stores and transfers messages by telephone. Last year the three-year-old firm had sales of $4 million, and Matthews bullishly says they could double this year.

The most explosive area for growth companies today is south of San Francisco Bay in a 250-sq.-mi. area in Santa Clara County, where orchards of apricots, prunes and cherries were once a main source of income. Tiny semiconductors made with chips of silicon that were first manufactured there at the end of the '60s gave the region its nickname—"Silcon Valley." Growing up alongside the semiconductor companies in such towns as Sunnyvale, Los Altos and Cupertino are a host of new, high-tech industries. Says Michael Shields, a catalogue marketer in Palo Alto: "Living here is like riding in the nose cone of the space shuttle. We're riding into the future."

A range of other industries is also growing up in the region. Some say it should really be called the Siliclone Valley because of the 16 genetic-engineering companies now located there. Robert Swanson, an M.B.A. from M.I.T. and Biochemist Herbert Boyer, for example, started Genentech. Collagen Corp., a biomedical products company in Palo Alto, makes a biological implant called Zyderm, which helps remove the effects of scars from the human skin. Companies like Coherent Radiation in Palo Alto are doing pioneering work in the industrial use of lasers.

There are now no fewer than 786 electronics firms in the fertile valley at the foot of the Diablo Range. In 1980 they produced $8.7 billion worth of goods. The American Alliance for Innovation now gives two-day seminars on marketing strategies and venture capital for hopeful entrepreneurs. Says William Hambrecht, a San Francisco investment banker whose firm, Hambrecht & Quist, helped launch Apple Computer and Genentech: "Being a successful entrepreneur here is one of the most privileged positions in today's world."

The mere presence of so many profitable businesses leads to the creation of still more companies. The entrepreneur has become the local cultural hero and role model, just as movie directors are in Los Angeles or oil drillers in Houston. Nearly everybody knows someone who left a company and started up his own.

David Steininger, 33, a graduate of Purdue University, is currently a project manager with Palo Alto's Electric Power Research Institute, an energy think tank. Says he: "I want to make my own mark and do something that has a lot more challenge. If you can't win a Nobel Prize, the next best thing is to start your own company." Steininger is thinking about forming a firm that will develop new oil-recovery technology.

One secret of the valley's success is a well-developed business network. An informal group of experienced executives, consultants and development services has sprung up to help start new businesses and then help them manage rapid growth. With a couple of local phone calls, a budding businessman with the right ideas can round up $1 million in venture capital in a day. Says British-born Adam Osborne, 42, who has already accumulated $70 million in orders for his year-old personal computer company, Osborne Computer Corp.: "Every single thing we need is within an hour's drive for us."

Just as important as the network is the attitude of businessmen and backers toward infant enterprises. They see failure as a demonstration of an adventurous intellect, not as a shortcoming. Says Gordon Moore, 53, the chairman of Intel Corp., a major semiconductor manufacturer: "Even when someone starts a company and fails, he'll be more valuable than someone else the next time because of his business experience." The result is an effervescent creative spirit that bubbles like California's best sparkling wine. Says Dallas-based L. J. Sevin, managing partner of Sevin Rosen Partners, which invests heavily in the new firms: "Between 60 and 70 percent of the most interesting ideas for new companies come out of the Bay Area."

Stanford University, near Palo Alto, was the source of much of the valley's spirit and success. Two Stanford graduates, William Hewlett and David Packard, opened a small company not far from the campus in 1939. Hewlett-Packard is now the area's largest electronics employer and a leader in computer-based technologies. Moreover, many of its employees have left the company to start a host of new businesses. Among the most successful: Apple Co-Founder Stephen Wozniak and Tandem Computers' James Treybig.

Other firms were started by Stanford University professors. William Shockley, co-inventor of the transistor, taught electrical engineering at Stanford. Eight alumni of Shockley Transistor Corp., which he founded in 1956, went on to form Fairchild Camera and Instrument, which launched the microchip industry. Some 53 so-called Fairchildren who left the firm have started their own semiconductor companies.

The adventurous businessmen of Silicon Valley also created a style of management that is likely to have a strong impact on business in other parts of the U.S. Executives in the valley face a few acute problems because of their highly competitive environment: keeping workers satisfied in order to reduce job hopping, and maintaining the small-company entrepreneurial spirit as firms grow larger. Experienced technicians are in short supply and can easily win large salary increases and hefty bonuses by changing employers. Executives are also fearful that as their firms expand, they will lose the ability to respond quickly to changing market conditions and new technology.

ROLM Corp. in Santa Clara, a manufacturer of computerized telephones and computers for the military, has been a pioneer in developing a new corporate life-style that encourages worker loyalty and innovation. The company built a $1 million sports complex at its headquarters that is used by two-thirds of the staff members. They can stretch their muscles on Nautilus bodybuilding equipment, take lessons in aerobic dancing and Kung Fu and then relax in a Jacuzzi or a tanning parlor.

To keep workers intellectually fresh, ROLM gives each employee three months of paid time off for every six years of service. Most people use the time to travel. One engineer crossed the Sahara Desert during his sabbatical, another trekked to Mount Everest. Says Executive Vice President Robert Maxfield: "When our people return from sabbaticals, they bring back a fresh attitude. They don't settle into the old ways of doing things."

At Tandem Computers, which built the first fail-safe computer systems in 1974, employees gather every Friday afternoon with President Treybig, 41, for a beer party around the company swimming pool. The sessions help keep everyone informed about what is happening inside the company. Other companies in the valley have started similar gatherings.

Another way to keep creative workers from wandering is to give them a stake in the company. Tandem widely distributes stock options to employees at all levels so that they can participate in the growth of the firm. So far 25 of Tandem's 3,000 employees have earned $1 million through company stock ownership, 100 have earned $500,000, and 1,000 others $50,000 each.

Sudden wealth can transform the way the entrepreneurs live and work. A few unabashedly flaunt their new riches. W. J. (Jerry) Sanders III, 45, who delivered milk and dug ditches while growing up in Chicago, started Advanced Micro Devices, an early semiconductor manufacturer, in the dining room of his home in 1969. Today he owns houses in the Bel Air section of Los Angeles and in Malibu, and has a Bentley, a Ferrari and a Rolls-Royce. A year ago, Sanders rented San Francisco's Civic Center to treat 7,000 workers to a $350,000 party. Atari Founder Nolan Bushnell owns two yachts: the 41-ft. *Pong*, which he has lent to a friend, and the 44-ft. *Sea Rat*, which he uses himself.

Many young risk takers regard their accumulated wealth as a yardstick of success rather than as an end in itself. K. P. (Phil) Hwang, 45, emigrated from Korea in the early '60s and worked as a busboy and waiter while attending Utah State University. In 1975 he used $9,000 in family savings to found TeleVideo Systems, a company that makes computer screens and keyboards. Although Hwang is now a multimillionaire, he says that his wife still fusses over utility bills and turns down the thermostat at home.

A few serpents, however, have begun to crawl into northern California's economic Garden of Eden. Though renowned for their liberal personnel policies, some Silicon Valley employers are under attack for their treatment of hourly production workers. Assembling circuit boards or inspecting chips is a tedious dead-end job that has attracted thousands of Mexicans, Filipinos and Vietnamese immigrants. Many earn wages of less than $5 an hour, low by industry standards.

In addition, the blue sky and open spaces that attracted the area's pioneers 25 years ago are now becoming obscured by industrial parks and a thin layer of smog. Crime is on the rise. The theft of computers and semiconductors has become an estimated $20 million-a-year problem. Housing is scarce and expensive. The price of an average home in Santa Clara County is now $128,484.

One result is that some Silicon Valley companies are looking around the U.S. when they want room to expand. Many states, in search of industries that are clean, fast-growing and pay good wages and fringe benefits to skilled workers, would like to at-

tract such companies. North Carolina is spending more than $24 million to build a microelectronics center near Durham in what is called the Research Triangle.

The spirit and support structure of the risk culture can be hard to duplicate. Starting a successful new business requires a unique combination of characteristics that has little to do with geography. John Welsh and Jerry White of Southern Methodist University's Caruth Institute of Owner-Managed Business have studied the personality traits of risk takers. Chief among them are self-confidence, vision and the need to be in charge. Indeed, many have been frustrated at larger companies. Says White: "Entrepreneurs have a fundamental need to control their own destiny. Seldom can they find this in someone else's organization." Although most entrepreneurs have worked for large corporations, they usually stayed only a short time.

Headstrong and independent, risk takers are rebels with a cause—themselves. William F.X. Grubb, 37, left Atari, the successful manufacturer of home video equipment, and formed Imagic, which makes video game cartridges and hopes to have sales of $25 million or more this fiscal year. Says he: "Entrepreneurs want to be able to test their abilities and see how far they can go. It's the ultimate report card." That same pioneering spirit can make these businessmen hard to live with. Many are workaholics who lock themselves up in their offices for long stretches and have little tolerance for socializing.

One Wall Street adage has it that if a person has not made his first million dollars by the time he is 30, he is never going to make it. In 1776 Adam Smith wrote that it was young people who had "the contempt of risk and the presumptuous hope of success," precisely the skills needed to found new businesses. Indeed, a large number of entrepreneurs have achieved success at a very early age. One of many examples: William Gates, 26, dropped out of Harvard in 1975 during his sophomore year to form Microsoft, which makes software for personal computers. Its 1981 sales: $15 million.

Patrick Liles, a former Harvard Business School professor now with the Charles River Partnership, a Boston venture capital firm, says that the best time for a businessman to start a company is between the ages of 26 and 36. Says he: "Earlier than that, a young person lacks business experience, competence and self-confidence. And by his late 30s or early 40s, the person is usually too embedded in his corporate career or facing too many financial commitments to take a chance."

In some exceptional individuals, however, the entrepreneurial spirit never ages. Henry Kloss, 53, founded his first company, Acoustic Research in Cambridge, Mass., at the age of 22. It made stereo speakers, and he eventually sold it to his partner. Headstrong and impulsive, Kloss has since gone on to establish three more home electronics firms, including Advent, which is now in receivership. His latest is Kloss Video, which makes large-screen-projection TV sets and was started in 1977. But Kloss may now be too tired for another new venture. Says he: "Each one of those enterprises started with a bare room, and I don't have the heart for it again."

Entrepreneurs like Kloss often move restlessly from one field to another, starting new companies like an industrial Johnny Appleseed. S. Allan Kline, 61, is a physicist by training, so it is not surprising that he helped found Xicor, a company that makes memory chips for computers. Less expected was his development of a nutritional snack. New Generation Foods, which he founded in 1977, last year sold $3.6 million worth of Spicer's WheaTwists, a low-calorie, high-protein snack chip. Quips Kline: "I'm in the chips business: one edible, one inedible."

A few risk takers are immigrants who came to America to reap the benefits of its entrepreneurial climate. Sirjang Lal Tandon, 39, left his native India in 1960. In 1975 he founded a firm that makes disc drives for personal computers that are sold by Radio Shack and other companies. Last year his firm had sales of $54.2 million. Jesse I. Aweida, 50, the Palestinian-born founder of Storage Technology in Louisville, Colo., turned the computer memory company into a $922 million-a-year business. Both Altos Computer Systems in San Jose, Calif., and Osborne Computer Corp. in Hayward, Calif., were founded by businessmen who had moved to the U.S. from Britain.

The very factors that make entrepreneurs successful in starting companies can lead to problems later on. Frequently egotistical, the upstart executives seldom admit failure and sometimes refuse to share responsibility or hire good people to help run the company. A crucial turning point comes when a new enterprise reaches sales of about $250 million. In some cases, like that of Engineer Kenneth Olsen of Digital Equipment Corp. in Maynard, Mass., the innovative founder develops the managerial skills to run a large, complex organization. In other cases, the entrepreneur gets in trouble and must get help from professional managers. Centronics Data Computer Corp., a New Hampshire maker of computer printers founded by Robert Howard in 1968, ran into financial problems in 1980. Managers from Xerox and Raytheon were brought in to help. Losses ran to $24.5 million on sales of $123.9 million from June 1980 to June 1981. The company has signed an agreement with Control Data that could bring in $25 million in new cash, and Howard may be forced to step down as chairman.

Sometimes a company's backers insist on professional management from the start. David Lee, 44, of San Jose, invented a high-speed printing system, known as the daisy wheel, which is now widely used in office machines. In 1973, when he started his own firm. Qume, in Silicon Valley, he and his backers agreed that an outsider should be head of the organization. Robert Schroeder, a Harvard M.B.A., then came in to run the company.

Once the risk takers have established their firms and developed new customers, they face inevitable challenges from older and bigger companies that are attracted to the growing markets. The semiconductor industry shows what can happen. Intel in Santa Clara invented the first memory chip in 1968. Then American giants such as Motorola and Texas Instruments jumped into the market. After them came the Japanese, who now control 40 percent of the business for the most popular size, the 16K memory chip.

Partly as a result of this increased competition, Intel sales fell by $66 million last year, and its profits were down 72 percent. National Semiconductor, whose earnings dropped from $30.2 million to $1.2 million during the last half of 1981, has halted construction of a plant in Arlington, Texas, and last year asked its employees to take twelve extra unpaid vacation days.

Intel President Andrew Grove predicts that his and other semiconductor firms can defeat the Japanese challenge. Says he: "Our industry is in a critical stage of development, with our market under attack. We are now fighting a vicious assault; but so far as I am concerned, we will succeed."

That kind of can-do confidence has always been the hallmark of American entrepreneurs. At a time when the U.S. sees its economic power eroding, these businessmen are a unique source of strength. They are pioneering new industries in telecommunications, bioengineering and lasers. They are providing U.S. business with a fresh burst of energy. Says Arthur Levitt Jr., chairman of the American Stock Exchange: "If there is any hope for our economy, it rests with these people. They are the most challenging, irreverent bunch around." They are also the bunch leading the U.S. into the high-technology future.●

89-059 O-85-16 (Pt. 3)

IDA NUDEL

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1982

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support legislation which I have cosponsored expressing the sense of Congress for Soviet religious freedom and the right of its citizens to emigrate, and to participate in the World Day of Protest on behalf of Ida Nudel, the "Guardian Angel of Moscow," who has been serving a 4-year sentence in exile in Siberia.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Soviet Union continues to discriminate against and persecute religious minorities, denying them the right to practice their faiths and subjecting them to physical and psychological harassment, including imprisonment, beatings, confinement in mental institutions, and separation from family members.

Soviet Jewish emigration, which the Soviets promised to freely allow at Helsinki in 1975, has plummeted from 51,320 in 1979 to 9,447 last year. Each month since August 1981, Soviet Jewish emigration has been at the lowest levels of the 11-year history of the movement.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 373 urging the Soviet Government to cease religious persecution and to comply with its obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Helsinki Final Act, and the constitution of the U.S.S.R. and calling upon the President to impress upon the Soviet Government this country's strong opposition to its policy of persecution. The resolution also reminds the Soviet Union that the United States considers compliance with commitments under international law when evaluating relations with other nations. In addition, this legislation requests the President to send the

U.S. delegation to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights meeting in Geneva this month with a message that the Soviet Union should respect the rights of its citizens to practice their religion and end the triple assault of declining exit visas, escalating harassment, and increasing attacks on Jewish self-study groups.

America has long been a symbol of freedom for all oppressed people, and it is appropriate for the United States to speak out against religious persecution and for the Congress to support House Joint Resolution 373.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the case of Ida Nudel is a symbol of countless individuals in the Soviet Union who are struggling against religious oppression and persecution to exercise their basic human rights. Ida Nudel was born on April 27, 1931. An economist and a resident of Moscow, she made here first application for an emigration visa in May 1971. The request was refused on the trumped-up charge of "State Secrets." At that time, she began her efforts to care for and support Jewish prisoners who had been jailed for their beliefs. Her years of effort on their behalf earned her the title of "Guardian Angel of the Prisoners of Conscience." They also earned her the attention of the Soviet Secret Police, the KGB.

For 7 years, Ida Nudel was subjected to repeated harassments, interrogations, and a false press campaign that sought to brand her as a criminal. Finally, on June 1, 1978, Ida Nudel was arrested on charges of "malicious hooliganism." Her crime was to hang a banner outside her Moscow apartment that read: "KGB, Give Me My Visa." After a trial in which she was allowed neither representation nor witnesses to testify on her behalf, she was sentenced to 4 years in internal exile.

She has since been confined to a small village in the bleak Siberian wasteland. She is the only Jewish woman now held as a Prisoner of Conscience in the Soviet Union. Her courage, determination, and spirit are unsurpassed. She has declared:

No matter how I am tormented by the chastisers or after I cried out of weakness, loneliness and seemingly senselessness of my present life, I do not regret and I do not denounce any of my actions. But if our suffering will not force every one of you to rush to help us, then it is in vain.

Mr. Speaker, let Ida Nudel's suffering and efforts not be in vain. Let us condemn the Soviet Union for their continued violations of their citizens' basic human rights. I urge my distinguished colleagues in the strongest terms to support House Joint Resolution 373 and to continue to voice at every possible opportunity the sense of this Congress that the Soviets should respect the rights of its citizens to emigrate and to practice their religions. We must not stand idly by or Ida Nudel's suffering will be for naught.●

THE F/A-18: $40 BILLION FOR THIS?

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the Navy admits that the F/A-18 will cause a reduction in the offensive (attack) capability of our carrier aviation but claims that its defensive (fighter) capability will be essential for our fleet in the late eighties. At a time when the Soviet fleet is reaching unprecedented strengths, the U.S. Navy is proposing to reduce our ability to clear the Soviet threat from alliance sea lanes.

The F/A-18 does have a fighter capability of sorts. However, any fighter must be judged by its capacity against its most likely opponent. In the case of the F/A-18, this means a comparison with the new Soviet air superiority fighter, the Mig-29. Comparative performances of the two aircraft are:

	F/A-18	Mig-29
Range (nautical miles):		
Air to air	380	432
Air to surface	670	594
Ceiling (feet)	59,000	65,000
Maximum mach:		
Altitude	1.82	2.3
Sea level	1.05	1.20
Maximum turn rate (o/sec):		
Instantaneous	15.26	16.8
Sustained	8.01	[1] 8.25
Thrust/weight ratio	1.10	1.3
Radar range (nautical miles):		
Look up	28	25
Look down	21	13
Missiles:		
Visual	2	2
Beyond visual range	2	4

[1] Approximate.

From the table, it is apparant that the F/A-18 is slower, is less maneuverable, and climbs less rapidly than the Mig-29. It also has a shorter range. By backing the F/A-18, the Navy is backing a sure loser.

Not only is the Navy backing a loser, it is unwisely gambling a vast amount of money on the aircraft. The selected acquisition report, due in mid-March, will show a total program cost of $39.725 billion—or an increase of over $4 billion over previous estimates. Last August, Secretary of the Navy Lehman said that any further cost increase in the F/A-18 would lead to a reevaluation of the program. The cost increase has occurred, but there is no sign of Navy reevaluation of the program. Instead of a reevaluation, the Navy continues to dig in its heels.

In January, a F/A-18 lost a wheel on takeoff. Navy public affairs tried to blame the resulting accident on "pilot error." It is hard to conceive that any but a last ditch defender of the F/A-18 program would call equipment failure "pilot error."

It was not the pilot, the whole U.S. Navy has made an error. Now is the time for the Navy to get off the F/A-18 bandwagon. To cancel the F/A-18 now would cut our budget deficit by $2 billion in fiscal year 1983 without harming national security. If the Navy will not accept the need for fiscal responsibility, then Congress must insure that the Navy is brought to its senses.●

FREEDOM FOR IDA NUDEL

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1982

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, Ida Nudel, one of the bravest and most heroic of Soviet Jews, is scheduled for release from internal exile this month. I rise today to help impress upon the Soviet Union that people around the world are watching and waiting for Ida Nudel's release.

However, simply releasing her from internal exile will not silence Ida Nudel. She was jailed for actively desiring to emigrate to Israel, and almost 3 years in captivity have not extinguished her desire. Her own words express this most powerfully:

No matter how I am tormented, how weak I am, how lonely or senseless my present life, I do not regret or renounce any of my actions. We believe our suffering is not for nothing, and this belief keeps us from despair. I believe that some day I will walk up the steps of an El-Al aircraft, and my suffering and my tears will remain in my memory only, and my heart will be full of triumph. I grant that it will happen soon.

The right to emigrate is protected, in word, by international law. Indeed, however, that right is often denied. Ida Nudel and her supporters will not stop speaking out until she is granted the permission to emigrate which is due her under international law.●

REAGAN'S CONTRADICTORY POLICY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision by the administration to cover the loans made by the Polish Government from U.S. banks is a matter of great controversy. In my judgment, there was no good reason why the U.S. Government should take the pressure off the martial law regime in Poland by altering the normal loan guarantee requirements.

When Poland's debt installment of $70 million to U.S. banks came due recently and Poland could not pay, the banks to whom the debt was owed should have, as the Credit Commodity Corporation requires, aggressively sought payment from Poland. Instead, the Agriculture Department paid the bill.

This contradictory policy was discussed in an article by Chicago Sun-Times columnist, Otis Pike in his column of February 8. I wish to insert his commentary at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Sun-Times, Feb. 8, 1982]

SAFETY NET CATCHES TRULY NEEDY BANKERS

(By Otis Pike)

WASHINGTON.—The Reagan administration's vaunted safety net for the truly needy finally saved some folks last week. Those who had been suspicious that the mesh on the net was so large that a lot of little people were falling through can take comfort in the fact that at least the net catches the big ones. Last week the administration rescued such needy citizens as Chase Manhattan, Morgan Guaranty, Citibank and Bank of America.

These banks, and many others at home and abroad, had lent a great deal of money to Poland. Some $71 million of it was due last month, and Poland couldn't pay.

In the context of a $700 billion budget, or even a $100 billion deficit, $71 million doesn't amount to much. That, however, is only the January payment. Poland will owe an additional $53 million this month, $51 million in March, and so on to a total of $397 million this year. In all, Poland owes $1.6 billion to U.S. banks. Poland hasn't got it.

There is no question that the federal government had to make good to the banks for the principal on the loans. The loans were made to help Poland buy U.S. grain and were guaranteed by the Agriculture Department as much to help U.S. farmers as to feed Poland. The guarantees, however, cover the principal. The bankers, like needy bankers everywhere, want to collect all the interest, too. Here is where the good old safety net came into play.

If you or I or anyone else couldn't pay off what we owed to the bank, the bank would say we were in default, foreclose on the mortgage, grab the car and the TV and garnishee our salary. If the house and car and the TV didn't bring enough to satisfy the debt, the bank would lose money, and bankers hate losing money more than anyone.

Poland doesn't have enough cars and TV sets or even ships lying around the United States for the banks to grab, so the banks didn't want to say Poland was in default, even if it is. Once the banks tell the Agriculture Department that Poland has defaulted, they could kiss their interest goodby.

At the highest levels of the Reagan administration, a lovely fiction was created for the banks. Instead of the banks telling the Agriculture Department that Poland had defaulted, the Agriculture Department told the banks it would pay off the loans even if Poland doesn't default. If Uncle Sam paid off the principal, maybe Poland could get up the interest, and everyone would be happy, especially the banks. Taxpayers don't count.

A few years back, there was a cult for a left-handed ukulele player who called himself Tiny Tim and made a career out of singing in a nasal falsetto. His best-known rendition was "Tiptoe Through the Tulips."

It would have made a great theme song for Secretary of State Alexander Haig last Tuesday as he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to explain why the U.S. government had decided to pay off bank loans to Poland on which the U.S. government had decided Poland had not defaulted.

Haig said, "The action he took will require the Soviet Union to make the money good." That statement should have caused an explosion of questions. How would it require the Soviet Union to make the money good? When would the Soviet Union make the money good? Will the Tooth Fairy come tonight?

The Foreign Relations Committee was a bed of tulips. They wanted to believe. They want their farmers to keep selling the grain, even if we must invent new fictions for every month's payment—or even if U.S. taxpayers must pay for it all.

Haig said the action the administration took was "the hard position, the more rigid position," but said the United States could make further moves if the Russians stay naughty. Presumably, any other options must be softer and more flexible.

In the meantime, the banks are happy. And after all, what good is a safety net if it doesn't catch your friends?●

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LIMIT THE TERMS AND AGE OF PUBLIC OFFICE

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the bill I introduced today for consideration in the House of Representatives. This bill would amend the U.S. Constitution to improve upon the legislative and representative functions of Congress and the operation of the Federal judiciary.

First and most important, my bill would amend the Constitution to limit the length of office for Representatives and Senators to 12 years. The bill establishes a limit of two 6-year terms of office for Members of the Senate and three 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

The need for term limitation in the Congress is urgent. The past decades have witnessed the rise of the career politician, at the expense of the citizen legislator. Toward the pursuit of reelection, many Senators and Congressmen spend an inordinate amount of time and energy manipulating constituencies and appeasing interest groups, which may or may not be in the best interests of the country. In addition, incumbents' campaign advantages have grown to proportions which make it exceedingly difficult for challengers to unseat current officeholders. As a result, some Congressmen and Senators become less responsive to the needs of those they purport to represent, or have little time after politicking to do so. In effect, the representative function of the Congress has become secondary to political survival.

Term limitation for Members of Congress would help to rectify this distressing situation. Under the proposed amendment, the incentive for Members to view their offices as lifetime careers is removed. As a result, the legislators have more time to devote to their districts' concerns and will place a lower emphasis on upcoming elections. Additionally, the injection of new talents and fresh perspectives, which the bill fosters, brings needed vitality to a system that lends itself to institutional decay.

Second, the bill I am introducing lengthens the term of House Members from 2 to 4 years. This provision allows House Members not only the greater opportunity to develop legislative expertise, but also reduces electoral pressures. Such pressures emerge from the 2-year election cycle that leads to one continuous campaign for reelection. In addition, the voters, by securing an improved opportunity to assess the performances of their Representatives, also benefit from the lengthening of House terms.

A 1981 Gallup poll showed that American voters believe that the holding of high political office should be a period of public service, not a career. Specifically, a proposal to limit Senators to two 6-year terms received the approval of 61 percent, with 32 percent disapproving. A proposal to restrict service in the House of Representatives to three terms of 4 years each was favored by 59 percent of the public, with 32 percent opposed. The same degree of support for the proposals was found in all population groups, including partisans of the major political entities.

Finally, the bill limits the term of office for Federal judges and justices to 10 years. The bill also requires the retirement of these judges when they reach the age of 70. For the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives, no person could be elected to these offices who may attain the age of 70 years during the term of office.

The proposed measures concerning the judiciary are adapted from the Pennsylvania constitution, and my personal experience with them has been very positive. Such provisions have helped to insure that judges and justices in Pennsylvania continue to hold offices while they are mentally able and are exercising good behavior. I am sure that these measures can be applied successfully at the Federal level as well.

Mr. Speaker, this bill which could greatly benefit the governing of our Nation I respectfully introduce for the

careful consideration of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.●

DEPRESSION FEARS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal carried an article last week that makes depressing reading. Headlined "Still a Minority, Depression Fear Grows," the article discussed the fears of a growing number of prominent economists that the high interest rate policies of the Reagan administration may be leading the United States into a depression.

Depression is a word that has not been used to describe economic conditions in our Nation since the end of World War II. We have had recessions when business activity has dipped and unemployment has risen. But we have been spared fears of an economic collapse in which millions of people would be unable to find work and thousands of businesses would be closing their doors.

However, Kenneth Bacon, the Journal's chief economics correspondent, writes, "* * * a disturbing note of pessism is creeping into some economic projections. Several of the Nation's leading economic soothsayers are beginning to worry that the economy could collapse under the burden of high interest rates, plunging the Nation into the first depression since the 1930's."

Those economic soothsayers include none other than Reagan economics adviser Alan Greenspan of Townsend-Greenspan & Co., Michael Evans of Evans Economics, Inc., and Allen Sinai of Data Resources, Inc. What gives their warnings a sense of urgency are the latest figures on business failures.

According to the Wall Street Journal article:

The rate of business failures has already risen sharply over the last few years of high interest rates. Failures per 10,000 businesses were 27.8 in 1979, 42.1 in 1980, and were running at a seasonally adjusted rate of 60.8 in June of 1981, the last month for which Commerce Department figures are available.

Raymond Dalio, president of Bridgewater Associates, a consulting firm that has been predicting a 1982 depression for about a year, projects that business failures will rise to a rate of 155 per 10,000 this year. The combination of large debt burdens and high interest rates during a period of slowing inflation and economic contraction will be devastating, he reasons.

"As the economy contracts while debt-service payments do not, less money is available for consumption, causing the contraction to feed itself," Mr. Dalio explains.

I am not by nature a predictor of doom. But I must admit that these warnings, especially Mr. Dalio's, come as no surprise to me. Last May, the House Small Business General Oversight Subcommittee, which I chair, held one of the first congressional hearings on the impact of the Reagan administration's economic policies on small business. At that hearing, Francis Bator, a Harvard University economist, warned that the administration's contradictory tight money and expansive fiscal policies would result in continued high interest rates. Those high rates, he continued, would result in high unemployment and an increasing number of business failures. Norman Ture, the Treasury Under Secretary for Tax and Fiscal Policy, who testified with Professor Bator, blithely brushed off his warnings and predicted that the administration economic program would bring a boom. Almost a year later, I am sad to say, Professor Bator has been proven right.

This has very serious consequences. If our economy is to recover and provide the prosperity and new jobs that President Reagan has promised, we must have a healthy, thriving, and growing small business sector. Despite the decline of our large basic industries during the 1970's, we were able to provide new jobs for the 18 million people entering the work force during that decade because of the growth of small businesses. We can expect at least 15 million new entrants to the U.S. labor force in the 1980's, for whom we will have to create new jobs. If we continue tc experience high interest rates and a high business failure rate, there is no way that we will have a healthy, growing small business sector that will be able to provide the needed new jobs.

The business failure figures cited in the Wall Street Journal article make it clear that small businessmen are bearing the burden of the administration's failing economic policies. What is even clearer is that the burden is becoming even heavier. I just hope that the small business sector can somehow survive until sane economic policies can be put in place.

Following is the article from the February 22, 1982, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

STILL A MINORITY VIEW, DEPRESSION FEAR GROWS

(By Kenneth H. Bacon)

WASHINGTON.—Last week the three members of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisers arrived on Capitol Hill to find a hearing room festooned with large pictures of Ronald Reagan and Herbert Hoover. Rep. Henry Reuss, the irascible Wisconsin Democrat who chairs the Joint Economic Committee, was dramatizing his contention that President Reagan's economic policies run the risk of bringing on a depression.

Few economists share this view. But a disturbing note of pessimism is creeping into some economic projections. Several of the nation's leading economic soothsayers are beginning to worry that the economy could collapse under the burden of high interest rates, plunging the nation into the first depression since the 1930s.

Forecasters such as Alan Greenspan of Townsend-Greenspan & Co., Michael Evans of Evans Economics Inc. and Allen Sinai of Data Resources Inc. assign a low probability to a calamitous economic collapse. But they're beginning to warn their clients that a sharp and damaging economic contraction is at least a possible alternative to today's conventional forecast.

The standard projection holds that the economy will pull out of its current recession by the summer and grow nicely during the second half of the year and through 1983. For instance, the latest consensus of 44 forecasts assembled by Eggert Economic Enterprises shows the economy starting to grow again in the second quarter of this year and expanding 4.1% after inflation in 1983. The Reagan administration projects that Gross National Product adjusted for inflation will rise 5.2% in 1983 as the economy begins a period of sustained growth fueled by tax cuts, declining inflation and falling interest rates.

But what if interest rates don't fall? Or if, as some forecasters fear, rates fall briefly and then turn up again as borrowing to finance expansion begins to compete with the Treasury's ravenous credit demands to finance record deficits?

Mr. Greenspan, one of President Reagan's nongovernment advisers, says this interest-rate resurgence could choke off the recovery. He declares: "This would lead to the chilling scenario of a gradually eroding economy interspersed with short-term cyclical behavior—a scenario which could scarcely continue for very long without either a crack in long-term confidence and a decline into what would be generally described, even in today's jargon, as a depression, or a political response which could end up raising the level of inflation markedly higher in a futile endeavor to reflate."

"This scenario still has a low probability but it should no longer be put into the bizarre or kooky category," he says.

The economics profession hasn't developed a standard definition of depression. But many economists say an economic contraction that pushed the unemployment rate to over 10% for a year or so, caused a surge in bankruptcies and destroyed confidence in long-term investment and business prospects would qualify. "We're walking the brink and it's very worrisome," says Mr. Sinai of Data Resources. "One thing is for sure. Without adjustments now in the current thrust of policies, the U.S. economy runs the risk of a major collapse, unprecedented in the postwar period." He notes that the auto and housing industries are already depressed and recommends sharp cuts in projected deficits and an easier monetary policy to bring interest rates down and prevent a depression from spreading.

Even if a depression were to occur, Mr. Sinai and most other economists say it wouldn't equal the devastation of the Great Depression 50 years ago. Between 1929 and 1933, Gross National Product fell nearly 50%, the unemployment rate reached 25% and the financial system collapsed.

The current concern over a possible depression arises from the cruel impact of rising interest rates in the face of a recession and falling inflation. "Many individuals and businesses have been holding on by their fingernails through this latest bout of recession and high interest rates—gradually whittling down their assets, postponing decisions to replace necessary equipment, lag-

ging behind in their accounts payable and other moves which smack of desperation," Mr. Evans notes. Without a decline in interest rates, many businesses may not be able to hold on much longer, he fears.

The rate of business failures has already risen sharply over the last few years of high interest rates. Failures per 10,000 businesses were 27.8 in 1979, 42.1 in 1980 and were running at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 60.8 per 10,000 in June of 1981, the last month for which Commerce Department figures are available.

Raymond Dalio, president of the Bridgewater Associates, a consulting firm that has been predicting a 1982 depression for about a year, projects that business failures will rise to a rate of 155 per 10,000 this year. The combination of large debt burdens and high interest rates during a period of slowing inflation and economic contraction will be devastating, he reasons.

"As the economy contracts while debt-service payments do not, less money is available for consumption, causing the contraction to feed itself," Mr. Dalio explains.

Talk of a depression doesn't mean, of course, that one will occur. Most economists think President Reagan's program has a far greater chance of success than of failure, particularly if the large prospective deficits can be reduced. But Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker has called the Reagan program "a riverboat gamble" and economists, like all oddsmakers, must consider the possibility of big losses as well as gains.●

THE SEVENTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Seventh Special Session of United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) recently completed its deliberations in Vienna, Austria (February 2-8, 1982). The U.S. delegation was ably led by our distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for INM; Gene R. Haislip, of the Drug Enforcement Administration; Walter V. Hall of our U.S. Mission to Vienna; F. Gray Handley, Jr., of the State Department's Bureau of International Organization Affairs; Stewart Nightingale, of the Food and Drug Administration; and Dr. Jean Paul Smith, of the National Institute on Drug Abuse. Elliott Brown, of our House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, Andrew Fenrich of our U.S. Mission in Vienna, Marc Golubock, from our Embassy in Bonn, and Elena Kim of the State Department's Bureau for INM provided staff support for our delegation. Through the cooperation of Mr. DiCarlo and on behalf of the House Narcotics Select Committee, of which I am a member, I participated in the Commission's deliberations and delivered a statement on the global dimensions of narcotics trafficking and the urgency of the international community to contribute or to increase their contributions to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse (UNFDAC).

In December 1981, the U.N. General Assembly approved Resolution 36/168 adopting the international drug control strategy and program of action, a U.S. initiative and a measure that I helped draft as a member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. General Assembly.[1] This resolution calls for establishing a task force to review, monitor, and coordinate the international drug control strategy and consists of CND Steering Committee members and representatives of the Division of Narcotic Drugs, the United Nations Development Program, UNFDAC, the International Narcotics Control Board, and the World Health Organization. The task force, which was established at the Commission's February 1982 meeting, is to meet and report during each session of the CND. Other resolutions adopted by the CND include: A resolution calling for concerted action against the illicit drug traffic in Central and South America and the Caribbean, designating an international year against drug abuse, measures to improve international cooperation in the interdiction of illicit drug traffic, procedures to be followed by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in the scheduling of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, and regulating the demand and supply of opiates for medical and scientific needs.

Mr. Speaker, narcotics trafficking is a multibillion-dollar illicit business activity conducted by international criminal syndicates whose highly organized, well-financed and sophisticated operations reach into every region of the world, undermining the health of our citizens and corrupting our political, economic and social institutions. Just in our country alone, drug trafficking is estimated to reach a staggering $90 billion annually—$90 billion of untaxed dollars.

The international community must recognize that narcotics production, trafficking, and drug abuse are not going to go away today or tomorrow—that drug abuse prevention and the control of narcotics trafficking is a never-ending battle requiring dedicated, coordinated action by the entire family of nations. In this regard, the recently adopted U.N. General Assembly Resolution 36/168 and the CND's recently established Drug Task Force are steps in the right direction to develop and implement an effective global drug strategy. If the "war" on drug abuse is going to be won, it is imperative that every nation and appropriate international organization pool their resources, finances, expertise and personnel to provide the necessary tools to implement a global drug strategy and to assist the U.N. Drug Fund to fulfill its mission of combating drug trafficking and drug abuse. It is imperative that all of us do our utmost to elevate the drug problem to a top priority on our agendas and to help raise the consciousness of citizens throughout the world regarding the dangers of drug trafficking and drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring to the attention of my colleagues the global dimensions of drug trafficking and the urgent need to support the U.N. drug-related agencies, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the complete text of my statement delivered at the Commission's Seventh Special Session.

STATEMENT BY HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

Mr. Chairman, distinguished representatives to the Seventh Special Session of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, I welcome this opportunity to be part of this delegation and to share with you my thoughts and the thinking of many of my colleagues in the United States Congress, regarding the efforts by the international community to combat narcotics trafficking and drug abuse. As a member of the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control and as a representative of my Government's delegation to the 36th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, who helped draft resolution 36/168 endorsing the international drug control strategy that was adopted by the General Assembly on December 16, 1981, it is a particular privilege for me to share my thoughts with you since this resolution represents many years of work in seeking to raise the consciousness of the international community regarding the dangers of drug abuse. Interdicting narcotics trafficking, eradicating the illicit production of drugs at their source, educating our world citizenry to the dangers of drug abuse, and treating and rehabilitating those who have become dependent upon drugs are complex global problems.

The war against heroin, cocaine, marihuana, hashish, phencyclidine (PCP) and other dangerous drugs is a never-ending battle. The global dimensions of illicit drug production and trafficking reaches into the hundreds of billions of dollars, causing suffering for millions of citizens throughout the world.

No nation, regardless of its political ideology, or its social or economic status, is immune to the devastating and debilitating effects of drug abuse or to the insidious drug merchants who profit from human suffering. Every region of the world—from North America to Latin America, from Europe, Africa and the Middle East to the Orient and Oceania—has become a victim of drug trafficking, drug transshipping and drug abuse. In virtually every region of the world there are major narcotics distribution hubs and financial centers for international drug syndicates to conduct their shady business transactions, to purchase legitimate businesses for illegal purposes and to launder illicit profits . . . narco-dollars that are often used to purchase weapons and to finance terrorist activities.

We all recognize that narcotics trafficking is a worldwide business that knows no boundaries, political ideologies or competing

[1] For details pertaining to this resolution, including the complete text, see my statement entitled, "The United Nations Global Strategy," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Jan. 25, 1982), PP. 15-17.

economic systems. Drug abuse does, however, adversely affect the health and well-being of all of our citizens and mostly our youth. The corrupt tentacles of the well-financed, highly sophisticated international drug syndicates reach into every corner of the world, undermining the moral fabric of our societies.

For the United Nations to effectively wage "war" on the drug problem, member nations must submerge their competing political and economic differences. Just as the world cannot survive nuclear confrontation, so, too, it cannot long endure "victimization" by international drug traffickers. Such illicit business activities undermine our institutions, contribute to global inflation, jeopardize the health of our citizens and destroy the roots of our society—our youth. No nation is immune to this devastation. Just as Chapters VI and VII of the United Nations Charter pertain to a situation "likely to endanger international peace and security" or constitute a "threat to the peace", "breach of the peace", or "acts of aggression", so, too, does drug trafficking and drug abuse constitute a clear and present danger to the entire family of nations, requiring collective action to combat this scourge of all mankind.

Until the last Commission on Narcotic Drugs meeting in February 1981, there was no comprehensive strategy or plan of action available to guide the diverse efforts of those seeking to maximize drug control activities. That situation was disheartening to all nations concerned with drug problems. The need for an aggressive, new approach was obvious.

Now, with cautious optimism, we can anticipate some potential for change, for after several years of work, the UN General Assembly has finally adopted the Commission's long-term strategy and five-year program of action for drug control.

In general the strategy calls for greater attention to the issues of drug abuse both within the UN agencies and elsewhere. Specifically it recommends an increase in programs aimed at drug abuse control in the specialized UN agencies including the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Labor Organization (ILO), and the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), as well as in the UN Development Program (UNDP) and the other development-oriented programs. The strategy further recommends that the increased attention to UN drug-related activities should be part of regular agency programs and budgets because of the substantial impact drug abuse has on so many areas of social concern.

For the past several years that I have had the pleasure of sharing the thoughts of my Congressional colleagues with this distinguished Commission, I have been critical of the process whereby the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) underwrites drug-related projects of certain UN agencies. In my opinion, these agencies should elevate the problems of drug abuse to a higher level of priority within their agendas and should devote more of their resources to their drug-related projects, thereby releasing scarce dollars to the UN Drug Fund.

I recognize that this is a period of financial austerity for all UN agencies. Nonetheless, I find it difficult to understand the minimal priority these agencies give to combatting the pervasive drug problem from their own resources. Not only are the overall program funds dedicated to these activities low, but the agencies have in many cases underwritten no more than 20-30 percent of those costs. One directly involved agency, for example, out of a total budget of over 625 million dollars only commits a few hundred thousand dollars of its own funds to drug control related programs.

All nations must recognize that narcotics production, trafficking and drug abuse are not going to go away today or tomorrow—that drug abuse prevention and control is a never-ending battle requiring dedicated and coordinated action by the entire family of nations. No one nation or any small group of nations can single-handedly combat the highly organized, well-financed and sophisticated operations of international drug traffickers. If the "war" on drug abuse is to have any substantive meaning, then the recently adopted international drug control strategy resolution urgently needs to be implemented expeditiously, and to achieve this objective, the international community must pool its resources, personnel, funds and expertise.

With regard to financial contributions to UNFDAC, it is disheartening that only a handful of nations have contributed $100,000 or more to the Fund. Last year, 35 nations or about 22 percent of the Members of the United Nations contributed or pledged a meager $4,855,311, which represents a decrease by nearly $600,000 from the nearly $5.5 million contributed to UNFDAC in 1980. In 1979, 45 nations contributed a paltry $4.6 million to UNFDAC. At the UN Pledging Conference for Development Assistance held in New York last November 3rd and 4th, 18 nations pledged less than $4.5 million to the UN Drug Fund.

Given the staggering and growing global dimensions of drug trafficking and drug abuse, UNFDAC is performing its mission in the best manner that its meager resources permit. According to its 1981 Interim Report, last year the Fund supported programs in 15 countries, comprising a total of 28 projects that has been a major source for underwriting the bulk of the drug-related programs of UNESCO, WHO, ILO, and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

Surely an international community of 157 nations can contribute more than a few million dollars to wage a global assault on the drug problem. Some nations, including those who are most adversely affected by the illicit drug production, trafficking, transshipping and abuse, have failed to contribute a single penny to the UN Drug Fund. There is an urgent need for the entire family of nations to pitch in and help UNFDAC fulfill its objectives by contributing to the Fund, whose projects benefit all of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, the challenge of translating the international drug control strategy resolution into a workable program of action rests with this distinguished Commission. It has the mandate to establish a task force to review, monitor, coordinate and recommend future strategy revisions and to translate the noble objectives into substantive details for preventing, controlling, and ridding our societies of drug abuse.

But time is of the essence. The world-wide drug problem is worsening each year. This plague on our institutions is rapidly spreading throughout the world.

Let us seize the opportunities we have to recommit ourselves and overcome the crippling scourge of drug abuse. Nothing short of full commitment is needed to help us move forward in resolving this critical problem confronting all of our societies.●

GENERAL MIHAILOVICH AND THE 500 RESCUED AMERICAN AIRMEN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1982, I reminded the Members of the efforts of the National Committee of American Airmen to Aid General Mihailovich. This group of U.S. air crew members is attempting to correct the record regarding the unfair treatment of Draja Mihailovich, Yugoslav anti-Axis guerrilla leader, by the Allies during and immediately after World War II. I recently received a letter from Mr. David Martin, author of "Patriot or Traitor, the Case of General Mihailovich," which throws a new and rather sensational light on the Anglo-American abandonment of General Mihailovich.

In his book, Martin charged that elements in SOE Cairo, the SOE was the British equivalent of the U.S. OSS, sabotaged United States and British supplies of Mihailovich; and slanted and suppressed intelligence for the purpose of inducing the Western Allies to switch their support from Mihailovich to Tito.

Mr. Martin's letter, gives the details to substantiate his charges. His letter is reprinted for the information of the Members.

ARLINGTON, VA., *January 21, 1982.*

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DERWINSKI: Because of the great interest you have displayed over the years in the case of General Draza Mihailovich, I am writing to inform you of some highly important information that has emerged with regard to the Mihailovich case.

As you know, in my book "Patriot or Traitor, The Case of General Mihailovich," I reproduced extensive documentation from the reports and statements of the British and American officers who served with Mihailovich to establish (1) that, many months before the British Foreign Office made the fateful decision to abandon Mihailovich in December of 1943, there had been persistent sabotage of the Mihailovich supply operation by elements in the British SOE in Cairo; and (2) that vitally important reports sent out of Yugoslavia by the British and American liaison officers were never forwarded to London by SOE Cairo. I suggested that the person probably responsible in both situations was a junior British officer by the name of James Klugman, who rose from the rank of lieutenant to that of major by the end of 1943. Klugman, I pointed out, was a known Communist who had before the war headed up the European Communist youth movement and who after the war became the editor of the British Communist theoretical journal. I did *not* say that Klugman was a Soviet agent, even though I strongly suspected it, because at the time

definitive proof was lacking. Now the proof is in.

A book recently published in England, "Their Trade is Treachery," by the distinguished journalist, Chapman Pincher, identifies Klugman as a Soviet agent. According to Pincher, Klugman was an even more sinister agent than Anthony Blunt whose case became internationally famous two years ago when he was stripped of his knighthood and dismissed as Queen Elizabeth's art advisor. Klugman, he said, was identified as the person who had recruited him for Soviet intelligence by John Cairncross, a confessed Soviet spy who had served in several sensitive government positions during World War II—including the Yugoslav desk of MI6, the British Secret Intelligence Service.

The story of James Klugman is of major interest to our current personnel security problems in government because it illustrates how a quite junior military officer or government servant, in an obscure position, can play a major role in confusing and misdirecting the foreign policy of countries like the United States and Great Britain.

Before the war, Klugman was a member of a Communist group at Cambridge which included some half dozen bright young men who in the post-war years were to achieve international notoriety as Soviet agents. Among the alumni of this group were Guy Burgess and Donald Maclean, high-ranking officers of the British Foreign Office, who defected to the Soviet Union in 1951; Kim Philby, the head of British counterintelligence, a co-conspirator with Burgess and Maclean, who gave them the warning which made possible their escape from England and who himself defected to the Soviet Union in 1963 after his exposure as a Soviet agent; and Sir Anthony Blunt, who was recently exposed as one of the most effective recruiters for the Soviet intelligence apparatus in World War II and who was, in consequence of this exposure, stripped of his knighthood by Queen Elizabeth. But the most brilliant member of this remarkable group of young men on their way to becoming Soviet agents was James Klugman, according to "The Climate of Treason" by Andrew Boyle.

The full story of James Klugman has yet to be told. In my opinion his greatest service to the Communist cause was the role he played as a British intelligence officer in helping to turn Yugoslavia over to Communism. As you are aware, the American government displayed considerable reluctance over the abandonment of Mihailovich, but they went along with Churchill's decision because it had been agreed that Yogoslavia belonged to Britain's sphere of influence. Before I detail just how Klugman was able to manipulate Churchill and the British government into switching their support from Mihailovich to Tito, let me, for the sake of sequence—although I am certain you are familiar with all of these historical facts—write one paragraph of historical summary.

In March of 1941, the German army invaded and subjugated Yugoslavia. Hard on the heels of the official capitulation, a young Yugoslav army officer by the name of Colonel Draza Mihailovich raised the flag of resistance on the mountain of Ravna Gora and called for continuing war against the Nazi occupiers. To the beleaguered western world, he became a symbol of the resistance movement in occupied Europe. Time magazine made him man of the year. The British and American governments, although they were able to send very little into Yugoslavia before the collapse of Italy in September 1943, recognized General Mihailovich as commander-in-chief of the Royal Yugoslav Army in the homeland and strongly supported him in their broadcasts to Yugoslavia. But then, at the end of 1943, for reasons which made no sense to you and to me and to many others, the British and Americans abandoned Mihailovich and threw their support instead to the Communist forces of Josip Broz Tito.

The British justified the switch from Mihailovich to Tito on the grounds that the Tito movement had much greater popular support and was effectively fighting the Germans while the Mihailovich forces were doing nothing of significance against the occupying forces and were, in fact, collaborating with them. *This was the information that was reaching London from Cairo through the Yugoslav office of SOE,* the British equivalent of our wartime OSS. James Klugman played a key role in shaping this intelligence as the number two man in a quite small office, who represented continuity under several successive commanding officers. His authority was all the greater because he spoke the Serbo-Croat language tolerably well. He also had unlimited power to manipulate the flow of information to London because he was in charge of communications; all the messages from and to the 25 British officers and three American officers who were attached to the Mihailovich forces had to pass through SOE Cairo. If SOE Cairo decided to forward them to London, they were forwarded; if it decided not to, they were not forwarded. He also played a major role in supervising the flow of military supplies to Yugoslavia, to the Tito forces and—ostensibly—to the Mihailovich forces until December of 1943.

In my book, as you will recall, I presented a lengthy chronological compendium of reports by British and American officers dealing with anti-Axis actions and sabotage by the Mihailovich forces and of reprisals against Mihailovich Serbs. Most of the items in this compendium were excerpted from the Operational Log maintained by the Yugoslav office of SOE Cairo. I sent a copy of this compendium to Sir Douglas Howard who, as wartime head of the British Foreign Office Southern Department, had been in charge of Yugoslav affairs and had the task of giving Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden almost daily briefings on the intelligence coming in about the situation in that country. I asked Sir Douglas in my letter: "Suppose the Foreign Office in mid-October 1943 had received a memorandum from Bailey and Armstrong which said approximately the following:

"The past several months, despite foot-dragging in some areas, have witnessed a relatively high level of activity by the Mihailovich forces. During this period they have been involved in some half dozen major attacks on Axis forces, in each of which the enemy death toll was in the range of 200 to 300. At Mucanj, south of Uzice, on July 31, they engaged a strong Bulgarian force and inflicted severe casualties on it. At Trstenik, on August 29, they derailed two troop trains and killed 200 of the enemy and captured others. At Prijepolje, on September 11, they attacked a German garrison approximately 1,000 strong and put it to flight after killing more than 200 enemy troops. At Priboj, on September 12, after a night of hard fighting, they forced the surrender of an Italian garrison of 1800 men under Col. Grazziani. At Visegrad, on October 5, they attacked a German garrison some 800 strong, killing several hundred of them and driving the rest northward—after which they blew up the 600-foot double track Visegrad bridge, effectively disrupting the Belgrade-Sarajevo railroad line. At Rogatica, on October 14, the Mihailovich forces again attacked a strong Axis garrison, killing several hundred Ustashi. In addition to these actions—taken on their own initiative—they were instrumental in compelling the surrender of the Italian Venezia Division at Berane and of substantial Italian units at Kotor and other points. On top of these major engagements, there were numerous minor engagements; four important railway bridges were destroyed and tracks torn up between Visegrad and Mokra Gora on the Sarajevo-Uzice line; and trains were wrecked and tracks torn up at other points. Finally, the period in question witnessed two large-scale attacks on Mihailovich's headquarters by German forces, one on September 5 and the second on October 10. This record is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that Mihailovich has received pathetically little support in terms of arms and ammunition."

My letter to Sir Douglas Howard continued with this question: "Suppose you had received such a message from Bailey and Armstrong [the senior officers of the British mission], sometime in October [1943], would this have affected the Foreign Office position on Mihailovich? . . . I should be most grateful if you could take the time to read the enclosed compendium and give me your thoughts on it."

In reply, Sir Douglas wrote:

"I have read and reread your letter . . . with great interest, and with a certain measure of astonishment. . . . If, of course, as now seems more than possible, our information re Mihailovich's activities were incomplete, to say the least, then the whole affair changes color. . . . *If the information contained in your work had been available to us at the time, our whole policy might and probably would, have been very different."* (Emphasis added.)

What all this boils down to is that scores of messages from the British officers with Mihailovich, some of them reporting on highly important actions, were not forwarded to London by SOE Cairo as they should have been. In the absence of this information, the Communist charges that the Mihailovich forces were collaborating with the enemy seemed plausible. As my research in the Foreign Office files established, people like Douglas Howard and Anthony Eden, who *wanted* to support Mihailovich and had grave misgivings about throwing allied support to Tito, only with great reluctance came to the conclusion that the allies had to make the switch.

Not only was Mihailovich denied the credit for major actions which his forces fought against the Axis Armies, but the credit for his actions was in very many cases given to the Communists by BBC on the basis of information they received from SOE Cairo. On November 16, 1943, Brigadier Armstrong fired off an omnibus protest to SOE Cairo in which he said:

"If you want to get the best out of Mihailovich you must give him fairer press and broadcasts. Bailey was with Mihailovich forces when [they] took Priboj and Prijepolje and Berane. I saw capture Visegrad, destruction bridges, and know Ostojic took Rogatica. Mihailovich never credited with any [of] these, although reported to you. On other hand, when Partisans drove his

forces out, Partisans credited on BBC [with capture of these places from enemy]."

This message, also, was not sent to London.

Bad intelligence, or deliberately falsified intelligence, inevitably leads to wrong decisions. That is precisely what happened when the British and American governments, on the basis of the slanted and falsified intelligence sent to London by SOE Cairo and by the Yugoslav section of the Secret Intelligence Service (M16), decided to abandon the pro-democratic and pro-Western forces of General Draza Mihailovich in favor of the Communist-controlled movement led by his rival, Marshal Tito.

I mentioned the matter of the Mihailovich supply operation over which Klugman also had authority. During the course of 1942, when Mihailovich enjoyed sole political recognition by the British government as *the* leader of the resistance movement in Yugoslavia, there were elements in SOE Cairo who were friendly to Mihailovich, but, because of the shortage of planes and the long distance from North Africa, the amount that could be airdropped to him was nominal. Colonel Bailey (chief of the British mission until the end of September, 1943) reported that "the few tons of supplies dropped included 30 million Italian occupation lire overprinted in bright red, 'Ethiopia,' and several hundred boxes of anti-tropical snake bite serum. Mihailovich's rage was matched only by my own. . . ." In September of 1943, after the occupation of Southern Italy, the British mission at Mihailovich's HQ was informed that 35 air sorties had been allotted to the Mihailovich forces for the period October 5 to November 3. In fact, although the British Foreign Office was unaware of this, Mihailovich received nothing of any use during this period. About this situation, Brigadier Armstrong wrote to the London Daily Telegraph on January 24, 1977: "Poor Mihailovich had not got the weapons to fight the Germans with all their modern weapons; his supply depended on what his forces could capture. I remember particularly two airdrops at my HQ; one consisted mainly of gumboots [rubber boots], the other of office equipment."

Virtually nothing of what appeared to be promised to Mihailovich ever got through to him—and what little did get through frequently consisted of the most senseless miscellaneous rubbish that SOE could find in Cairo—including rusty rifles and waterlogged ammunition, office lighting equipment and canisters of toilet paper, Ethiopian occupation lire and rubber boots and battle dress in midget size—all of it utterly useless. Brigadier Armstrong told me that he felt it was shameful that British fliers should have been called upon to risk their lives to deliver such rubbish.

This was how Klugman ran the Mihailovich supply operation.

There are some who will tell us in the interest of privacy and First Amendment rights, we should abandon all efforts to try to keep Communists or other extremists committed to the revolutionary overthrow of our system out of sensitive positions in government. The case of James Klugman illustrates just how much damage can be done by a single dedicated Communist in an obscure but sensitive position.

We know the story of Burgess and Maclean and the story of Kim Philby through the several books that have already been published on these subjects. I hope it will not be too long before we have an authoritative history on the activities and accomplishments of James Klugman in the service of Soviet totalitarianism.

This entire history, I believe, has a direct bearing on your successful efforts to oblige the Department of State to make public the fact that General Mihailovich, in 1947, had been awarded the Legion of Merit in the degree of Chief Commander by President Truman, acting on the recommendation of General Eisenhower—a fact that has been kept secret for almost 20 years. It also has a direct bearing on your more recent efforts, supported by some 75 members of the House of Representatives, to enact legislation that would permit the National Association of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich to erect a monument to Mihailovich on federally owned land in the District of Columbia, as an expression of gratitude for saving the lives of almost 500 American airmen. It cannot be emphasized too much that all of this was done *after* Mihailovich had been abandoned by Britain and America and that Mihailovich at the time received no recognition and no gratitude from the Allies for this very great service to the Allied cause.

My very best personal wishes and my best wishes for the success of the Mihailovich monument legislation.

Sincerely,

DAVID MARTIN.●

THE NINTH ANNUAL MARCH FOR LIFE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once again several tens of thousands of prolifers have come to the Nation's Capital to protest the Supreme Court's 1973 abortion decision. Each year they have come here to deliver the same message: The Court's decision on abortion was wrong.

In the early years of the prolife movement, however, that message, though understood, was seen as religiously motivated and considered inappropriate for the public forum. It is not acceptable for a religious minority to impose its morality on the rest of us, so the slogan went. The first amendment clearly states that religion and government should be separate, the charge continued, and, besides, to make abortion illegal again would be unrealistic. The Supreme Court decision, many said, is the law of the land; the matter is settled.

But then, with the witness of tens of thousands of people in Washington each year, often braving severe cold and inclement weather, the perception of the prolife movement began to change. People began to think.

The Supreme Court is not infallible. It had been wrong before. In 1857, the Dred Scott decision had declared that black slaves were not citizens, but property, and as such were subject to the wishes of their owners, just as today, according to the Court, unborn human beings' very lives are subject to the wishes of the women in whose bodies they were conceived. Once again some members of the human family have become the property of others.

In those days, the distinguishing feature of those who were ineligible for the right to liberty was skin color. Today, the distinguishing feature of those who are ineligible for the right to life is environment—inside the womb.

There were many in pre-Civil War days, even in the North, who looked upon those who wanted to abolish slavery as a minority of unrealistic moralists and fanatics who were destroying the peace of communities by trying to force their beliefs on the rest of the country. If they were allowed to continue, it was believed, the economic, social, and political stability of the whole country would be upset. Eventually, that is what happened; but justice had to prevail. And so, today, justice must prevail.

Because of the perseverance of these marchers and of the educational efforts of prolifers everywhere, more and more people are coming to realize that members of religious bodies have as much right, as American citizens, to express their views as anyone else. They should not be denied their right to participate in the democratic process any more than members of any other group. The first amendment was never intended to make atheism the established religion of the United States.

It has been demonstrated again and again that the prolife movement includes a wide spectrum of religious and even nonreligious beliefs in its membership. What religion is the prolife movement? The same religion as the antislavery movement—American.

In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution recently, Dr. Raymond Adamek, a sociology professor at Kent State University, summed up his analysis of public opinion on abortion in the United States with the following statement:

> A majority of Americans do not endorse either the pro-choice or pro-life platforms. If anything, they are closer to the pro-life ideology.
>
> Our present public policy, however, as mandated by the Supreme Court, is essentially pro-choice in ideology. This, I suggest, is the main reason for the turmoil we have experienced over this issue in recent years.
>
> It would seem to me that a constitutional amendment which would remove the major responsibility for our abortion policy from the Supreme Court and return it to the legislatures would go a long way toward resolving the turmoil in a just and rational manner.

That is why the prolife movement has been effective. That is why these marchers keep coming. It is because

they know that someday they will succeed.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1980, I was absent from the floor of the House of Representatives for one suspension. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 11: House Joint Resolution 373, a joint resolution, amended, expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the Soviet Union should respect the rights of its citizens to practice their religion and to emigrate, and that these matters should be among the issues raised at the 38th meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights at Geneva in February 1982, "yes."●

A WAY OUT OF THE NATION'S ECONOMIC TRAP

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues. It was written by the noted economist, Walter Heller, and published in the Wall Street Journal of February 25, and describes the economic bind the administration is currently facing.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say that the current economic situation has me very worried. Unemployment is at its highest since 1938. My State of Washington, dependent as it is on the forest products and housing industries, has been among the handful of States which lead the Nation in recorded unemployment rates—we now exceed 11 percent unemployment. Real take-home pay in private industry is declining. Productivity has experienced a measurable drop. The fourth quarter of 1981 showed a dip of 7.6 percent—the largest quarterly decline on record. Farm prices are down, interest rates are up. Housing starts and automobile sales are almost nonexistent. Bankruptcies are the highest they have been since 1961—and just 33 away from the all-time high experienced in 1933. Corporate mergers are growing. And the Federal budget deficit could go as high as $157 billion in the coming fiscal year, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

We have got to consider making a midcourse correction. We must end the current decline, and institute some initiatives to start the recovery. And yet the message from the White House is more of the same. I think Mr. Heller's article presents some ideas which the Congress and the President should consider very seriously.

The article follows:

A WAY OUT OF THE NATION'S ECONOMIC TRAP

(By Walter W. Heller)

Reaganomics is caught in a no-win gap: While denying any rift with the Fed, Mr. Reagan won't give an inch on the rapid military buildup and gigantic tax cuts that will put deficits into a triple-digit orbit for years to come. But unless these menacing deficits are brought within bounds, Mr. Volcker won't give an inch on a super-tight money policy that will prolong recession, stunt growth and abort recover. Yet there is simply no way within the bounds of political tolerance, or human decency, to cut the 1983–86 deficits down to size via further assaults on social programs.

To see just how unyielding a trap we're caught in, one must appraise the true size of the deficit problem that Mr. Reagan and Congress have to surmount to head Mr. Volcker off at the gap. The basic raw materials for drawing up a "best bet" deficit profile are the two official budgets just issued:

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) "baseline budget," which projects receipts and outlays under existing policies, that is, before any further spending cuts or tax increases.

The Reagan budget, which proposes sharp civilian budget cuts and modest tax increases and projects markedly lower interest costs and a faster defense buildup than the CBO budget.

The accompanying table gives a bird's-eye view of the two budgets and then offers a "modified Reagan budget" constructed on the following "best bet" assumptions:

THE 1982–85 BUDGET OUTLOOK

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—			
	1982	1983	1984	1985
Congressional Budget Office:				
Receipts	631	652	701	763
Outlays	740	809	889	971
Deficit	−109	−157	−188	−208
President Reagan:				
Receipts	627	666	723	797
Outlays	725	758	806	869
Deficit	−98	−92	−83	−72
Modified Reagan budget:				
Receipts	631	658	710	772
Outlays	736	794	867	954
Deficit	−105	−136	−157	−182
Modified Reagan budget at high employment (6 percent unemployment):				
Receipts	684	700	743	802
Outlays	721	783	859	946
Deficit	−37	−83	−116	−114
Ratio high-employment deficit to GNP (percent)	1.1	2.2	2.9	3.3

Actual civilian budget cuts and tax boosts will be about half of the amounts projected by the President.

Defense spending will grow at the Reagan pace, reaching $292 billion a year by 1985 rather than the CBO projection of $263 billion. Congress will make some defense cuts, but they will be offset by price and cost increases exceeding the Pentagon's usual optimistic estimates.

Interest costs will be sharply above the Reagan estimates because deficits will be higher and interest rates, as CBO projects, will also be higher.

Under this modified Reagan scenario (which incorporates the optimistic Reagan projection that recession will soon be over and growth will then be sustained at about a 5% rate), the actual deficits would weigh in at $105 billion this year and rise to $182 billion by 1985.

Even if we shift to a steady "high employment" basis in order to eliminate the impact of economic fluctuations on the budget (and thereby to isolate and identify changes in fiscal policy), we find the deficit rising from $37 billion this year to $144 billion in 1985. The deficit at high employment would triple from 1.1% of GNP this year to 3.3% in 1985, reflecting the highly expansionary fiscal policy that is so troubling to the Fed.

These projected deficits are bad enough. But they are by no means a "worst case" estimate. They don't, for example, include off-budget borrowing that the White House optimistically forecasts at $60 billion for the next four years, when it is more likely to be $80 billion. And if real GNP were to grow at only 3% in 1983–84 instead of 5%, the deficits would rise a further $40 billion to $50 billion a year. Small wonder that the financial markets are assessing the deficit outlook between grim and grisly, and the outlook for interest rates between discouraging and devastating.

The budget trap, then, is far deeper than the Reagan budget would have us believe. And as the economic battle lines are now drawn, the prospects for escape are bleak. One could imagine Congress finding ways to cut non-defense spending by about $25 billion to $30 billion a year by 1984 and patching together tax hikes of another $25 billion to $30 billion by then. But that would still leave the modified Reagan budget $100 billion in deficit (or $60 billion at high employment).

That effort, while requiring great political will, would simply not provide a sufficient basis for detente with the Federal Reserve. Granted, in an economy wracked by three years of stagnation and recession, the Fed could on its own relent and seek to reduce the record-high real interest rates (long-term rates less prospective inflation rates). But Mr. Volcker has just thrown down the gauntlet again: Without sharp cuts in deficits, don't look for sharp cuts in interest rates.

The truly sad thing about Mr. Reagan's budget stance—his stonewalling that masquerades as steadfastness—is that a strategically plausible, economically positive and politically palatable alternative lies within his reach. A Reagan initiative to lead us out of our economic trap would have the following main elements:

Announce that while he holds to his long-term goals, he recognizes that his tax, budget and defense programs are trying to do too much too soon; that the budgetary and monetary strains, the economic disruptions and the human costs are proving to be too great.

Convene a summit "economic disarmament conference" among the three coordinate branches of economic government—the White House, Congress and the Fed—to hammer out an agreed agenda to end the recession, promote sustained growth and curb inflation. (Under our separation of powers, it has to be an informal accord, not a contract signed in blood.)

The centerpiece of the accord would consist of two parts. The first would be a pledge by the White House to slow the tax cuts and the defense buildup for 1983 and beyond while continuing to make carefully targeted

cuts in non-defense spending. Putting the final stage of the personal income tax cuts and indexing on "hold" would by itself cut the deficit by $60 billion to $70 billion by 1985.

Second, strike a firm bargain with the Fed (the 1951 accord provides a notable precedent) under which the Fed, in exchange for the deficit cutbacks it has been demanding, would agree to accommodate expansion by rasing its monetary sights and lowering real interest rates. Such an accord would recognize the true lesson of the 1964 tax cut, namely, that tax cuts consistent with shrinking deficits can be accommodated rather than vetoed by Fed policy.

Having removed the monetary barrier to a climb-out from the rut of recession and stagnation, take a further step to speed the day of recovery: speed the 1982 personal tax cuts—to Jan. 1 if technically feasible, otherwise to April 1. This would temporarily boost the deficit in a soft economy that can stand it, while paying off handsomely in speedier shrinkage of deficits as the economy expands.

Reinforce the improving inflation outlook—and we may well be on the threshold of a lower plateau of inflation—by a presidential appeal to big business and big labor to moderate their wage and price behavior in exchange for the improved job and profit opportunities generated by lower interest rates and more rapid expansion. Such an appeal would go against Mr. Reagan's grain. But perhaps he could undertake it in the name of the voluntarism in the private sector that he has so strongly urged.

It is hard to see anything but winners from such an economic disarmanent agreement:

The President would emerge as an economic statesman willing to change course to get and keep the economy moving again.

Volcker the villain would become Volcker the valiant.

Incumbent Congressmen could claim their share of the credit for the brighter economic skies generated by quicker tax cuts and lower interest rates and for bringing the gigantic future deficits under control.

Wall Street would rejoice in the lower deficits and interest rates, while Main Street would be relieved of the heavy yoke of intolerably high interest rates that threaten bankruptcies of financial institutions and small business in particular.

The business community in general, eager to capitalize on the accelerated depreciation bonanza in the 1981 tax act, would find its generous tax incentives, hitherto stifled by sky-high interest rates and weak markets, newly buttressed by falling real interest rates and strengthening markets.

MIGHT LIKE THE TRADE-OFF

Even the intended beneficiaries of the third-stage tax cut and indexing might like the trade-off facing them: In exchange for forgoing their tax benefits for a time, they would welcome the lower deficits, lower interest rates, rising stock and bond prices and higher income and investment that would grow out of Mr. Reagan's change of course.

Who might lose? If it were seen as a Reagan triumph rather than a response to Democratic initiatives, the reinvigoration of the economy might forestall the resurgence of the Democrats at the polls next November. But that's a risk that a truly loyal opposition has to take.

Mr. Reagan will have to recognize that by breaking the economic stalemate in this manner he can set the economy on a path of sustained expansion without reigniting the fires of inflation. There will be more for everyone. And if critics challenge Mr. Reagan for changing his course, he could parry their thrust with Winston Churchill's words: "I neither withdraw nor apologize for anything that I have said at any time, believing as I do that anything which I may have said at any time was perfectly justified by the special circumstances of that time and by the amount of information I may have had in my possession."●

STUDENT LOANS PROTECT OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post reports that the United States faces an increasingly ominous threat. The Post quoted the Pentagon's Director of Research as stating: "We expect a large, permanent, manned orbital space complex to be operational by about 1990 * * * capable of effectively attacking * * * ground, sea, and air targets from space." How could it be that the Nation which has produced the predominance of Nobel Prize winners over the last decades is so far behind in defense technology? The answer lies in the relative importance placed on education in the United States and the Soviet Union. At a time when the Russians enjoy an ever-increasing number of scientists, the Reagan administration has submitted to Congress a budget which would effectively dismantle Federal assistance for higher education.

Twenty-three years ago, President Eisenhower initiated a Federal program to guarantee every student the right to higher education despite their personal resources. He stated: "* * * the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women." Later, President Kennedy said: "The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry and higher standards of living." I fully agree with both of these former Presidents that it is the responsibility of this Nation's leaders to make available to all our young people the finest possible education.

Whether the economic faith of our elected leaders be supply-sided, Keynesian, or monetarist, increased support for education and scientific research deserves the highest priority. Today, the U.S. foreign trade patterns resemble an underdeveloped nation rather than that of a superpower. We now export raw materials in abundance while concomitantly importing more manufactured goods than we sell abroad. These facts cannot be isolated from our relative loss of commitment to higher education. Over the last 15 years, Japan and West Germany have doubled their output of scientists and engineers. By 1980, on the other hand, the number of American students graduating with a Ph. D. in physics declined to 985 from 1,740 just 10 years earlier.

The future of America is not being served by the administration's proposals to dismantle Federal aid to higher education. The individual students impacted by the President's proposals will be especially dire. Whether dependent upon Pell grants, guaranteed student loans, social security, or other educational loans or payments, these young Americans were confident the U.S. Government would remain consistent in its commitment to higher education. But regardless of the impact upon individual Americans, the profound loss will be to our Nation as a whole. The open society we seek, the productivity of our Nation's industries, the quality of health care and other professional services, not to mention our military preparedness—all of these will ultimately suffer the consequences. This is why I urge my colleagues to oppose further cutbacks in our commitment to the education of tomorrow's leaders.●

LEGISLATION TO AMEND SECTION 112 OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT RELATING TO HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 5669, a bill to amend the hazardous air pollutants provisions of the Clean Air Act.

During the past 12 years, we have seen relatively little progress in this crucial area. The EPA has listed only seven air pollutants as hazardous, and has regulated only four. The EPA has been studying 37 other pollutants for a considerable period of time, but has failed to take action.

My bill would accelerate the control of hazardous air pollutants. The Administrator would be required to list as hazardous the 37 pollutants currently being evaluated, unless the Administrator finds within a year that an evaluated pollutant is not hazardous. The bill also would require that factories use the best possible systems to minimize emissions of hazardous air pollutants. However, no source of pollutants would be required to do anything that was not technically feasible.

For the information of all concerned, I am including the text of the

legislation and a summary of its provisions. The material follows:

H.R. 5669

A bill to amend section 112 of the Clean Air Act relating to hazardous air pollutants, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Section 112(b)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act is amended by inserting "(i)" after "(A)" and by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(ii) The Administrator shall determine, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, whether or not each of the substances listed on page 561 of part 3 of the Clean Air Act Oversight Hearings before the Committee on the Environment and Public Works, 97th Congress, 1st Session, June 5, 9, 11, and 22, 1981 (Serial #97-H12) is a hazardous air pollutant within the meaning of subsection (a)(1).

"(iii) In the case of any substance which is not referred to in clause (ii), within 180 days after receipt of information (including a petition submitted by any person) which indicates that such substance may be a hazardous air pollutant within the meaning of subsection (a)(1), and after notice and opportunity for public hearing, the Administrator shall determine whether or not such substance is such a hazardous air pollutant. This clause shall not require the Administrator to make such determination in the case of any substance which the Administrator has previously determined not to be a hazardous air pollutant, but nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Administrator from determining at any time (either on his own motion or on petition of any person) that any substance is a hazardous air pollutant, whether or not such a prior determination has been made.

"(iv) If the Administrator makes an affirmative determination under clause (ii) or (iii) with respect to any substance, he shall (simultaneously with such determination) include such substance in the list required to be published under this subparagraph. Each substance referred to in clause (ii) shall, by operation of law, be included on such list on the date one year after the date of the enactment of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1982 unless the Administrator has determined that such substance is not a hazardous air pollutant within the meaning of subsection (a)(1).".

(b) Subparagraph (B) of section 112(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B)(i) The Administrator shall publish a list of each category of stationary sources which emit in significant amounts any hazardous air pollutant included on the list under subparagraph (A). The list of source categories shall include:

"(I) each category of stationary sources which emit a listed hazardous air pollutant in significant amounts and which are listed under section 111(b)(1)(A) or which are part of a major emitting facility type referred to in the first sentence of section 169(1); and

"(II) each other category of stationary sources which emit a listed hazardous air pollutant in significant amounts.

"(ii) If, after the Administrator has listed hazardous air pollutants and source categories in accordance with the schedule set forth in subsection (f), the Administrator makes any revision in the list of hazardous air pollutants under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall, within one year after such revision, publish a revised list of source categories under this subparagraph. Such list of source categories may be revised by the Administrator at such other times as may be necessary to include all categories of stationary sources which emit in significant amounts any hazardous air pollutant listed under subparagraph (A).".

(c)(1) Section 112(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting the following after subparagraph (B):

"(C)(i) The Administrator shall publish proposed emission standards under this section for new stationary sources in each source category listed under subparagraph (B).

"(ii) After publication of any proposed standard under clause (i) for any category of sources, the Administrator shall promulgate emission standards under this section for new sources in such category. The Administrator shall revise such standards where appropriate following periodic review. The Administrator shall complete a review of each standard promulgated under this section within 10 years from the date of promulgation.

"(iii) The standards and proposed standards published or promulgated under this subparagraph for any category of sources shall apply to each hazardous air pollutant listed under subparagraph (A) which is emitted in significant amounts from sources in such category.

"(D) Each emissions standard promulgated by the Administrator under this paragraph shall be established at the more stringent of the following:

"(i) the greatest degree of emission reduction achievable through application of the best system of continuous emission reduction which the Administrator determines is available on the applicable date (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any non-air quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements), or

"(ii) the most stringent emission limitation which is achieved in practice, as of the applicable date, by other sources in the same category (or in a category of sources having similar air pollution control characteristics).

The applicable date for purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) shall be the date of proposal of the standard concerned.".

(2) Section 112(b) of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(3) The Administrator may distinguish among classes, types, and sizes within categories of sources for purposes of establishing standards under this subsection.".

(d) Section 112 of such Act is amended by inserting the following at the end thereof:

"(f)(1) The actions specified in the following schedule which the Administrator is required to take under this section after the date of the enactment of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1982 shall be completed on or before the expiration of the period specified in the schedule:

Required action	Period after the enactment of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1982 required for completion
"(A) Make listing determination under subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii).	1 year
"(B) Publish list of source categories under section (b)(1)(B)(i)(I).	15 months
"(C) Publish list of source categories under section (b)(1)(B)(i)(II).	18 months
"(D) Proposal of standards for source categories listed under section (b)(1)(B)(i)(I).	30 months
"(E) Proposal of standards for source categories listed under section (b)(1)(B)(i)(II).	42 months

The Administrator shall promulgate standards for each source category for which standards are proposed under this section within six months from the date of such proposal. No time period specified under this subsection may be delayed or modified by reason of any petition submitted to the Administrator or by reason of any action brought in any court.

"(2) Completion of any action referred to in paragraph (1) by the date specified in paragraph (1) shall be treated as a nondiscretionary duty of the Administrator for purposes of section 304(a)(2). In any case in which the Administrator fails or refuses to take any such action within the time period specified in paragraph (1), any person may commence a civil action on his own behalf under section 304 against the Administrator to require the Administrator to take such action. For purposes of applying section 304(b)(2), in the case of an action referred to in the preceding sentence, 10 days shall be substituted for the 60 days specified therein.".

(e)(1) Paragraph (1) of section 112(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) Where a delegation is in effect under subsection (d) the provisions of this paragraph shall be carried out by the State to which such delegation is made.

"(B) No person may construct any new source or modify any existing source of any hazardous air pollutant listed under this section (whether or not the source is included in a category of sources listed under this section or subject to a standard promulgated by the Administrator under subsection (b)), where such construction or modification will increase (after the application of Federally enforceable emission limitations) the emission of such hazardous air pollutant by a significant amount (as determined by rule by the Administrator) unless such source is required to comply with an emission standard established under this paragraph.

"(C) The Administrator shall establish emission standards under this paragraph on a case-by-case basis. Such standards shall be established for each source at the level which, in the judgment of the Administrator, provides an ample margin of safety to protect the public health from the hazardous air pollutant concerned unless he determines that such a standard is not economically or technologically practicable. Where he makes such a finding, he shall publish the finding, together with a detailed statement of the basis on which the finding was made.

"(D) Where the Administrator has made a finding under subparagraph (C) for any hazardous air pollutant emitted from a new or modified stationary source, the emissions standard under this section shall be established at the more stringent of the following:

"(i) the greatest degree of emission reduction achievable through application of the best system of continuous emission reduction which the Administrator determines is available on the applicable date (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any non-air quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements), or

"(ii) the most stringent emission limitation which is achieved in practice, as of the applicable date, by other sources in the same category (or in a category of sources having similar air pollution control characteristics).

The applicable date for purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) shall be the date on which appli-

cation is made for a permit or other form of approval to commence construction or modification of the source concerned. No standard established for the control of emissions of any hazardous air pollutant from any individual new or modified stationary source under this paragraph may be less stringent than any standard which has been promulgated by the Administrator under subsection (b) for the emission of such pollutant from the category of stationary sources of which such source is a part."

(2) Section 112(d) of such Act is amended by inserting "new or modified" before "stationary sources".

(f) Section 112 of such Act is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(g)(1) The Administrator shall prescribe regulations which shall establish a procedure similar to that provided by section 110 under which each State shall submit to the Administrator a plan which—

"(A) establishes emission standards for each air pollutant listed under subsection (b) of this section for each existing source to which an emissions standard would apply under subsection (b) of this section if such existing source were a new source; and

"(B) provides for implementation and enforcement of each such standard as expeditiously as practicable (but not later than 3 years after the date on which such standard is established).

Regulations of the Administrator under this paragraph shall permit the State in applying a standard to any particular source under a plan submitted under this paragraph to take into consideration, among other factors, the remaining useful life of the existing source to which such standard applies.

"(2) The Administrator shall have the same authority—

"(A) to prescribe a plan for a State in cases where the State fails to submit a satisfactory plan as he would have under section 110(c) in the case of failure to submit an implementation plan, and

"(B) to enforce the provisions of such plan in cases where the State fails to enforce them as he would have under sections 113 and 114 with respect to an implementation plan. In promulgating a standard under a plan prescribed under this paragraph, the Administrator shall take into consideration, among other factors, remaining useful lives of the sources in the category of sources to which such standard applies.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any owner or operator of any stationary source to operate such source in violation of any standard applicable to such source under this section.".

(g)(1) Redesignate subparagraph (C) of subsection (b)(1) of section 112 of such Act as subparagraph (F).

(2) In subsection (e)(1) of such section 112 strike out "adequate to protect the public health from such pollutant or pollutants with an ample margin of safety" and substitute "consistent with the requirements of subsection (b)(1) of this section".

(3) Section 112(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "to which no ambient air quality standard is applicable and".

(4) Section 112(b)(1)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out the phrases ", within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act," and "for which he intends to establish an emission standard under this section".

(5) Section 307(d)(1)(C) of such Act is amended by inserting "the promulgation or revision by the Administrator of any" before "emission standard".

(h) Nothing in any amendment made by this section shall affect the listing of any air pollutant, the proposal, promulgation, or revision of any standard, or any other action taken by the Administrator under section 112 of the Clean Air Act before the date of the enactment of this Act, except that any revision of any such list, and any proposal, promulgation, or revision of any such standard after such date of enactment shall comply with the provisions of the Clean Air Act, as amended by this Act.●

AMERICA NEEDS A FAIR TAX—A SINGLE RATE TAX

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the once bustling, competitive progressive community of the United States of America has virtually become a ghost town. Vast areas of once-thriving industry are idle while massive foreign imports capture those great markets where America once dominated—automobiles, electronics, nuclear reactors, aircraft and more.

America has become a retirement community where a frustrated people are preoccupied with work slowdowns, retirement gimmicks, squirreling schemes, and tax dodging—while Japan and other nations have adopted the American free enterprise system and their economies boom with success and abundance.

Why? What caused America to take this disastrous turn from dream to nightmare? Why the high interest rates? Why crippling inflation? Why rundown and shutdown factories? Why huge industrial and farm debt? Why are millions out of work or about to lose their jobs?

Congress scandalously overspends, that is true. The Federal Reserve dangerously overmanages the money supply, that is true. And the Government seriously overregulates, that is true. But the fraud-ridden, unfair, incentive-killing graduated income tax holds the bloody knife which has stabbed a prosperous-progressive America in the back.

To save that fast-expiring American dream, the progressive income tax must be quickly cast aside—it is time for a fair tax, a tax the people can understand and afford, a tax which will invite respect for, not abuse of the law. It is time for the single rate tax.

File your tax on a form the size of a postcard. File without fear of those costly and nosey IRS audits. File under a simple system where you always know what is yours to keep.

The single rate is a fair tax where everyone pays the same fair share, and the gimmicks are gone so the rich man pays along with everyone else. Also gone are the tax dodging business deduction loopholes.

More people paying more taxes means less for each person to pay—the single rate tax means a tax cut for America, less redtape for America, a real chance for a balanced budget and the best way to cut inflation and interest rates and put the country back to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to act. The single rate tax plan, H.R. 4821, is now before the Congress. This legislation, the Tax Simplification Act [TSA], was introduced on November 10, 1981, and is now pending before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

The TSA does three things: First, it reduces the burden on taxable income to a single, universal percentage rate of 14 percent. Second, while keeping the current exemption structure as it is under existing law, it allows deductions only for religious contributions to maintain the first amendment separation of church and state and for catastrophic medical expenses to protect the bodily health of the Nation. Third, by simplifying the Internal Revenue Code, it protects against the twin dangers of totalitarian collection techniques and the antifree enterprise thrust of the graduated tax structure.

The net result of the TSA single rate tax proposal would interestingly be a dollar income increase to Uncle Sam with less burden to the taxpayer.

The potential impact of the TSA on tax collections is most encouraging, particularly as it applies to the single most important drain on Federal revenues—the disappearance of taxable income into the so-called underground economy. The General Accounting Office [GAO] gives a figure of more than $200 billion annually with a tax loss of $30 billion annually. The same source alleges that the problem is growing at the rate of 10 percent per year.

No enforcement technique now available can reverse or eliminate this phenomenon. In fact, there is some evidence that it is the coercive ways of the IRS itself which is a substantial stimulus to the disappearance of income into the unreachable sector. Any expansion of this coercive power of the IRS stands an excellent chance of being counterproductive.

Given the premise that abusive tactics decrease rather than increase collections, what other means is available to increase revenues without increasing tax rates? The essence of the supply-side economic theory is that repressive taxation, like repressive methods of collection, is subject to the law of diminishing returns. In reducing the individual tax burden as a percentage of the total taxable potential of the economy, the theory projects that the potential will grow larger and the tax take will then expand with it.

At the same time, the current administration seems committed to de-

regulation and reducing the role of the Federal Government in a number of social programs. The two trends converge toward one remedy which would both reaffirm the Reagan economic thrust and demonstrate the depth of the philosophic commitment to removing the tax collector as an engine of social change.

The sole justification for graduated income tax has been the socialist goal of a redistribution of the wealth. It has been sold on the idea that it would soak the rich and spare the poor and people of average income. Facts make it plain, however, that the actual tax load on incomes has fallen most heavily, not on the rich, but on working people and families of modest means. The system, in fact, has had the side effect of protecting the rich from the full impact of income tax through legislative exemptions and through their collective means to pay for tax avoidance.

As a result, it is now commonplace that the rich and upper middle income groups play the tax shelter game and pay little or no income tax at all. The time is right for the passage of a single rate tax bill. My proposal, H.R. 4821, sets the rate of tax on all personal income at 14 percent, allowing deductions only for religious, not charitable contributions, and for catastrophic medical expenses. All other income is taxed at the 14-percent rate.

The TSA concept will provide both savings and increased income to the Federal Government. The savings are obvious. Most of the distasteful enforcement methods of the IRS and their huge staff can be dispensed with at a saving of more than $1 billion annually. Return processing will become a mathematical function, easily handled by nonlabor intensive systems.

Under the TSA, increases in revenue to the Government can be expected from both the top and the middle of the income spectrum without an additional personal tax burden because shelter schemes will be abandoned. The bill not only does away with the opportunity for this kind of activity, but it also removes the incentive for such schemes since they would become economically nonproductive when the tax is fixed at the suggested low 14 percent. Even at the lower level of income a more reasonable tax rate should have a substantial pressure on returning hidden earnings from wages and other income to the tax rolls, particularly since any gain to be realized will not continue to justify the risk of fines and prosecution.

Most important, since the fixed tax rate will leave more money in the taxpayers' pockets while returning a net tax revenue to the public treasury at least equal to current tax revenues, everyone benefits—citizen and government alike.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to act. America needs a fair tax—a single rate tax.●

21ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE NEW REVELATION MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1982, the New Revelation Missionary Baptist Church, one of the leading churches in the greater Pasadena area, will celebrate its 21st anniversary with the Cornerstone Installation Service.

For more than two decades now, the New Revelation Church has been striving to meet, not only the spiritual needs of its congregation and its community, but to meet their social, educational, and economic needs as well.

The church has been successful in attaining its high goals; it has met its obligations with an active, thriving preschool program that helps very young children in many critical, crucial ways. It has other programs that have helped many individuals increase their skills and job marketability.

In looking ahead, I have no doubt that the New Revelation Church will continue to grow and prosper; that it will continue to provide spiritual guidance and leadership throughout the community and that it will continue to be an asset to the city of Pasadena, the district, and to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize one of the fine churches of southern California and to congratulate all its members as they celebrate a special occasion.●

SAVING LIVES IS WHAT THEY ARE ALL ABOUT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last month I listened to an inspiring address by Linda Theis, president of the Ohio Right to Life Society, on the occasion of the Ohio breakfast here in Washington on January 22.

Those of us who are committed to the prolife cause can readily see that the concept of the right to life is not only an essential part of the heritage of American democracy—an unalienable right, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence; it is also an instinctive reaction on the part of any caring human being when fellow human beings are in peril.

This is the theme that is so eloquently expressed in Mrs. Theis' remarks which follow:

ADDRESS OF LINDA J. THEIS, PRESIDENT OF THE OHIO RIGHT TO LIFE SOCIETY

Soon a decade will have come to pass in the life span of the pro-life movement. Nine years ago today 7 of 9 Supreme Court Justices of the United States of America—our America, your and mine—sent down two fatal decisions that have resulted in the mass slaughter of over 10 million innocent babies. And today, 9 years later, their voices cry out to us in a chorus more tearfully than we could possibly have known on that cold day in January back in 1973.

As each day and each week turned into each month and each year, we found we had to face the horrible fact that this repulsive and cruel practice of killing unborn babies was to take not just a number of months to resolve—but many numbers of years.

What we had hoped would be a relatively short-term commitment has stretched into nearly a decade—and the killing goes on—and we are to reaffirm our commitment and to stand firm until that day when we accomplish our ultimate goal of legal personhood and protection for all our unborn brothers and sisters.

We as people who have known of the value of each individual life from the very onset of our own lives can stand firm in that commitment. Thanks largely to our own mothers and fathers who sought to instill in us a very real reverence for every individual human being, we have come the distance and know without question that we must see this effort through.

We are at an extremely crucial time in the history of this great movement—possibly the most crucial time we've been through to date. For so very much—the moves toward the acceptance of infanticide, euthanasia, in-vitro fertilization—so much depends on how we can effect positive change on the question of abortion.

Have you ever noticed the reaction of every person in a crowded room when an infant or a child in that room begins to cry? Or the reaction when a person is drowning and struggling to save his own life? This is a natural instinct in all of us that makes us want to "ease the pain" to "make things better" to dive into the water if need be to help save that life.

Just last week when Air Florida 90 plunged into the Potomac here in Washington, a passerby dove into the icy waters and brought a stewardess to safety who otherwise would have perished. The man wanted no recognition, wanted no news cameras there to record his every word about his feelings when he jumped into the waters. He very simply stated that he just knew another person needed his help and without a thought he did what he instinctively knew he should do.

You people here are not unlike that gentleman who did what he had to do without thought of courage and valor. There are certain basic feelings that surface when the flare goes up. You people here in this very room have in ways that may never be known to you saved the lives already of thousands. The waters you tread in attempt to rescue the unborn are icy and treacherous too—more so than we ever bargained for—but you have gone ahead anyway and babies' lives are being saved as a result. Those children will never walk up to you and say "thank you for saving my life" but you will know that somewhere out there

they are alive and well and growing to their potential as members of our human family because of you.

Oftentimes I don't think you realize just how vital you are in the great pro-life movement. The leaders of this movement formulate the changes in our governmental policies and attempt to guide the grassroots people of this country but you—every one of you sitting here today are the ones who make those changes happen. You are the ones who educate your communities and your legislators on this issue and this movement. You, not we, are the force that makes things happen in this great nation of ours. And today your response to what I am going to ask of you will make the difference in how soon we can stop the killing of over 4,000 babies every day in this country.

I would ask each and every one of you to think very hard and with directed intent on the amount of commitment you are willing to make during this next year.

The major point I need to have clear in my mind, as a pro-life leader in Ohio, is how much "active" support do we have out there across this state.

We know we have the vast majority of support philosophically, but what about the activists? Those who are out there in the trenches really fighting to win have been at it for a long time. They need help to continue. They need every single one of you who is here today—and more.

And so I would ask that you look to the person sitting beside you today at this Ohio Congressional Breakfast and know that he or she has made a solid commitment to pro-life activism in 1982. Look to that person and make a promise to him, to yourself, and to every unborn baby whose life will depend on your activism during the coming months of 1982. And let that promise be one of support and comfort when he becomes weary, one of optimism when he feels his efforts may never see fruition. Promise him that special warmth and security that only you can provide as his comrade and friend in defense of the unborn.

God bless and be with us every one as we continue to speak in the unified voice of the Ohio Right To Life Society for those yet unborn who cannot, as yet, speak for themselves. Life is precious. We will be the acting force to preserve and protect every human being from the very moment of his creation.●

COMMUNISM: THE GREAT ECONOMIC FAILURE

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the March 1 edition of U.S. News & World Report features an article by David L. Barnett entitled, "Communism: The Great Economic Failure," which examines how and why communism has failed so totally to produce the benefits envisioned by its originators and supporters. Mr. Barnett begins his examination of economic problems behind the Iron Curtain this way:

For the 1.5 billion inhabitants of the Communist world, the Marxist promise of a workers' paradise has turned into a nightmare of permanent scarcity, economic stagnation and discontent.

This dismal performance of the Soviet Union's "planned economy," the Soviets' inability to feed their own people, and the diversion of all important resources from civilian to military uses points up the failures of Communist rule in the Soviet Union. We see on television every night the economic misery being endured by the Polish people—and we tend to forget that that misery is not unique in Eastern Europe. Indeed, it is the norm, as author Barnett points out in his article. From that article, it becomes clear that the economic hardships and the political oppression confronting residents of eastern European nations dominated by the Soviet Union can be remedied in only one way: the establishment of a system of free enterprise and expanded political freedoms for those men and women now ruled by the Kremlin.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this excellent article to you and to my colleagues, and I include it in today's RECORD:

COMMUNISM: THE GREAT ECONOMIC FAILURE

(By David L. Barnett)

For the 1.5 billion inhabitants of the Communist world, the Marxist promise of a workers' paradise has turned into a nightmare of permanent scarcity, economic stagnation and discontent.

Poland's economic disaster, which spawned a now aborted revolt by disillusioned workers, is the most dramatic symptom of a wider crisis gripping the Soviet Union and a dozen other nations that copied its economic system.

In Russia itself, 65 years after the revolution, the masses of people still must queue for hours, not just for luxuries but even for meat. Grim as they are, living standards in the U.S.S.R. and much of Eastern Europe are expected to deteriorate. Economic growth rates, impressive in the '50s and '60s, are sliding to near zero levels. Officially regulated prices are skyrocketing—up by as much as 400 percent for foodstuffs in Poland.

Intensifying the pressure on supplies and costs in Russia is the fact that a worker produces only half the goods and services turned out by his American counterpart. The economic squeeze is likely to be increased by the loss of easy access to Western loans that have been used to import technology and industrial equipment. Banks in the West have provided an 80-billion-dollar crutch for limping Soviet-bloc economies—surpassing the Marshall Plan aid that helped to rebuild Western Europe after World War II.

Not just money and technology have been imported from the West on a lavish scale. Features of the free-market system increasingly have been copied by a number of Eastern European countries as well as by China in an effort to escape from the crippling vise of Soviet-style "command economies." The Soviet-bloc states that are doing best have reformed the most. Economists stress that the crisis in the Communist world differs fundamentally from the recession plaguing the West today. The slump in the U.S. and Europe is seen as cyclical, with the prospect of recovery over the next year. By contrast, the economic crisis in the Soviet bloc stems from structural problems within the system itself and is expected to persist—perhaps even worsen—unless basic reforms are introduced.

The Soviet system, as it operates now, has what many economists see as formidable built-in obstacles to progress. A central planning group—Gosplan—sets wages, prices and production goals and allocates resources more on a political than economic basis. The first objective for an industrial manager is to persuade the planners to set low targets that can be easily achieved and win rewards rather than press for higher output.

Also: With prices set arbitrarily, planners cannot tell whether their decisions will produce a balance of supply and demand. Shortages crop up suddenly, and the system is too rigid to adjust. Finally: Workers and managers have no incentive to work hard since laborers rarely get fired and there are few material rewards for greater efficiency.

To examine the fate of the marxist economic experiment and the propsects for revitalizing the system, staff members of U.S. News & World Report talked to experts in this country and abroad and conducted on-the-spot inquiries in major Communist countries. This is what they found:

THE SOVIET ECONOMY—SHACKLED BY INERTIA

Despite its standing as one of the world's two superpowers, the Soviet Union provides its populace with one of the lowest living standards among industrial nations. Although the U.S.S.R. has a vast store of natural resources, economic growth has slowed dramatically from the sharp upward trends of the '50s and '60s. The increase in the national product, according to one authoritative study, is now crawling along at 1.2 percent a year.

Nicholas Daniloff, the magazine's correspondent in Moscow, reports: "The fact that the Soviet economy is an economy of scarcity is underlined by long lines at stores, black marketeering, bribe giving and bribe taking—and the government's new harsh campaign to stamp out speculation and corruption."

Especially grim is the situation in Soviet agriculture. For the third year in a row, Russia has suffered a major crop failure. As a result, says Marshall Goldman, associate director of the Russian Research Center at Harvard, "the Soviet Union finds itself with a disaster of unprecedented magnitude on its hands."

Adverse weather is a factor, but basically the disaster stems from the monumental inefficiency of the Soviet system of collectivized agriculture. Almost a quarter of the Soviet workers are in agriculture, and the still can't feed the nation. By contrast, only 3 percent of the American labor force is engaged in farming and produces vast surpluses. Each U.S. farm worker feeds 60 Americans; each U.S.S.R. farmer feeds only eight Russians.

Ironically, the only bright spot in this bleak picture of Soviet agriculture is the island of free enterprise in the otherwise collectivized society: The tiny private plots that workers on collective and state farms are allowed to cultivate—occupying less than 2 percent of the farmland but producing one third of the total meat-and-vegetable output.

The recurrent agriculture disasters multiply Russia's industrial troubles. To pay for imports of grain to feed its people, the Kremlin was compelled to sell 224 tons of

gold abroad in 1981. This impedes the drive to modernize Soviet factories by limiting funds available to buy Western technology.

However much they value technology developed in the West, the Russians resolutely reject any notion of importing any of the features of the free-enterprise system that spawns the advanced technology. Kremlin leaders even spurn suggestions that the small slice of private enterprise permitted to farmers be extended to repair services, restaurants and small shops. The central management of virtually every aspect of Soviet work seems firmly entrenched and stands out as a fundamental reason for the country's economic malaise. Says one Western expert based in Moscow: "They will tinker, but that's all they will do."

Compounding the problems is the fact that the people seem to have lost whatever incentive they had to work hard. Industriouness seems to have disappeared because the incentive of private gain has been banned. Ideological jawboning—exhortations to avoid waste and work harder—no longer has much effect.

Soviet officialdom makes no secret of its concern. Radio Moscow recently compared the Tolyatti plant, built by Fiat on the Volga River, and the Daimler-Benz plant in West Germany. The broadcast complained that Soviet output lags far behind in quantity and quality because of chronic absenteeism and extended tea breaks.

Aside from the inefficiencies of the system itself, what virtually rules out the prospect of a better life for the Russian people is the massive diversion of resources to the military. America's investment in defense, even with the increases now proposed, is modest by comparison. Although the Soviet economy is about half that of the U.S., the Russians devote 12 to 14 percent of total output to the military, compared with 6 percent in the United States. The defense establishment not only has first call on material resources but also on the best engineers and scientists.

On top of the military burden is the cost of preserving the Russian empire, which further drains scarce resources at the expense of the Soviet consumer. The U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency estimates that Soviet aid of all kinds to other Communist regimes soared from about 2 billion dollars in 1971 to nearly 24 billion in 1980.

The goal of a world converted to Communism is a pillar of Kremlin doctrine. But foreign aid, particularly goods shipped to Eastern Europe, is a source of bitterness to the Russian worker. He grumbles that the Eastern Europeans already are better off than he is—and he is right.

EASTERN EUROPE—ON A RISKY ROAD TO REFORM

Nowhere is the search to break out of the Communist economic straitjacket more evident and risky than in Eastern Europe, where 109 million people in six countries have struggled under a Kremlin economic system imposed by Soviet might after World War II. The satellite states have little room to maneuver.

The tragedy of Poland today is cited as an object lesson of the penalty for going beyond the strict limits imposed by Moscow. Still, Czechoslovak economist Jaroslav Vejvoda admits publicly: "It is becoming clear that for a full 30 years we have been unable to solve problems associated with production under socialism, either in theory or in practice."

Today, most of the Soviet-bloc countries of Eastern Europe face economic stagnation, with growing shortages of basic materials, a hard-currency debt of 60 billion dollars to the West and dim prospects for the future. But even the countries with the best performance records, such as Hungary and East Germany, are now in serious trouble. Over all, the average yearly growth rate of Communist economies in Eastern Europe has plunged from 5.7 percent in 1976 to 1.2 percent in 1980, according to the International Monetary Fund. And an even worse slump is predicted in the period ahead.

A Communist Party newspaper in Czechoslovakia recently admitted: "It is no use covering it up. The economic situation today is much worse than five or 10 years ago. We have to make rapid adjustments or the whole system will be seriously threatened."

Government-ordered price increases make inflation in the U.S. look like stability. Romania on February 15 ordered price hikes on basic food products and cigarettes by an average of 35 percent. Meat prices went up 64 percent. Czechoslovakia just raised meat prices 137 percent. Poland on February 1 jumped the cost of foodstuffs between 200 and 400 percent.

Why the sharp economic deterioration throughout Eastern Europe? The Polish crisis is one factor—but by no means the most important one. Shortages of food, coal, sulfur and industrial goods have been aggravated through much of the Soviet bloc, which depended on Poland as a major supplier. But the crisis also has made Western banks much more cautious about financing East-West trade. Many analysts think that a cutoff of hard-currency loans would confront Eastern Europe with a real economic disaster.

Even before the Polish crisis, it was becoming evident that Eastern Europe's economic game plan was failing. Alfred Zanker, the magazine's European Economic Editor, reports that the strategy has been to borrow from Western banks to purchase advanced technology from the West. New plants and equipment were supposed to produce goods, such as typewriters, that could be exported to pay off the Western debt.

The hitch is that exports to the West have not increased enough to ease the debt because of the poor quality of their products or other shortcomings.

In an effort to bail out its Eastern European empire, the Soviet Union has been buying the inferior made-for-export goods from satellite nations and selling them oil at cut-rate prices. For example, Poland in 1980 bought Soviet oil at about 46 percent of the world dollar price.

But this year the Russians, themselves caught in a worsening squeeze, are refusing to increase oil shipments to the Eastern Europeans. The Soviets are committed to send oil at the 1980 level for the next five years, which actually means a sharp cut from 1981 levels and not enough for economic expansion. Furthermore, the oil is now being provided at near the world price, which adds greatly to the drag on Eastern European economies. The result, say some economists, could be to push Eastern Europe to the brink of an economic calamity. A new study by the Central Intelligence Agency says that the cutback would virtually wipe out even the modest growth predicted this year. Czechoslovakia's annual growth rate would drop to 0.3 percent, and even in Hungary, the most buoyant of the Eastern European states, the rate would slide to 0.7 percent, a reduction of two thirds from the projected 1982 rate.

Damaging as the external setbacks have been, economists stress that the most basic problem in Eastern Europe is a fatal flaw in the system—the lack of incentives. Lester Thurow, economics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, points out that because of shortages there are few material rewards for hard work. Thus, the worker has no incentive to labor productively. Production falls, and stores end up with even fewer goods.

There also is little incentive for managers to experiment. Charles H. Movit of Wharton Econometrics notes that the system gives the greatest reward to managers who year after year overfulfill their production quotas by only 1 percent. A new approach that might improve production by 10 percent is not worth the risk.

In efforts to shake loose from this straitjacket, several of the Soviet-bloc countries are adopting Western-style incentive systems. Stewart Powell, the magazine's London-based correspondent who has traveled widely in Eastern Europe, reports that East Germany, for instance, offers bonuses, longer vacations and a shorter workweek for more productive workers. Also, 247,000 of the country's 8 million workers now are engaged in private enterprises in areas such as meat processing, building maintenance and retail trade.

Even so, East Germans seem dissatisfied. A major reason: Nightly they see on West German television what they lack in their own stores.

The most satisfied consumers in Eastern Europe are in Hungary and Bulgaria, primarily because those two countries have junked as much of the Kremlin model as they think they can get away with. Hungary already is so tied to Western economies, correspondent Powell reports, that were a trade embargo clamped on, half of Hungary's factories would be forced to close within 90 days because of lack of key components for finished products.

Experimentation with free-market concepts in Hungary, East Germany and Bulgaria is tolerated by the Kremlin, because, unlike in Poland, the political power of the Communist Party is in no way being challenged.

CHINA—TAKING THE LEAP TO FREER ENTERPRISE

All of the changes in European Communist countries are dwarfed by China's rush to embrace free-market practices. Reports James Wallace, the magazine's Asia correspondent: "Emphasis now is on productivity rather than equality, on pragmatism instead of ideology. Incentives such as bonuses and higher wages are replacing political exhortation. Profits are not only permitted; they are demanded by government leaders."

The reforms reflect Peking's acknowledgment of failure of its past economic policies, among the most doctrinaire in the Communist world. In its far-reaching effort to overhaul the economy, the Chinese government no longer assigns all workers to government jobs at fixed pay, under orders to fill production quotas set by central planners. It is encouraging free enterprise by offering tax exemptions and low-interest loans to the self-employed. Of the 40 million Chinese entering the job market each year, more than 2 million will end up working for themselves or for privately financed groups, mostly collectives.

The biggest departure is the planned reorganization of industry. As in Western economies, the bottom line—profits or losses—will become the major factor. Each enterprise will pay to the state part of its profits, an amount roughly comparable to corporate

taxes in the West. The rest will be used for higher wages, expansion or whatever the enterprise itself decides.

Furthermore, China's Communist leaders are offering new incentives in an effort to attract increased foreign investment. To reassure Westerners, they have introduced tax and other laws regulating foreign investments, joint ventures and co-production agreements. So far, such investment amounts to less than 1 billion dollars. Several Chinese provinces are competing to attract foreign business, much as American states do, with favorable tax rates, low-cost land and labor.

Such radical changes are not being made without a fight. Correspondent Wallace reports: "The most fundamental objection comes from Communist Party stalwarts who fear loosening economic controls will destroy firm central political control vital to any Communist system. So far, however, the reformers are winning. But they could be undone if the reforms do not produce quick, visible results."

Not only has the Kremlin model fallen flat in the more industrialized countries, but it also has proved to be a failure in the underdeveloped areas. Mozambique and Ethiopia, in Africa, are the most recent to embrace the Kremlin economic model as a fast way to prosperity through industrialization. They are both impoverished. Vietnam remains viable only with substantial subsidies from the Kremlin. Cuba needs billions in Russian aid to stay afloat.

The two Koreas provide a striking example of the difference the free-enterprise system can make. South Korea has one of the new miracle economies of the world, with a growth rate last year of more than 14 percent. Communist North Korea, with one fourth the output of the South, uses half its work force to feed its people, compared with little more than one third in South Korea.

All in all, the Communist economies of the world are at a cross roads. Central planning and collective agriculture appear to be failures. While still rejected by Russia as a threat to Communist Party political control, a switch to Western-style free markets and individual incentives is taking place in China and several Eastern European countries. Russia's willingness to join this trend and allow its satellites to go far enough with reforms could well determine whether the decline continues inexorably in the Soviet bloc or whether the slide can be reversed.

UNITED STATES VERSUS U.S.S.R.—A COMPARISON OF WORLD'S TWO LARGEST ECONOMIES

Total output: United States, $2.9 trillion; U.S.S.R., $1.4 trillion.

Land area (square miles): United States, 3.6 million; U.S.S.R., 8.6 million.

Population: United States, 230 million; U.S.S.R., 268 million.

Oil (barrels produced per day): United States, 8.57 million; U.S.S.R., 12.18 million.

Steel (production in metric tons): United States, 100.8 million; U.S.S.R., 148.0 million.

Autos (production): United States, 6.4 million; U.S.S.R., 1.3 million.

Urbanization (percentage living in urban areas): United States, 73; U.S.S.R., 65.

Energy use per person (equivalent of metric tons of coal): United States, 12.4; U.S.S.R., 6.1.

Computers (value of general-purpose computer mainframes, end of 1980): United States, $58.2 billion; U.S.S.R., $9.2 billion (estimate).

Farm workers (as percentage of total work force): United States, 3; U.S.S.R., 24.

Meat produced per person (pounds): United States, 256; U.S.S.R., 126.

Grain produced per person (pounds): United States, 2,552; U.S.S.R., 1,571.

NOTE.—Figures are for latest year available from both countries—usually 1980.

TWO EUROPES—WHICH PRODUCES THE MOST? [1]

	Economic growth 1980 versus 1979 (percent)	Total output per person	Energy use per person (United States=100)	Proportion of workers in farming (percent)
Western Europe:				
Austria	Up 3.1	$10,250	42	9
Belgium	Up 2.5	11,800	55	3
Britain	Down 1.8	9,400	46	2
Denmark	Down 0.2	13,000	48	7
Finland	Up 5.0	10,450	51	12
France	Up 1.2	12,150	40	9
West Germany	Up 1.8	13,350	54	4
Greece	Up 1.7	4,200	23	38
Ireland	Up 1.9	5,400	31	19
Italy	Up 4	6,900	28	11
Luxembourg	Up 0.6	13,000	([2])	([2])
Netherlands	Up 0.5	11,850	55	6
Norway	Up 3.8	14,000	97	8
Portugal	Up 5.5	2,450	12	25
Spain	Up 1.5	5,700	23	15
Sweden	Up 1.4	14,750	69	5
Switzerland	Up 4.4	15,850	42	5
Average	Up 1.5	10,000	41	9
Eastern Europe:				
Bulgaria	Down 0.3	4,500	44	38
Czechoslovakia	Up 2	7,650	55	11
East Germany	Up 2.6	8,100	71	10
Hungary	Up 0.2	4,950	33	16
Poland	Down 2.7	4,650	47	31
Romania	Up 1	5,250	39	33
Average	Up 0.4	5,700	49	25

[1] On average, Western Europe outproduces Eastern Europe almost 2 to 1.
[2] Not available.

Note: Output per person is for 1980—latest available.

Source: USN&WR—Basic data: Central Intelligence Agency, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Population Reference Bureau, Inc.●

STAMP PROPOSAL BY JOSEPH ZAGAME

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a proposal offered by Mr. Joseph Zagame, a noted philatelist and historian.

Recognizing the educational value of commemorative stamps issued by the U.S. Postal Service, Mr. Zagame has suggested initiating a series which would honor the many ethnic heritage which have contributed to the development of America.

In this regard, the following are brief summaries, written by Mr. Zagame, which describe the achievements of four Italian immigrants who are particularly noteworthy and deserving of recognition.

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

1980 marked the 175th anniversary of the birth and the 100th anniversary of the death of a great Italian American artist, Constantino Brumidi, who painted the Capitol in Washington. He pioneered the "affresco" technique in the U.S.

Constantino Brumidi was born in Rome on July 26, 1805. His accidental death on February 19, 1880 was caused by a fall from the scaffold on which he was standing while working on the rotunda of the Capitol. In the place of his death now rises a marble bust commemorated to him in 1968 for his inspiration to art and liberty.

To his love for art, Brumidi added a love for liberty, and it was this desire that brought him to America. Because of his love for liberty he was considered "undesirable" by an influential person in the Vatican, and was first imprisoned, then freed with the condition that he go into exile by the intervention of Pope Pius IX, who was his friend. In 1852 he came to America.

He arrived in New York on September 18, 1852. He soon expressed his wish to become a citizen and was naturalized two years later in Washington. Both New York and Philadelphia have some works of art of Brumidi. In New York they are kept in St. Stephen Church (147 E. 28th Street) which celebrated his 125th anniversary in 1973. The affresco of the crucifixion, behind the main altar, is the best known work in the church.

It was in Washington, in the Capitol, where Brumidi gave the best measure of his genius and of his talent as an artist, so much as to gain the nickname "The Michelangelo of the Capitol of the United States." His afrescos in the Capitol are an American version of Michelangelo's afrescos in the Sistine Chapel in Rome. Brumidi had started his artistic career restoring Michelangelo's afrescos in the Sistine.

In America, Brumidi worked under six Presidents. For his 25 years' work beautifying the U.S. Capitol he received a total of $80,712.71 or about $3,200 per year. At the age of sixty, he began painting the dome of the Capitol, which he enriched with an afreso concave of 4,646 sq. ft.

The works created by Brumidi in the Capitol interpret majestically America's spirit and ideals. Comments about his work have been made by many, including Senator Morrill of Vermont who said, "So long did he dedicate his heart and his strength to this Capitol that his love and reverence for it have not surpassed those that Michelangelo had for St. Peter's."

ENRICO FERMI

On the second of December 1942, the first atomic pile began to operate, causing the first chain nuclear reaction. This was the beginning of an era, when man learned to employ enormous energy quantity in the nuclear atom.

This most important event was the fruit of the genius of one of the greatest physicists of all times, the Italian Enrico Fermi.

Fermi was born in Rome on the 29th of September 1901. He graduated with a Physics degree in 1922, when he was only 21 years old. In 1929 he was named the "Academic of Italy." In 1938 he was given the Nobel Prize in Physics. In 1937 he came to the United States for some conferences, but in 1939 he took refuge in America, due to the fascist laws which struck his wife and his children. He had a teaching post at Columbia University in New York. During the 2nd World War, he devoted all his activity to the development of nuclear energy on a large scale, first in Chicago and then in Los Alamos.

The atomic bomb was planned and made thanks to Enrico Fermi and the "chain reaction" made by the experiments at the University of Chicago in 1945. These experiments were the key to the fabrication of the

atomic bomb, in the American establishments of Clinton Engineeers and the first atomic explosion in Almo Gordo, New Mexico on July 10, 1945. In 1946 Fermi received the United Atomic Energy Commission's first special award.

Fermi died when he was only 53 years old on November 29, 1954. Italy and the entire world lost one of the greatest and brightest scientists of all times.

He devoted to America, which was his second homeland, 15 years of his scientific activity, through his research, his brilliant inventions and his teaching and he raised the scientific level of the counry and opened the doors of the world's history to a new era. The nuclear era, full of dangers, but also full of hopes and promises. The Federal Government honored his memory by giving his name to the biggest nuclear accelerator of Batavia, Illinois, inaugurated on May 11, 1974.

On December 2, 1967, the Italian Post issued a commemorative stamp on the 25th anniversary of the first "chain nuclear reaction by Enrico Fermi." Fermi has honored Italy where he was born and his second homeland, like many other Italian Americans, known or unknown, who contributed to make America the most powerful country in the world.

ARTURO TOSCANINI

Arturo Toscanini was born in Parma on March 25, 1867. The Italian Post issued a commemorative stamp on the centenary of his birth. He was a great concerter, performer and supreme orchestra conductor. The image of this eminent composer is peculiarly close to the American world since he spent a long part of his life in this country.

To emphasize the importance of his work in America, we remember his directing the Philharmonic Orchestra of New York from 1942 to 1957 and the famous Broadcasting Corporation established expressly for him. His work inspired the spirit of the American music and he spent most of his life at the service of the American culture. During his long residence in New York the composer achieved a unique goal for American music, preventing it from following those provincial characteristics of the 19th century and opening the doors of a country, which had reached the "Tunes of Gershwin," towards the great features of the European musical tradition.

Toscanini died on January 16, 1957. New York had been his second homeland after his voluntary exile from Italy in 1938. His residence at Wave Hill in the Bronx has become a public institution. The inheritence of Toscanini is historically inerasable and a source of constant pride to all Italian Americans. Besides being the Italian culture symbol, he has diffused in the world the light of beauty and civilization. He has been the personification of the courage and liberty that challenged the tyranny.

ANTONIO MEUCCI

Antonio Meucci was born in Florence, Italy on April 13, 1808, and died in Staten Island on October 18, 1889. He had a hard and adventurous life, first in Florence, and then in the Americas, where he also helped Giuseppe Garibaldi in his ventures. Meucci was his collaborator in building a candle factory in Staten Island. However, his life was mostly enlightened by the research of the transmission of sounds by distance.

In 1835 in Auana (Cuba) he realized the telegraph communication. From 1844 to 1848 he went back to Italy and took part in the revolution, reaching the rank of Lieutenant. Meucci came back to Auana and stayed until 1850, the year of the fire at the theatre where he was supervising the mechanical and electrical installations.

Meucci settled in Staten Island, continuing the experiments he began in Auana in 1857, improving his invention. Unfortunately, all his efforts to raise money to promote his invention were in vain, because of the skepticism of those the inventor asked. In order to insure the priority of his invention, in 1871, Meucci was able to put together enough money to take the sketches and documents to the patent office. He gets patent number 3335 on December 28, 1871. At this time again he can't find anyone who will finance him, and when the patent expires he doesn't even have the money to renew it. At the Patent Office, Meucci is told they can't find the documents. They shall never find them. Through many vicissitudes, old age, political conflicts, judicial controversies and disputes, the Supreme Court in 1886 finally granted him the invention's priority.

It was only a moral victory, since the patent had expired in 1873. Meucci's life ended in Staten Island, serene and poor, living in a house which had been donated, surrounded by those who had known him and loved him. That house today, is called "Garibaldi-Meucci Museum" and is taken care of by OSIA—Order Sons of Italy in America.

Two commemorative stamps were issued in Italy in 1965 and 1978, to the memory of Antonio Meucci, "True inventor of the telephone."●

WE CAN CUT DEFENSE SPENDING

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Deputy Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci recently challenged critics of the Pentagon to find any cuts in the fiscal year 1983 defense budget. This is a gauntlet too tempting to resist picking up.

A few weeks ago I wrote a memo for Congressmen explaining some of the inherent difficulties in cutting defense spending this year because so much of what we are being asked to appropriate is not due to be spent until later years. In his budget briefing for the press February 6, Mr. Carlucci stood my argument on its head. He said 31 percent of outlays in fiscal year 1983 would come from prior year appropriations while 62 percent would be for immediate operations, such as personnel and O. & M., and thus, he implied, untouchable. That would leave only 7 percent or $15.1 billion of new money. Trying to have his cake and eat it too, Mr. Carlucci then argued that even if you cut all of that $15.1 billion, you would save less than a quarter of that because three-quarters of that money is not spent until later years. I will ignore the fact that the Deputy Secretary has managed to switch from outlays to budget authority in midparagraph and thus totally bollixed his line of logic. But I do want to address his declaration that this is a minimal budget lacking in cuttable items.

The fiscal 1983 budget is larger, in real terms than even the budget for the peak year of the Vietnam war. The Reagan 5-year program provides for the fastest peacetime escalation in defense spending since 1940. If the administration saw war looming on the horizon, the prudent course would be a crash program to build up war reserve stocks of munitions and spare parts. Then the armed services would be able to sustain combat until industry could be placed on a war footing. In the posture statement, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger claimed the administration was placing high priority on sustainability, planning to spend $90 billion for this purpose over the next 5 years. There is good reason for such a rapid buildup if we see war clouds building. If the administration did fear a war in the near term, however, it would be doing such things as putting more bombers on alert and more submarines on patrol. But the administration is not doing this, so it is clearly not anticipating a near term war. If war is not imminent, it would be better to slow the pace of funding for sustainability.

We should remember that the administration program provides very few additions to our force structure; basically it is filling out the force structure and modernizing it.

So, the key question is when do you get there. The administration has decided no war is imminent, and in that I concur, so there is less need to embark on a crash buildup.

Furthermore, we must remember that national security is not coterminous with the defense budget. Our human resources, measured by such things as educational attainment and technical skills, are also important. The strength of our economy is key. At this juncture, with three-digit deficits visible out to the horizon and the prospect of years of interest rates so high they will choke off needed investment, we need to realize that the scale of the defense budget is a major contributor to the deficits that are driving up interest rates—which in turn is crimping the investment so necessary for the industrial base to which the Defense Department pays lip service.

Looking at the gross numbers, President Reagan promised 7 percent annual real growth in the defense budget. This year he is asking, by his figures, for more than 10 percent real growth and an average of 8.4 percent annually in the outyears. A growth rate of 7 percent, 5 percent or even 3 percent would get us there only a few years later than Reagan's plan—but with lower deficits.

A real growth rate of 5 percent per year would require a cut of $10 billion

in outlays from the Reagan budget this year. This cut is by no means impossible, and it can be done without resorting to the traditional tactic of slicing into readiness.

One place to look for cuts is the $8 billion for sustainability in 1983. It breaks down into $2.6 billion for conventional munitions, $1.1 billion for war reserve spare parts, and the remaining $4.3 billion almost entirely for highly complicated munitions that may or may not work but cost 10 to 20 times what an ordinary munition costs. These complex munitions are weapons like the Maverick infrared guided antitank missile or the cluster bomb. If we defer such purchases, we could save substantially on outlays and the engineers would have more time to work out the kinks in the weapons. Nor would we damage either readiness or sustainability. The $2.6 billion will buy full complements of training rounds, and the services generally have adequate stockpiles of ordinary munitions. The services do not use the complicated rounds in training because each Phoenix missile or HARM antiradar missile costs too much to shoot when it does not count.

Sustainability and readiness are rather fuzzy categories. The Pentagon itself is constantly in the throes of defining what is readiness and what is sustainability. A good example of something that could go either place is aircraft replenishment spares. We need spare parts to keep aircraft flying so that pilots can train. That is readiness. We also need spare parts so that airplanes can fly in battle. That is sustainability. But the spare parts are the same. Frequently, to improve apparent readiness, the services will raid war reserves—sustainability—for the purpose of maintaining high mission-capable rates—readiness. But actually the airplanes are ready whether the parts are taken out of war reserves or not. It is just a matter of putting the parts on the plane.

In past years we have bought too few aircraft spares. The Weinberger budget overbuys them. Purchases of aircraft replenishment spares-used for both war reserves and peacetime operations—rise from Brown's plan of $3.4 billion in fiscal year 1983 to Weinberger's request for $4.2 billion. Apparently the intent here is to open the tap of the spare parts pipeline, to improve industrial readiness in case of conflict. This measure would be prudent if war were around the corner. But as we have seen their is no balanced program for imminent war. The priority given to fully funding a wartime operations tempo for aircraft is hard to rationalize in peacetime.

Furthermore, this administration is—correctly—concerned about the defense industrial base. A rapid buildup designed to eliminate all problems in a short while, however, necessarily means that purchases will decline once those problems are eliminated and stocks are at the desired level. Private enterprise can see that quite easily. But private enterprise is more interested in the prospect of steady markets than the boom or bust approach of the administration. The budget, therefore, threatens to undermine the defense industrial base rather than boost it.

Look at the line item for Air Force "munitions and associated equipment." The Pentagon budgeted $344.4 million for this item in 1981. Then it tripled, to $1,081 million in 1982. Now Mr. Weinberger proposes to cut the Air Force munition buy by 21 percent to $854 million in 1983. Then in 1984 it nearly doubles again to $1,535 million. This roller coaster will leave munitions firms—and especially the work force that will be laid off one year and rehired the next—dizzy.

Weinberger's program of building up war reserves has another drawback. Many of the munitions in the war reserves are in bad shape. The armed services lack adequate manpower or facilities to inspect and repair the war reserves. As new weapons and equipment enter the force structure, moreover, many of the spare parts and munitions become obsolete and useless. When the Pentagon insists on the need for rapid replacement of weapon types, augmentation of large war reserves to sustain months of combat becomes impractical if not impossible.

A further place to cut that will not hamper training and care of equipment is in depot maintenance. Weinberger's budget pushes depot maintenance above Brown's level by approximately $1.6 billion—the precise figures have not yet been supplied to Congress. For aircraft depot maintenance alone, the increase is $687 million, or 20 percent. The purpose of this large increase is to reduce the backlog of depot maintenance to zero at the end of each fiscal year.

This zero backlog sounds like a good idea, but it is not. It requires the services—which have not exactly earned a reputation as top flight managers—to run the depots so precisely that they fill each year's schedule entirely with nothing left over at the end. They will reach the last month in the fiscal year either with more than 1 month's work left to do, requiring expensive overtime and a sudden surge in parts deliveries, or with less than a month's work left, resulting in disruptions of normal work and delivery schedules. It is better to retain a backlog and put less pressure on the management of the depot system.

This covers in exhaustive detail just one area where the defense budget could be cut without either harming the national security or, for that matter, the administration's declared goals.

We could cut the $10 billion that would maintain a steady pace of 5 percent real growth in defense. The attached table shows one set of sensible cuts that would result in a defense budget that continues the buildup without overstraining other priorities.

TABLE I.—*Savings associated with a reasoned program of increasing military power*

	Outlay cuts (millions)
Unneeded strategic programs	$3,077
MX	1,941
B-1	859
Civil defense	189
Continental air defense	70
Binary munitions	18
Moderate growth in pay and allowances	1,890
5 percent instead of 8 percent pay raise	1,140
Cancel subsidy to commissaries and PX	750
Feasible research and development	1,329
Moderate improvement of war preparedness	3,834
Defer war reserves	705
Aircraft spares	72
Depot operations	1,357
Real property maintenance	1,700
Total outlay savings	10,130

The table has four main categories. The first is unnecessary strategic programs. The biggest item is the MX, an orphan after the demise of one more basing scheme. It makes no sense to push ahead with funding for a missile without a home.

The second category is pay and allowances. We just gave the military a 14.3-percent raise last October, triple the civil service raise. That was billed as a catchup raise that would solve all the problems stemming from past pay caps. Last year's explanation obviates any rationale for a pay raise this year in excess of the civilian raise.

The research and development category simply cuts Weinberger's overblown program back to the funding earmarked by Secretary Brown. With the expansion of procurement budgets under Reagan, the systems authorized by Brown for development may someday be fundable. Weinberger's increment would overburden even his expanded procurement budget.

The final category shows the savings from building sustainability at a more reasonable pace.

Pentagon outlays are difficult but not impossible to cut. Secretary Carlucci has supplied the challenge. It is now up to the House and Senate to take him up on that.●

H.R. 5684, TO REFORM SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, social security disability insurance terminations have risen dramatically in the last year. As a result of the accelerated process of continuing disability investigations begun last March, the monthly disability termination rate has almost doubled, rising from approximately 6,300 per month in 1980 to over 12,000 per month today. This increased number of terminated recipients and the process under which the terminations were carried out have caused considerable public outcry. I am sure nearly every House Member has been contacted by constituents upset over the harsh treatment terminated disability recipients have received.

Yesterday, March 2, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5684, which is designed to ease the human pain caused by disability terminations. My bill does not seek to prevent disability reviews from taking place. By all knowledgeable accounts, many disability cases are in need of review. What my bill does is propose a series of four disability insurance program reforms to make the termination process more fair and ease the transition period back to the work force for those recipients whose benefits have been eliminated.

First, H.R. 5684 would prevent State agencies or the SSA from making a disability termination decision prior to notification of the recipient. Under current law, beneficiaries, through no fault of their own, can receive notice that their benefits should have been terminated as of some past date, up to several months before. Such decisions often leave terminated beneficiaries with little of no transition time and, in many cases, no current income and a debt to social security.

Second, H.R. 5684 would extend from 3 months to 5 months the transition benefit period for terminated recipients. This 5-month period, which corresponds to the 5-month period disability beneficiaries now wait to receive benefits after filing, would greatly ease terminated recipients' transitions back into the work force. After several years without working and in many cases a certain degree of residual pain, it is not reasonable to expect terminated disability recipients to settle into a steady job in less than 5 months.

Third, to balance the extended transition benefit period, H.R. 5684 would institute an earnings test on transition disability benefits. In other words, criteria similar to those in retirement cases would be used to reduce transition disability benefits by $1 for every $2 earned, when an individual's earned income exceeds $360 per month. The earnings test would prevent persons who have successfully reentered the work force from continuing to receive transition benefits.

Finally, H.R. 5684 would allow a disability recipient whose benefits have been terminated, and who has filed a timely appeal, to receive continued payments until the appeal is concluded. Under this provision, however, if the appeal is lost, all benefits paid after the 5-month transition period would be considered overpayments and be subject to recovery by the Social Security Administration. This continued payments provision is necessary to provide a means of addressing the needs of the thousands of persons appealing State agency termination decisions because they are unable to work. At the present time, those persons filing appeals are often forced to wait up to 10 months without support before an administrative law judge can hear their appeal. This provision would not increase costs because, under the current system, a person who wins an appeal is retroactively awarded past benefits.

I believe the reforms proposed in H.R. 5684 will effectively address the uncertainty currently faced by terminated disability recipients, without greatly increasing trust fund costs or creating new administrative problems. The only added cost to the disability trust fund would be the difference between the cost of 2 additional months of benefits, which would itself be offset by revenue saved through the implementation of an earnings test on all transition DI benefits.

I urge my colleagues in the House to support this important and much needed legislation.

The text of H.R. 5684 follows:

H.R. 5864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 221(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (or of section 216(i) or 223), the day on which an individual's disability is determined to have ceased shall in no case be earlier than the first day of the month in which such individual is initially notified of such determination in writing (by the applicable State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be), and the month which is determined to be the termination month (as defined in section 223(a)(1)) with respect to any individual shall in no case be earlier than the month in which such individual is so notified, except to the extent otherwise provided by the Secretary in cases where notification was unavoidably delayed because of the failure of the individual involved to make a timely report of material facts (relating to either medical condition or gainful activity) which he had or should have had in his possession.".

(b) The first sentence of section 223(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "and ending with the month" and inserting in lieu thereof "and ending (subject to section 221(a)(3)) with the month".

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 223(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "third month" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sixth month"; and

(2) by striking out "15 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "18 months".

(b)(1) Sections 202(d)(1)(G), 202(d)(6)(E), 202(e)(1) (last sentence), 202(f)(1) (last sentence), and 223(e) of such Act are amended by striking out "third month" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sixth month".

(2)(A) Sections 202(d)(1)(G), 202(e)(1) (last sentence), and 202(f)(1) (last sentence) of such Act are amended by striking out "15 months" and inserting in lieu thereof "18 months".

(B) Sections 216(i)(2)(D) and 223(e) of such Act are amended by striking out "15-month period" and inserting in lieu thereof "18-month period".

(c) Section 1631(a)(5) of such Act is amended by striking out "second month" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifth month".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 223(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Subsections (b) through (l) of section 203 shall apply with respect to the earnings of an individual (receiving disability insurance benefits) for the month in which his disability is determined (with or without the application of section 221(a)(3) to have ceased, and for any subsequent month for which he receives a disability insurance benefit based on that disability, as though such individual were receiving such benefits under section 202(a) and were an individual other than one described in section 203(f)(8)(D) (and for this purpose the individual shall be deemed to have a taxable year which begins with the first day of the month in which his disability is so determined to have ceased and ending with the last day of the last such subsequent month)."

(b) Section 203(f) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) For provisions making this subsection and subsection (b) applicable in the case of certain individuals receiving disability insurance benefits, see section 223(a)(3)."

SEC. 4. Section 223 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, any individual who—

"(A) has been receiving disability insurance benefits,

"(B) is determined to be no longer entitled to such benefits, and

"(C) initiates a timely appeal with respect to such determination,

may elect (in such manner and form as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe) to have the payment of such benefits continued, after the last month for which he would otherwise be entitled to such a benefit pursuant to such determination, until a final decision is made on the basis of such appeal.

"(2) If an individual elects to have the payment of his disability insurance benefits continued under paragraph (1) while an appeal (with respect to the determination

that he is no longer entitled to such benefits) is pending, and the decision upon such appeal affirms such determination, any disability insurance benefits paid to him pursuant to such election (after the last month for which he would otherwise be entitled to such a benefit pursuant to such determination) shall, to the extent not otherwise directed by the hearing examiner or other person making such decision, be considered overpayments for purposes of this title.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'appeal' includes a request for an administrative reconsideration or a hearing.".

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to determinations (that individuals are no longer under a disability or are no longer entitled to disability insurance benefits (or that particular months are termination months)) which are made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

WOMEN'S STATUS IN EDUCATION

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD, a letter printed in the Honolulu Star Bulletin. The letter is by Ms. Loretta Lum, a librarian in Hawaii's public school system and a dedicated member of the Hawaii State Teachers Association, a Hawaii based organization which represents the views and interests of teachers in the State.

Ms. Lum summarizes and highlights the positive impact title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 has had in prohibiting sex-based discrimination in institutions which receive Federal funding. I support Ms. Lum's position, and I would like to share her letter with my colleagues. There is a very real need for this Congress to maintain its commitment to preserving the statutory protections of title IX and the scope of its enforcement.

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin, Feb. 13, 1982]

WOMEN'S STATUS IN EDUCATION

(By Loretta Lum)

I have just completed the reading of "Title IX: The Half Full, Half Empty Glass," a report on the results of the education amendments of 1972 which bans sex discrimination in all federally-funded institutions. I'd like to share some highlights of the findings because Title IX is being severely threatened by all three branches of government.

1—Substantial progress has been made in college admissions under Title IX.

A—The proportion of women enrolled in traditionally male vocational education courses increased from 5 percent to 11 percent between 1972 and 1978.

B—Women earned half of all master's degrees awarded in 1980 compared to only two-fifths in 1972; one-third of all doctoral degrees in 1980 as opposed to one-sixth in 1972.

C—The percent of professional degrees earned by women quadrupled during the same period, one-sixteenth to one-fourth. Actual numbers of women enrolled in professional schools also rose sharply.

2—Women's athletics has undergone dramatic changes under Title IX.

A—The proportion of girls in high school interscholastic sports increased from 7 percent in 1971 to 35 percent in 1981.

B—Females were 15 percent of all participants in intercollegiate athletic programs before Title IX as compared to 30 percent in 1980.

C—Sixty colleges offered athletic scholarships to women seven years ago. Now 500 do so.

D—In 1974, females received approximately 1 percent of all athletic scholarships awarded by institutions belonging to the two major athletic associations. Today, they receive 22 percent.

The "Half Empty" part of this report details the slow improvement, sometimes regressive action, in the area of women employed in education.

1—Faculty women's salary increases lag behind men's and their earnings relative to men's have declined in recent years.

2—In 1981, women were still less than 1 percent of the approximately 16,000 school superintendents. (Hawaii can say, "We're doing our part!")

3—The percent of women faculty at the level of full professor showed no increase from 1975-1981, although they managed gradual improvements in lower academic ranks.

How is Title IX being threatened?

In Congress, Sen. Orrin Hatch has introduced a bill which will have a devastating impact on Title IX by prohibiting discriminatory practices only for those programs that directly receive federal dollars. Tracking dollars to individual programs would make Title IX unenforceable.

Who is to know whether federal funds were used to purchase athletic equipment where girls were discriminated against or a computer program where female employees were discriminated against?

The Hatch bill would curtail employment coverage to "students" only and narrow the definition of financial assistance to exclude most federally financed student aid. Since Title IX is the only comprehensive federal law prohibiting sex discrimination in education, these changes would destroy the equal educational opportunity in our nation.

In the administration, Vice President Bush is having the Department of Education review the Title IX Intercollegiate Athletic Policy Interpretation. Again, any weakening of policy would be detrimental to Women's Athletics.

In the Justice Department, Secretary Terrel H. Bell has asked the court to rule that Title IX does not cover school employees—only students. Bell is also negotiating with the Justice Department to change the regulations so federal student loan monies will not be regarded as aid to educational institutions.

If we are to protect the gains we have made since 1972, we must take action by writing to Congress and the president, stating our concerns over the proposed amendments. We need to state the compelling economic arguments for broader educational opportunites for women and girls.●

THE MERGER TAX ACT OF 1982

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Merger Tax Act of 1982. This act places a 15-percent tax on mergers or acquisitions between companies with at least $2 billion in sales, which merge with companies with sales in excess of $300 million. The tax is set at 50 percent when the acquiring company is controlled by a foreign government.

In 1981, there was a huge increase in the number of large mergers. DuPont bought Conoco for $7.2 billion. Elf Aquitanine, a French Government controlled oil and mining company, purchased 65 percent of Texasgulf's stock for $2.7 billion. Kuwait Petroleum paid $2.5 billion in cash for Santa Fe International. Standard Oil picked up Kennecott Copper for $1.77 billion.

These mergers among corporate giants do not contribute to the growth of our Nation; they do not stimulate our economy; they do not provide new jobs; they do not increase productivity.

Last year when President Reagan proposed, and this Congress approved, huge tax breaks to big business, it was with the belief and understanding that in order to get our economy moving again, companies would need large amounts of capital for new investments. It was argued that these investments would stimulate our economy, provide new jobs and increase our gross national product. We have yet to see the kinds of productive investments that were anticipated. Instead, a number of corporate giants have spent a great deal of time, energy, and money in the pursuit of other companies. The history of the growth of this country reflects what Americans are most proud of—American ingenuity. Where is that ingenuity now? It certainly does not lie in huge conglomerates gobbling each other up. The buying up of existing resources does nothing to get our ailing economy back on the road to health. And as long as it is economically more sensible for giant corporations to purchase companies with proven resources rather for them to invest in the modernization and building of plants or in research and development, new jobs will not be created and our economy will continue to falter.

We must say to corporations which are following this path that it is not the path intended for them when they were given their huge tax breaks. And if they insist on buying up other firms because they perceive it as being cheaper for them to do so, we will make it make expensive for them. We

will simply tax them. If they do not use their tax breaks for the intended purpose of constructive investment, we will recoup some of those taxes. This tax will serve as an incentive for corporations to take their tax breaks and invest them in a more productive manner. This tax will say to companies that if they do not contribute to the economic revitalization of this country through productive investment, they will contribute to the economic recovery through the imposition of a tax on their nonproductive investment.

A second major consideration is the effect of mergers on our economic structure. Continued mergers between large companies is reducing the degree of competitiveness in our economy. In many industries, the number of firms selling 80 percent of the goods sold in the industry has been declining steadily. That number is dropping to a dangerously low level for competition.

From 1950 to 1976, the per cent share of the assets of the 100 largest manufacturers increased from 39.9 percent to 45.5 percent of assets held by all manufacturers. For the 200 largest firms, control increased from 47.7 percent to 58 percent of assets. Quite simply, small manufacturers are being squeezed out of the marketplace and the phenomenon of mergers between large companies accelerates that trend.

What makes this accelerating trend toward bigness most deplorable is the fact that small businesses account for most of the growth of new jobs in the U.S. In the first 8 years of the 1970's, employment grew by 9,583,000. During that time the Fortune 1000 companies increased employment by only 75,000 jobs, less than 1 per cent of the total. In addition, a 1966 Commerce Department study demonstrated that small businesses accounted for most of our scientific and technological developments. The Office of Management and Budget came to similar conclusions in 1977.

As mergers affect economic structure, they also affect our international trade position. Increasingly, we are finding ourselves behind in our trade with many countries. Perhaps part of the problem is the unwillingness or inability of our larger firms to adapt and be creative. The entrepreneurial force which made our country great is quite simply not as strong in our largest firms. Frankly, I believe a large part of the problem in our auto industry may be caused by this very point.

A third point that needs to be mentioned is that billions of dollars have been borrowed at record high interest rates in order to finance these multi-billion-dollar mergers. While the small business owner and homeowner cannot afford to pay an 18 percent interest rate, large corporations can and do pay high interest rates to finance corporate takeovers. These nonproductive investments further strain the amount of available credit by sheer virtue of the amount of money involved. These deals depend on the tax deductibility of interest payments on their huge borrowings. Taxpayers end up, in effect, directly subsidizing many of these mammoth mergers.

Fourth, and perhaps the most important point, the Federal Treasury needs the money because of the huge deficits. There is talk of cutting back on the tax reductions granted to the average working family when those reductions are doing little more than keeping them even with inflation. There is talk of not giving social security recipients their cost-of-living increases that they have been promised and which are truly needed. The President is predicting a $91 billion deficit for next year. Almost everyone else believes this deficit will be far higher if we adopt his program. This bill will help to reduce the deficit. I believe that we must have some equity in who is to pay the bill. This bill will, to some extent, restore a degree of equity.

I submit that this tax proposal will raise funds from those most able to pay and those who are engaged in one of the less productive activities. It is a tax which can actually promote productive investment. We have thrown plenty of carrots at big businesses hoping that they will invest. I believe that the stick may on occasion have some value.

Specifically, this bill provides a tax equal to 15 percent of the sale price of any acquisition, including a merger, when the acquired entity has sales in excess of $300 million and the acquiring entity has sales in excess of $2 billion. I believe that these figures are set high enough to remove from the tax those medium-sized firms which sometimes benefit by being acquired because of the need for capital and other resources. The tax would still be paid so long as $150 million is spent to acquire at least a 35-percent interest over a period of 18 months.

This is not a confiscatory tax by any measure. It is quite common to see premiums paid on the order of 50 percent above the stock price for an acquired company. The bill exempts those acquired companies which have suffered significant losses. It is to the advantage of the economy to allow mergers among those companies which are in some danger of going under. The bill also exempts acquisitions of companies which the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, believes face substantial foreign competition and where the acquisition will significantly improve the companies' ability to compete.

The bill creates a 50-percent rate of tax when a company of above $300 million is acquired by a foreign controlled entity. I believe that it is clearly not in our national interest to see large businesses in our country controlled by foreign governments. This provision will clearly dissuade such acquisitions.●

TEN-FOOT RUSSIANS?

HON. RAY KOGOVSEK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. KOGOVSEK. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post recently published the following editorial. I would like to submit it as part of the RECORD. I believe the references to our colleague, PATRICIA SCHROEDER, are particularly appropriate during our current debate over defense spending.

TEN-FOOT RUSSIANS?

During the 1950s, a joke circulated about efforts of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. to "psyche" each other. In the "G" rated version the Soviets decided to unnerve the Americans by ordering army bunk beds from a U.S. manufacturer—and specifying the beds had to be 10 feet long.

As expected the patriotic bedmaker passed this "intelligence" to the Pentagon which bucked it to the president. Recognizing the Soviet ploy the president trumped it with an order to "send them the 10-foot bunks—but stamp each one medium?"

These days each side seems determined to convince itself that the enemy is 10 feet tall. The Pentagon's recent report, "Soviet Military Power" limited Soviet strength in worrisome terms. The Soviet parried vigorously. But as Rep. PAT SCHROEDER, D-Colo., has been arguing effectively such "man for man and tank for tank" comparisons ignore crucial differences in the two nations' political and strategic situations.

The U.S.A is only the strongest link in an alliance of free nations. In a showdown the combined economic and military power of such friends as Britain, Canada, France, West Germany, Australia, Israel, Italy, South Korea and many others would reinforce America.

In contrast, the Soviet Union is an anachronism, the last great imperialist power. Much of its strength has to be deployed keeping people who detest it in subjugation. As Schroeder notes, much of the reported "gap" in U.S.-Soviet military spending vanishes when the $100 billion spent by our NATO allies is tallied against the estimated $30 billion spent by the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact satellites. Overall, NATO even has a slight edge in manpower over the pact. The biggest question of all, of course, is whether Poland, East Germany, Hungary and Czechoslovakia would side with their oppressors or their liberators in a final crisis.

Finally, our borders are with Mexico and Canada—good friends. In contrast, the lands stolen from China by the Russian czars are like Germany's theft of Alsace-Lorraine from France in 1870—a source of enduring enmity with an unforgiving neighbor.

Of course, the U.S.A. can't be complacent. Our reserve forces, with the exception of aviation units, have deteriorated badly. Our Navy's sea control capability is inadequate.

The Army is only beginning to scrap the outmoded, "Verdun" doctrine of firepower and attrition and revamp its equipment and tactics around maneuver principles—the key to victory since Alexander knocked off Darius. All services need help in retaining trained cadre.

But the proposed military budget seems guided more by what defense contractors want to sell than by any rational assessment of our security needs.

Schroeder has proposed trimming $30 billion, including $13.5 billion in the upcoming fiscal year. She would slow procurement of the orphaned MX missile and the Navy's bungled F-A-18, scratch the B-1 bomber and one of two new nuclear aircraft carriers. Such trims would only slow our defense buildups to a manageable pace. We disagree with her proposal to slow the Trident missile submarine, however. Without a new bomber or missile, it's prudent to strengthen the remaining and most crucial leg of the strategic "triad."

But overall, the congresswoman is to be commended for realizing that panic buying spurred by fears of 10-foot-tall Russians is no substitute for measured reforms to revitalize American military power.●

POLICY ON U.S. MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN EL SALVADOR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues experiencing a shared sense of outrage and grief over the tragically escalating events occurring daily in the Central American country of El Salvador.

Thus far, President Reagan has sent $81 million in military aid to the Government of El Salvador. I am adamantly opposed to this assistance for a number of reasons.

First, the administration has argued that the struggle for human rights in El Salvador has improved. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we are all too well aware that there has been much documentation of continuing violations of human rights in that country. I, for one, am horrified that civil liberties have been violated, political rights are continually denied, and acts of kidnaping, torture, and murder are characteristic of military forces of the Government of El Salvador.

Recent reports indicate that more than 30,000 people, including 6 American citizens, have been killed by the military in the past 2 years.

The Special Representative of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights recently stated that:

> There has been in El Salvador a consistent pattern of gross violations of these (civil and political) rights which, in many cases has culminated tragically in attempts on human life.

Earlier this year, the American Civil Liberties Union and the American Watch Committee reported that:

> The Revolutionary Governing Junta of El Salvador is responsible for a widespread and systematic pattern of gross violations of human rights.

The report went on to state that these violations of human rights "are selectively directed against those perceived as opposing the country's economic and political system."

These tragic facts and figures, depicting the deplorable failure of the Government of El Salvador to comply with internationally recognized human rights, make for an unquestionably absurd support by our Government of the present Salvadoran regime.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that any aid granted to El Salvador should be humanitarian in nature, for this is an impoverished nation. As was pointed out in a New York Times article of February 20, 1982, the facts behind this poverty are startling:

First. Unemployment in El Salvador today is more than 40 percent.

Second. More than half the people of El Salvador subsist on an income of less than $10 per month per capita.

Third. Nearly 50 percent of the children in El Salvador die before the age of 5.

Fourth. Two percent of the population owns 60 percent of the land.

Mr. Speaker, the economic aid required by El Salvador is not military in nature. It is aid necessary to meet the basic human needs of its citizens. This problem is exacerbated by the problems experienced in the agrarian reform program. This land reform program, which was also intended as a redirection of a portion of the wealth and resources in El Salvador has failed. Therefore, the essential needs of the El Salvadoran people are immense. I firmly believe that any aid offered to El Salvador should be in the direction of constructive humanitarian ends.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the present actions of the Reagan administration clearly undermine the integrity and validity of the War Powers Resolution. Pursuant to section 4a of the War Powers Resolution, the President is required to report to Congress when he introduces military personnel into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances. By offering military equipment and advisers, I am convinced that the U.S. is imminently involved in the El Salvadoran conflict. It was intended that Congress be totally involved in important decisions that might lead to U.S. military involvement in foreign conflicts. Therefore, it is obvious to me that the War Powers Resolution was clearly designed for the present situation in El Salvador, thus requiring a complete, detailed discussion and dialog between this Congress and the President.

On March 28 an election for President will be held in El Salvador. It is my fervent hope that a fair and honest election representing all factions in El Salvador will take place. However, threats of violence by opposing sides against those who vote will apparently impede a fair and responsible election. As a result, it is imperative that the U.S. Government do all within its power to establish negotiations between the El Salvadoran Government and the citizenry in the insurgency. Both sides have stated a willingness to sit down and negotiate. It is now time for the negotiations to begin in order that this outrageous and horrifying bloodshed and pillage end.

Mr. Speaker, I am grief stricken by the atrocities in El Salvador. I join with my colleagues in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 226 which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should press for unconditional discussions among the major political factions in El Salvador to guarantee a safe and stable environment for free and open Democractic elections.●

FLOOR STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JIM COYNE

HON. JAMES K. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. JAMES K. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the recent trend of events in the Middle East. The Camp David peace process, which had given us great cause to believe that peace is possible, appears to be in jeopardy. Although Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak has pledged to continue the work of Anwar Sadat, he does not have the personal commitment to the process that characterized his predecessor. As a result, Egypt appears to be moving closer toward the other Arab States and away from its improved relations with Israel.

The Camp David agreement called upon Israel to return the Sinai to Egypt in exchange for peace. Israel was willing to take a major gamble when it agreed to these terms. The Sinai provided Israel with a strategic buffer against Egyptian attacks; it was the source of a large percentage of Israeli oil; it contained two major Air Force bases; it controls the access to the Gulf of Aquba, through which all of Israel's southern mercantile trade passes; it includes the strategic Tiran Straits which provide Israel's access to the Red Sea; it has become a favorite site for Israeli tourism; and, finally, it has become the home of many Israeli settlers. Although many of these settlers refuse to leave their homes, the Israeli Government is so committed to the Camp David accords that Israeli

troops are now being used to evacuate the settlements.

It is with this background in mind that I am so deeply concerned by the reports that President Mubarak's trip to Israel might be canceled. In his desire not to antagonize other Arab States, Mubarak apparently does not wish to visit Jerusalem or even remain in Israel for a few days. He reportedly wants to fly to Tel Aviv and leave within a few hours, thus not allowing time for meaningful negotiations. I believe that this is the wrong signal to send to the world. It implies a reduction of Egypt's commitment to the peace process. This would encourage the feelings of insecurity within Israel; it would also alert the United States that Egypt is not as willing to work for peace as had been the case under Sadat.

I sincerely hope that President Mubarak will reconsider his options and agree to go to Jerusalem. Just as Sadat's first visit to Jerusalem signified a courageous step toward peace in this troubled region, a Mubarak visit would solidify his role as a peacemaker. If Mubarak visits Jerusalem, he will assure the Israelis and the United States that he will continue the peace process even after the Sinai is returned on April 25. As today's editorial in the New York Times concludes: "Mr. Mubarak dares to ask Washington whether he really has to go to Jerusalem. For all concerned, he had better."

ON THE ROAD TO JERUSALEM—PRESIDENT MUBARAK IS LOSING HIS WAY

Somewhere along the trail beaten by Anwar Sadat, President Mubarak seems to have lost his way. He needs a swift reminder from Washington that the path to peace, as well as the return of Sinai, leads through Jerusalem.

The new Egyptian leader owes the Israelis a visit, and before the turnover of the last of his territory in April. Though he could, like Mr. Sadat, say anything he wants once in Jerusalem, the new Egyptian leader wants his itenerary to speak louder than words. He asks to avoid Israel's capital altogether. Even to request the detour is provocative.

It provokes the worst Israeli fears: that they will soon pay in blood for once again exchanging strategic territory for a promise. They are yielding Sinai—lock, stock, airfields and oil—for the promise of peace and full recognition. They agreed to it with an Egyptian who failed to survive the exchange and who some think was murdered for it. They do it despite Mr. Mubarak's difficulty in pronouncing the words Camp David; despite his notice that with Sinai in hand he aims to repair relations with Israel's enemies; despite the anguish of Zionists who cannot bear to evacuate settlements.

Yes, the Israelis too have been provocative. Their progressive annexation of the West Bank and unilateral actions in Golan and Jerusalem have been insensitive to Egypt's position in the Arab world. They have been grudging about the Camp David promise of "full autonomy" to the Palestinians. But they do not challenge Egypt's legitimacy or security.

Israel cannot trust a peace process that perverts a friendly visit into a protest demonstration. To ask Israelis to act like usurpers in their capital—because half the world does not accept its integration with parts of the city captured from Jordan—risks the most destructive expression of their anxiety. And if that takes the form of an attack on the P.L.O. in Lebanon, important Israelis want it to test Mr. Mubarak's forebearance before he gets Sinai back.

Whatever chances remain for transforming the Camp David accords into a stable peace depend upon Israel's serenity and confidence—confidence expressed by the exchange of Presidential visits, ambassadors, tourists, goods. Egypt meets those commitments sluggishly while Israel uses its army to uproot Sinai settlers.

Mr. Mubarak dares to ask Washington whether he really has to go to Jerusalem. For all concerned, he had better.●

RECOMMENDATIONS BY MR. HERON

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned about our adverse balance of trade. Many of you have suggested in this body ways to help bring it into balance.

One of the best analyses of the problem along with suggested solutions was presented to the President's Export Council Subcommittee on Agriculture by an expert in the field, Mr. Julian B. Heron, Jr., a partner in the Washington law firm of Heron, Haggart, Ford, Burchette & Ruckert. I urge that my colleagues who are interested in trade policy carefully consider the following recommendations by Mr. Heron. I am also urging the President to consider adopting these proposals as national agricultural export policy.

Remarks by Mr. Heron follow:

REMARKS BY MR. JULIAN B. HERON, JR.

It is a pleasure to be with the President's Export Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture. The opportunity is being taken to make specific recommendations regarding trade policy for this Committee's consideration. These recommendations will focus on agricultural trade, but will be beneficial to all United States trade. They are based upon the experience of members of the private sector who export their products worldwide. It is hoped that your Committee will find this helpful.

These recommendations deal with two aspects of trade policy. This seemed appropriate since your committee is undoubtedly well briefed on specific trade problems. We need to step back and look at the structure itself. First to be discussed is the need to develop a national export policy. Second, the manner in which trade policy is developed will be discussed. While the first is by far the most important, the second influences the first. These recommendations deal primarily with the development of a national agricultural export policy. However, the same principles may be applied to the development of a national export policy.

The specific recommendations are as follows:

(1) A national export policy should be adopted—

(a) It deserves the same attention given to foreign policy;

(b) It should be pursued as a government-wide objective;

(c) it should achieve both broad objectives and specific objectives;

(d) It should seek to maximize exports from the United States; and

(e) It should be consistent with international rules of trade.

(2) Procedural reforms are needed in the development of trade policy—

(a) Closer cooperation with the private sector is needed;

(b) A staff of permanent trade negotiators should be formed;

(c) The administrative process must be streamlined; and

(d) The principle input in trade policy development must come from the affected agency.

These two topics with their subpoints will serve as a framework for our discussion. Too often, a discussion of trade policy goes directly to specific issues or complaints without stopping to discuss the need to develop a sound export policy. We can readily agree that trade policy in its simplest form is summarized by the philosophy that we should export as much as possible and import as little as possible. Unfortunately, like many simple things, it is not that easy.

One of the reasons that the United States finds itself in its current position is that we have not had a national export policy. For a number of years, the Department of Agriculture has stressed the importance of agricultural exports. In more recent years, other agencies have acknowledged the importance of agricultural exports. Yet, there has never been a cohesive United States export policy which brings together the full resources available to our government to see that agricultural products are exported. The same is true on the industrial side.

Historically, trade policy has been subservient to foreign policy considerations. Because of this, attention has been focused on trade policy with very little attention given to export policy. It must be recognized that the formulation of an export policy is a national objective equal in importance to the formulation of a foreign policy. Historically, we have confused trade policy, export policy and foreign policy.

The adverse consequences of sacrificing long-term export advantages for short-term benefits can readily be seen from the grain embargoes in the 70's. Virtually all now agree that the embargoes imposed were detrimental to our long-term national economic interest. It provided artifical stimulation to our competitors the ability to whisper in the ears of our customers that it is no longer possible to know when the United States might terminate its commitments. Had there been a national export policy, this action might not have occurred.

If the effort is made to develop a national export policy, then it must be pursued throughout government. For years, the Department of Agriculture has had a sound understanding of the importance of agricultural exports. This is perhaps best reflected in the foreign market development program which is a shining example of the public and private sector working together for the common good. However, the recognition of the importance to the nation of agricultural exports by the Department of Agriculture is

not enough. Other agencies and the President must accept and support this premise.

In the past year, some progress has been made. The United States has been able to develop, on a government-wide basis, a sound approach to the damage being caused by the European Economic Community's agricultural export subsides. These subsidies affect many crops in many different ways. The common thread is the damage flowing from excessive subsidies granted by the European Economic Community. In response, the Departments of Agriculture, State and the United States Trade Representative took the lead in developing a common strategy to oppose this practice. Eventually, the strategy was adopted by the Cabinet.

All agencies of the government are now proceeding in a manner consistent with the Cabinet's strategy. This was perhaps best seen at the December 1981 meeting in Brussels where it was planned to have the Secretaries of State, Commerce, Agriculture and the U.S. Trade Representative present to discuss trade issues with the European Economic Community. That meeting was unprecedented. Increased cooperation of this type needs to take place in order to develop an overall United States trade policy.

Our government must be diligent in its effort to maintain a unified approach. Congress and the private sector will have to demand such diligence. We must not return to the time when, in dealing with agricultural trade issues, Defense referred to its bases, State to overriding political considerations and Commerce to industrial issues. We must all work together in a unified effort to support a national export policy.

Without a national export policy, it will not be possible to achieve both broad range and specific objectives. The effort made with respect to the European Economic Community's agricultural subsidy practices represents a specific objective. It is a good start, but only a start. We need to have strategy developed with respect to Japan, Mexico, Argentina and Brazil, to name just a few. Additionally, there must be an overall United States export policy developed.

It will be far easier to obtain and implement specific objectives on a unified basis if they fit into a larger national plan. The United States has never had a national export policy. We should move now to adopt one.

If a national export policy is adopted, it is certain to contain as one of its objectives the need to maximize exports from the United States. In order to accomplish this, much work will have to be done.

There is a tendency on the part of virtually every government agency, with the exception of the Department of Agriculture, to look only at the large volume and high value export items. It is understandable that big dollar items would receive immediate attention. They should. However, the United States needs to export its goods to every customer that can be found throughout the world. Many of these sales will be for small amounts of goods that are not bulk commodities. By themselves, each sale will be unimportant. Collectively, the entire group of sales can help return this nation's economy to a healthy state. The barriers faced in countries such as the Republic of China, Brazil, Korea and Mexico are together as important economically as the barriers maintained by our major trading partners. No one can justify the citrus or beef quotas maintained by Japan. These are world famous. The same is also true of Korea's licensing system which is less known and understood.

An example might serve well. We tend to think of India as a nation of starving people. Yet 10 percent of its population equals approximately 60,000,000 people. The top 10 percent of the individuals living in India are wealthy and can afford items not otherwise available to the general population. Sixty millon people represent a market the size of West Germany. Almonds, while often ranking as our number one agricultural export as a percentage of production, are not generally considered a major agricultural commodity. There was little interest outside the Department of Agriculture initially in removing the 200 percent ad valorem import duty on almonds or in attempting to obtain better licensing rules for imports. Eventually, the duty was slashed in half and the licensing restrictions lifted. With only a 100 percent ad valorem duty in place, the United States almond industry was able to send exports to India approaching $5,000,000. While this amount is small in the overall trade picture, it does not require too many sales of this magnitude in too many different markets to become important.

This example illustrates the need for the United States Government to assist exporters in removing barriers to exports in whatever country the exporter has determined a market exists.

If we can agree on the importance of developing a policy along the lines discussed, then it is also necessary that the policy be consistent with established international trading rules. Far too often there is a willingness on the part of diplomats to compromise and depart from the established international rules of trade in order to resolve a particular dispute. While this seems, at first glance, to be reasonable, practical and effective, it is not. The established international rules of trade were developed after long years of negotiation and effort. Although these rules are not perfect, they are based on sound economic theories and political realities. When the United States either willingly departs from those rules or allows others to do so, it creates an atmosphere that makes international trade more difficult. In the first instance, it is always extremely difficult to maintain the established rule. In the long run, it is always to the advantage of the United States to do so.

We tend to think of retaliation as a dirty word. Perhaps it is. What is important is that the United States must assume the leadership in making the established rules of trade work. At present, we preach the necessity of following the rules. Unfortunately, historically we persuaded the world that we will do nothing if our trading partners do not observe the rules. We have exercised our leadership in such a manner as to convince our trading partners that there is no liability in operating outside established world trade rules.

The result can be seen in many of the current bills pending in Congress calling for reciprocity. Congress is saying clearly that if the Executive Branch cannot enforce trade rules, it will. Reciprocity means removing quotas to a cattle rancher. It means erecting import barriers to an unemployed citizen of Detroit. It means something else to a banker. In short, it has no meaning.

The established rules of trade will work if followed. A price must be attached to trade practices by a country that are contrary to the established rules. This is a nation of laws. Certain penalties apply for failure to observe specific laws. The same can be true for world trade. To accomplish this, the United States will have to establish its leadership.

If a country objects to a penalty imposed as a result of failure to observe established rules, the penalty can be removed upon a change in that country's practice. We in the United States will have to be willing to accept similar consequences for our actions. This need not lead to a trade war. On the other hand, failure to impose discipline in international trade may. As exporters, we have an obligation to see that a workable system is developed, implemented and enforced.

Now a few suggestions as to how both trade policy and an export policy might be developed. This is an area that needs substantial reform if the United States is to be able to develop a cohesive policy which will allow us to maximize exports.

The first and most important factor in developing policy is obtaining close cooperation and input from the private sector. One of the reasons that there has been so much success with agricultural exports is the close cooperation between the public and private sectors. This is maintained, nurtured and developed through the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture. Again, this should serve as a model for our government. It is doubtful that there is a better example anywhere in the United States government of the cooperation, trust and dedication to the same goal that exists between the Foreign Agricultural Service and agricultural exporters.

In past years, the advisory committees established through legislation by the Congress have worked reasonably well. Unfortunately, in recent months, the agricultural advisory committees have not been active. It is understood that the Department of Agriculture plans to reactivate them in April. It is certainly hoped that this is so. Your Committee is urged to do everything possible to see that these committees are active.

While it is possible to criticize the private sector advisory committees, the overall benefit from the existence and operation of these committees is substantial. Trade negotiators cannot ignore the advice received from the committees whether or not it is accepted. The committees also require the trade negotiators to provide some degree of advice as to their plans for both multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations.

Additional thought should be given to the development of a staff of permanent trade negotiators. At present, the most experienced trade negotiators are in the Foreign Agriculture Service and in the Department of State. The Office of the United States Trade Representative was created by Congress to act as an independent organization, functioning directly under the authority of the President. This has worked well and should be continued. It must also be recognized that, traditionally, there has been a relatively high degree of turnover on the staff of the U.S. Trade Representative. This leaves the Trade Representative without a permanent staff of seasoned negotiators. Every effort should be made to develop a core of negotiators within the United States government whose skills are routinely employed whether or not they actually work for the Trade Representative.

A great deal needs to be done to streamline the administrative process used in the development of trade policy. At the present time, there are numerous agencies involved in the process and there is a multilayered process. If one looks to the regulations or executive orders on trade matters, it is

found that in addition to U.S.T.R. and the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, State and Treasury, there are numerous other departments and agencies routinely involved. These include the Departments of Interior, Defense, Labor, Justice and Transportation; the International Trade Commission; the Office of Management and Budget; the Council of Economic Advisors; and the National Security Council. Trade policy decisions are frequently made by a committee with representatives from each of these agencies. Many of the committee members are often uninformed about the issues being discussed.

This is perhaps best illustrated by a recent committee meeting where, after listening to a detailed and accurate description of the EEC's subsidy practices for one commodity, the representative from the Office of Management and Budget responded by arguing that there was simply no problem. He explained that because the described system was misguided and uneconomical, the ECC would have to discontinue it in order to maintain itself. While this gentleman's economic analysis may have been sound, we know that in practice the EEC maintains many uneconomical subsidies. We also know that the EEC has no intention of discontinuing these. Yet the gentleman from OMB, to the extent he could persuade other members of the committee, was in a position to attempt to influence the committee to take no action. This example is not given to criticize OMB, but rather to illustrate the problem inherent in our current procedures.

The interagency process should be streamlined so that only USTR, State, Agriculture, Commerce and Treasury routinely participate in trade policy matters. If there is a particular issue that requires the expertise of another agency or department, then that department may be invited to participate.

At the present time, depending on the issue, trade policy options may be reviewed by three to four committees before a decision is reached. This is neither effective nor efficient. A more streamlined management process must be found so that the United States can develop its trade policy and respond rapidly to the needs of exporters.

In developing trade policy, the principal input should come directly from the affected agency. For example, in agricultural matters, the Department of Agriculture should be closely involved throughout the development of agricultural trade policy. This often happens. However, equally important, Agriculture should be included in the negotiating process. Historically, USTR, in the development of an agricultural issue, may take input from the Department of Agriculture, but the Department's access often becomes more restricted as the negotiating process develops. Our negotiators should be encouraged to have at their side the experts from the affected agencies whenever possible. Undoubtedly, there will be times when it is not possible. In most negotiating sessions, however, it is possible and should be encouraged. Ambassador Brock and Secretary Block are to be congratulated for the cooperation that each has shown the other. Similar cooperation must be pursued at all levels of government.

It is hoped that the suggestions made will be of assistance to your Committee. Although these suggestions will not solve all trade policy problems, they will help to establish a coherent, credible, national export policy. Such a policy will significantly assist the effort to establish a strong economy. The establishment and implementation of a national export policy will increase employment, improve the national economy and correct our balance of trade.●

THE ASSASSINATION OF THE TURKISH CONSUL GENERAL AT LOS ANGELES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the ugly and deadly hand of international terrorism struck down its 21st victim among Turkish diplomats and their family members in the last 9 years.

This form of international terrorism takes the sons and daughters of middle-class Armenians from Western Europe, Lebanon, and the United States and transforms them into senseless killers just as our children were recruited into the Weathermen and other terrorist organizations in the recent past. The massacres of Armenians in the brutal intercommunal warfare between the authorities of the Ottoman Empire and the Armenians during World War I provide the grievance, Marxism or nationalist extremism the means through which to take "revenge" and fight for "national liberation."

But somewhere something went wrong. The largest contiguous Armenian settlements—about 3 million people—live in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Armenia where religious and national freedom is either nonexistent or very limited, Russification is promoted and human rights trampled upon. Yet these terrorists do not protest the Soviet misdeeds rather one of their groups, the ASALA (Armenian Secret Liberation Army of Armenia) has repeatedly called for an attachment of Eastern Anatolia where the Armenians lived before their flight and the massacres, to the Soviet Union, that is, to Soviet Armenia. The target is Turkey where only about 60,000 to 80,000 Armenians still reside.

The two terrorist groups are also virulently anti-NATO and anti-American. They consider us "guilty" of cooperating with the Turkish Government, their mortal enemy and their way of showing their devotion is to kill Turkish diplomats and their families in contravention of the most elementary principle of international law: The sanctity of the person and property of diplomats, a canon which even the Communists find it advantageous to keep.

At hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Terrorism last June and July, both Prof. Aydin Yalcin from Ankara University, the foremost expert on terrorism in Turkey and Prof. Stephen Possony from the Hoover Institution in Stanford, Calif., concluded that there are links in arms supply between the ASALA and Communist states, especially Bulgaria, while the British journalist, John Rees, writing in the Review of the News even opines that the KGB is at least partially involved in the planning of the murders and bombings.

As to the Justice Commandos of Armenian Genocide, the Monteneros of the Armenian political scene, they are basically restricted to the United States, Western Europe, and Australia where they have already committed four murders and numerous bombings. They are less Marxists but not less anti-American and pro-Soviet as they see in Soviet Armenia the Armenian "homeland."

Under these circumstances I am condemning in strongest terms of the new killing which had occurred on American soil for the first time since 1973 and call upon the State authorities and the FBI to undertake a thorough investigation of the Armenian terrorist groups.●

RESEARCH TO OVERCOME THE TRAGEDY OF AUTISM FACING 340,000 AMERICANS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today marks a great event in the lives of 340,000 Americans who struggle against the debilitating effects of that severe neurological disorder known as autism.

Today we celebrate the implementation of a research program at the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke designed to focus the intellectual skills of scientific investigators on the search for new ways to prevent and alleviate autism—a tragedy that strikes before or at birth, and drastically changes the lives of 15 out of every 10,000 children born into the world.

Responding to the will of Congress, as expressed in the reports of both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations, NINCDS has activated its section of autism and behavioral disorders; and has appointed a highly regarded pediatric neurologist, Dr. Martha Bridge Denckla, who graduated with honors from Bryn Mawr College and the Harvard Medical School, as chief of the new autism program.

As you know, I have joined with NSAC, the National Society for Children and Adults with Autism, to celebrate this event at a reception in the Rayburn House Office Building this afternoon at 5:30. I am pleased that so many of my colleagues will be with us

on this momentous occasion. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, this event is a landmark in the long and continuing struggle of the national society, and the thousands of parents and professionals who care so deeply for the children who have autism.

It is a beginning step that can lead to discoveries which will literally save the lives of these children, and bring happiness once again to the families who love them; for this new research section will be a focal point for scientists wishing to spend their energies in the search for causes of autism and practices to alleviate its effects.

Already, we have made progress. In years past, certain professionals thought that autism was a severe emotional disorder caused by parents who rejected their children from birth. Thousands of these good people were blamed for the neurological tragedy which has stricken their children, and their suffering under the burden of this undeserved weight of guilt added a new dimension of injury to their lives. But the pioneer work of such scientists as Dr. Bernard Rimland, who founded the national society in 1965; Dr. Eric Schopler who established the first statewide educational program for autistic children in 1971; Dr. Edward Ritvo of UCLA, Dr. Mary Coleman of the Children's Brain Research Institute, Dr. Donald J. Cohen of Yale, Dr. Magda Campbell of New York University Medical Center and many others, often working under the pressure of slim financial resources, provided evidence needed to convince all reasonable persons that parents have nothing whatever to do with the etiology of autism; that they are part of the answer, not part of the problem, and that this debilitating condition is, in fact, a physically based brain disorder. In response to these findings, and at the urging of the National Society, editors of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association and the Office of Special Education have removed autism from the category of "serious emotional disturbances."

Today we know that autism is caused at birth or before by factors such as viral infections, prenatal and perinatal complications, metabolic disorders such as phenylketonuria, hypocalciuria and hyperuricosuria; dietary conditions such as malabsorption, and exposure of parents to toxic chemicals.

Autism inhibits or distorts what a person sees, hears or otherwise senses; and this affects the way a child with autism understands his world, affects his ability to learn, communicate, and function as expected by society. Autism is found in every part of the world, in families of all races, creeds, and socioeconomic conditions.

The needs of autistic individuals are separate and distinct from those of other handicapped persons. Autism is not a form of mental retardation. It has been found to occur in children of all levels of intelligence. It is not schizophrenia; autistic individuals rarely develop delusions and hallucinations. It also differs markedly from a neurosis which has a good prognosis: autism is a lifelong disability.

The following list of behavioral signs and symptoms help illustrate the disability:

DEVELOPMENTAL DISCONTINUITY (DONNELLAN-WALSH, GOSSAGE, LA VIGNA, SCHULER AND TRAPHAGEN, 1976)

An autistic individual typcially has peaks of precocity mixed in with valleys of moderate to severe retardation.

PRESERVATION OF SAMENESS

Behavior is "governed by an anxiously obsessive desire for the maintenance of sameness that nobody but the child himself may disrupt on rare occasions." (Kanner, 1943.)

SELF-STIMULATION

Autistic individuals often engage in repetitive, ritualistic behaviors including kinesthetic, visual, tactile, and auditory stimulation. (Donnellan-Walsh et al, 1976.)

SOCIAL WITHDRAWAL

Autistic individuals exhibit an innate inability to develop appropriate relationships with people. (Kanner, 1943.)

STIMULUS OVERSELECTIVITY

Persons with autism tend to respond to a very limited element of complex stimulus field. (Lovaas, Schreibman, Koegel and Rehm, 1971.)

GENERALIZATION

Autistic individuals are typically unable to generalize skills learned in one setting to other settings. (Koegel and Rincover, 1977.)

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION DEFICITS

Problems with language and communication have been recognized since the autistic syndrome was defined by Kanner in 1943. Baltaxe and Simmons (1975) reported that 50 percent of children with autism are mute and remain so throughout their lives.

An appreciation of the unique characteristics of autism is critical for sound educational and vocational planning. Yet, while autism is twice as common as congenital blindness and more common than muscular dystrophy, it is poorly understood by professionals outside the field and by providers of services. As a result, children and adults with this disability are among the most in need of human services.

An autistic child may be too capable for a classroom for educable retarded children, yet also be unable to function in a regular classroom situation. An autistic adult may possess higher vocational skills than those manifested in sheltered workshops yet also be unable to function in a normal work environment.

Thus, the necessity for serious research, and the application of research findings in the fields of medicine, rehabilitation, education, and human services, both public and private, is clearly illustrated.

Autism research has not received enough attention and emphasis in the past by the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke. I am pleased that the House Appropriations Committee has urged NINCDS to move forward in its research.

Now I would like to express my thanks to the national society, which has brought the full scope of this tragic condition to the attention of Congress, and has sought our help in alleviating it. I commend the parents of autistic children for their endurance in the face of difficulties which included not only the human sorrow felt for their children, but also the unwarranted blame levied against them by uninformed professionals and the rejection of their children by disinterested service providers. Their strength and dedication is an example for all Americans.

What is it like to be the parent of an autistic child? According to Dr. Donald Cohen,

A family of a three-to-four-year old autistic child may go from physician to physician in search of a diagnosis and help; and the child may, in turn, be diagnosed as severely mentally retarded, schizophrenic, aphasic, learning disabled or emotionally disturbed. None of these diagnoses identify the disorder correctly.

While the symptoms of autism are not readily evident to an untrained person until the child is about 6 months old, the mother often has an uneasy feeling about her baby. Often the baby seems uncomfortable in his mother's arms, has problems with feeding, and seems disinterested in the world around him, even though he is about to crawl.

All autistic children are late to develop speaking skills and some never speak at all. Another common characteristic is the reversal of pronouns, which means he refers to himself as "you" instead of "I." Some will, however, copy phrases that they have heard often and their pronunciation is usually good. When the child tries to produce his own sentences or phrases, his pronunciation and control of pitch is poor.

Problems with speech are also coupled with visual problems. The autistic child tends to look past people or at the reflection of light in a person's eyes. It has been reported that one autistic boy only recognized his mother by her outline and so he would follow people who wore the same types of clothes. This behavior is a result of not comprehending the things he sees. In many ways, the autistic child is similar to a child who is born blind and deaf.

And when the children grow older, parents face a constant search for appropriate education, vocational training, jobs and a place to live. The stress is great, the demands are heavy and

the help is little and far between. And when the child becomes an adult, when the parents grow older and their strength for coping wanes, the person with autism faces a life in an institution if he or she has not been provided the skills needed for independent living, or functioning in a group home. The national society is determined to change this scenario, and I commend them for their efforts.

It was these same burdened parents who banded together in 1965, at the instigation of Dr. Bernard Rimland, a parent himself, who authored the scholarly work "Infantile Autism," and founded the national society. His goal was a parent/professional coalition, combining the resources of these two groups to advocate for research, education, and a better life for children and adults with autism.

The struggle of the national society has been long and difficult. We can all be assured that it will continue. And I join the national society in its dream—that one day the causes of this disability will be found, that preventive measures will be common practices, and that men, women, and children with autism will be helped to become free and productive citizens—not locked away in custodial institutions, at great public expense, where their lives are wasted and their caretakers are ignorant of their human potential.

Mr. Speaker, the creation of the section on autism at NINCDS is a welcome step toward making this dream a reality.●

GENE ENDRES

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the recent award received by my constituent Eugene Endres of New Philadelphia, Ohio.

Mr. Endres was the recipient of a 1982 Governor's award. This award is given annually to Ohio natives and residents whose careers have benefited mankind and brought honor to the State. Also among the 32 honored for this year's award were Vice President GEORGE BUSH and Mrs. Bush.

Endres received this award because of his achievements in the fields of creativity and beauty. One of his greatest successes has been rose growing and in 1980 he was elected to the Floricultural Hall of Fame, considered floriculture's highest honor. He has also received a Governor's Award for Community Action for his efforts to promote travel and tourism in the State.

Gene Endres is well known not only for his roses but for his goodwill ambassadorship for his home of Tuscarawas County, Ohio. We are proud of his accomplishments and contributions to the community and it is a pleasure for me to honor him.●

NEW FEDERALISM IS BAD FOR MICHIGAN

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's outrageous proposal to turn over a vast area of Federal responsibility to the States must not go unchallenged or unexplained. The White House listing includes both cash welfare assistance and food stamps, an assortment of health, child nutrition, and social service grants, vocational rehabilitation, vocational and adult education, job training, mass transit assistance, sewer construction grants and low-income energy assistance.

There will be other programs added to the list as the White House spells out the specifics of the plan, but the end result is that there would be absolutely no obligation for the States to continue any of these programs or even replace them with alternatives. The problems Michigan will have with New Federalism are spelled out in the excellent television editorial which was aired on February 10, 11, and 12. The editorial was read over WDIV/TV4 in the Detroit metropolitan area on these dates and I want to take this opportunity to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

The television editorial follows:

NEW FEDERALISM AND THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Televised: February 10, 1982—6:28 p.m.; February 11, 1982—12:28 p.m.; February 12, 1982—4:30 a.m.

On location—Lansing State Capitol.

State lawmakers here are wrestling with Michigan's budget. It's not an easy task. The state already has made massive spending cuts in education, transportation, social and human needs programs.

Every penny of Michigan's 1982 budget is dependent on future economic recovery of our state.

Times are bad with a deepening recession and a growing unemployment rate of 15 percent and higher. As bad as things look, the prognosis for Michigan could get much worse, if President Reagan's New Federalism becomes reality.

Mr. Reagan wants states to finance food stamps and ADC. In return Washington will pay for Medicaid. He also wants to turn over the administration of 40 welfare and community programs to the states.

It's a nice philosophy, giving back more government responsibility to the states, thereby giving states more control, but the timing for Michigan is unthinkable.

State Budget Director Gerald Miller says the swap is not good for Michigan. In fact, Michigan could be the biggest loser of all the 50 states.

Traditionally, Michigan has always sent more tax dollars to Washington than we ever get back. We're dead last among all states in getting our fair share of federal revenue dollars.

Our Governor and legislative leaders say they are committed toward getting Michigan on the road to economic recovery. We suggest they first get on the road to Washington, using all their political and pro-Reagan business clout to convince the Reagan people exactly what is at stake for Michigan.

Editorial delivered by Beth Konrad, Editorial Director.●

THE PRODUCTIVITY INCENTIVE ACT OF 1982

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation designed to address one of the most serious issues facing this country—the lack of productivity improvement.

Analysts disagree as to all the causes of the slowdown in the productivity growth rate in this country, but there is little doubt about its short- and long-term consequences. When wage increases outpace productivity improvements, as they have for many years now, the certain results are inflation and a declining standard of living.

If any country should be in serious economic difficulties these days, it is Japan. Japan has few natural resources, and must import virtually all of the raw materials, including energy, needed for modern industrial production. Yet rather than suffering from the kind of inflation and unemployment that we have experienced in the past 10 years, Japan's economy has grown and prospered.

Many reasons for this economic miracle have been suggested. Some are unlikely to be adopted in the United States because of differences between Japan's culture and ours. Lifetime employment, for example, has benefits for both company and employee, but our society values job mobility too much to make lifetime employment likely here.

One aspect of the Japanese economy which we probably can profitably adopt in this country relates to the wage structure. In Japan, worker pay in many cases does not consist only of a set hourly or weekly wage which is paid regardless of the company's performance. Instead, many Japanese workers receive a regular wage or salary plus a semiannual or annual bonus, based on the company's profits, which amounts to as much as half a year's pay.

This accomplishes several things. First of all, it gives the worker an incentive to be more cost conscious and more profit conscious, since his pay is going to depend to a considerable degree on the earnings of the company. It means that the other workers will also tend to discipline any worker laying down on the job, since, in so doing, he cuts into their earnings.

Second, and at least of equal importance, the system affords the Japanese company a means of adjusting its labor costs to meet changes in the business cycle without cutting the workers' weekly pay or resorting to layoffs. In fact, Japanese companies will make a strenuous effort to avoid laying off their employees. The resulting job security cannot help but produce greater feelings of loyalty on the part of the employees and better employer-employee relations.

Contrast that to the situation in the United States, where wage rates usually bear no direct relationship to productivity or earnings. The way U.S. companies usually adjust to downturns in the business cycle is to layoff employees. As a result, employees often feel that they have little stake in the company's performance. Under an inflexible wage structure, workers perceive their pay increases as being independent of the company's profitability. This wage structure gives them little incentive to use their ingenuity to help their company become more profitable by cutting costs and increasing productivity.

This kind of wage structure also emphasizes the divergence rather than the community of interest between employer and employee, and thereby contributes greatly to the deep antagonism that is so characteristic of labor-management relations in the United States. Our country can no longer afford such antagonism if it is to remain competitive in the new economic world of the 1980's.

My bill would encourage employers, with the consent of employees, to adopt the Japanese two-tier structure: a base wage and a bonus determined by reference to company profits or cost savings, with the bonus comprising up to one-third of an employee's annual compensation. To offset any additional costs associated with establishing and running this new wage system, employers would receive a tax credit under my bill equal to 5 percent of the bonuses they pay in a given year.

Of course, before such a system could be adopted in any company whose employees are represented by a labor union, it would have to be approved by the union, since Federal labor laws make any change in compensation the subject of collective bargaining, requiring the consent of the union as collective bargaining agent of the employees.

This bill is not a cure-all for our country's economic problems, but it should help improve job security as well as productivity. Moreover, the existing system is management's failure, not the workers'. American workers are not inferior to those in Japan; the problem is that management has failed to tap the richest source of information about cost reductions and productivity improvements—the workers themselves. It is instructive to note that the plant which captured Sony's 1980 worldwide productivity award was a San Diego plant using American workers.

Mr. Speaker, many other changes must accompany the type of wage restructuring which I am advocating, if we are to reverse our poor productivity growth in recent years. Particularly, the distortions in investment incentives which Congress approved in the Economic Recovery Tax Act must be addressed. There is no justification for tax incentives to investment which are at odds with economic incentives. To address this problem, I think Congress should repeal the existing system of accelerated depreciation and replace it with expensing, as was proposed in the Tax Incentive Act of 1981. And there are other proposals before Congress to improve our Nation's productivity growth rate which deserve serious attention.

Productivity is at the root of our country's economic problems. If we concentrate simply on dividing up a diminishing pie, we will all be losers. Instead, let us concentrate on enlarging the pie by examining policies and practices which hinder productivity improvement.●

WOMEN'S AMERICAN ORT CELEBRATES OPENING OF ORT HIGH SCHOOL IN NORTH MIAMI BEACH

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, Women's American ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training) throughout the Nation is today celebrating ORT Day. The southeast Florida region is holding their ORT Day celebration at the Jewish High School of South Florida.

I would like to extend my congratulations to Women's American ORT and the American ORT Federation for the prominent role they have played in the establishment of this school. Its opening last year marked ORT's entry into the day school movement in this country, and the American ORT Federation and Women's American ORT have agreed to lend ORT's century of expertise in science and technology to the Jewish High School of South Florida. The school already has an enrollment of over 100 students for its first semester, and will offer a unique mix of quality secular education, including training in science-based technology with a full range of traditional Jewish studies.

The school's department of science and technology will be headed by ORT and will be a valuable asset to the south Florida area. ORT continues to play a major role in building reservoirs of skilled people, using vocational and technical education as its instrument, in Jewish communities wherever they are.

I am pleased to pay tribute to Women's American ORT and to acknowledge their very fine work.●

LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEBT FINANCING PRACTICES

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, these are indeed difficult times for local governments attempting to finance their operations or facilities with long- or short-term debt. Although municipal bonds are attractive to purchasers because of their tax-exempt status, recent tax changes and the general mood of the debt markets have combined to eliminate many of the advantages of this status, and have raised local borrowing costs considerably. This obviously places a financial strain on local governments. Equally important, however, is the strain that it places on the management capabilities of municipal finance departments.

Mr. Michael D. Hernandez, director of the public finance department of Kidder, Peabody & Co., Inc., in New York recently delivered a comprehensive address which discusses the problems confronting municipal borrowers and some suggestions for enhancing their capacity to manage their debt load. I think that my colleagues will find his remarks enlightening.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Hernandez' address in the RECORD:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEBT FINANCING PRACTICES

INTRODUCTION

Significant changes are affecting state and local governments' ability to raise capital and are making the decision to issue bonds a difficult one. During periods of high interest rates, issuers of tax-exempt bonds face decisions not only of when and how to finance, but also whether to finance through borrowing. The changes taking place require increased sophistication in capital financing and debt management expertise if sound decisions are to be made.

The two key topics I will address are: 1) major forces of change affecting the ability

to raise capital; and 2) generic, not specific, areas in which increased sophistication may enhance options for state and local governments to deal with a changing world.

MAJOR FORCES OF CHANGE

Among the numerous factors affecting change in capital financing, the following are of major importance:

Increased size and diversity of financing requirements

In terms of size, the Public Finance Department of Kidder, Peabody forecasts a 100% increase, from $250 billion to $500 billion, in the amount of financing required over the remainder of the 1980's. In health care alone $120 billion will be needed.

The diversity and range of financing projects and techniques required have increased proportionate to the growth of specialized needs in hospital, transportation, public power, resource recovery, housing, corporate-related and other areas.

Increase in overall and regional economic pressures

Cutbacks in government budgets have created a pervasive financial strain throughout the country. Moreover, the disparity in the economic development rate in different parts of the country exacerbates this debt pressure in certain regions. In addition to overall federal funding cuts, California Proposition #13 and Massachusetts Proposition #2½ exemplify the regional variation in tax reduction measures.

Changes in the market place

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of the Reagan Administration, or ERTA as it is known, impacts heavily upon the future of the municipal securities market in several ways. In particular, the new program makes tax-exempt investments less attractive. By lowering the maximum tax rate for taxable income from 70% to 50%, the tax bill reduces the need for tax shelters.

Concurrent with the reduced demand for tax shelters will be an increased demand to raise capital through debt financing. The Reagan budget proposes a $13 billion cut in Federal aid to state and local governments for the 1982 fiscal year.

A substantial reduction has occurred in the institutional market. Commercial banks and casualty insurance companies, once the primary investors in tax-exempt municipal issues, have drastically reduced buying. Banks are favoring floating-rate investments and casualty companies, because of lowered profits, no longer see the need for tax shelters. Future involvement of casualty companies in the tax-exempt market is uncertain.

Simultaneous with the reduction in the institutional market is a shift in the retail market toward individual private investors. This shift requires a change in marketing orientation and may suggest a diminished importance of small investors.

Increased competition in other markets such as newly created tax shelters is best illustrated by the introduction of the tax-exempt all savers on October 1st. These certificates, also part of the ERTA package, pose a threat to the municipal market by attracting private investors interested in short-term, less risky investments.

Another possible change in the market place concerns the potential effects on local banks of the new interstate banking laws. These laws, which would allow for more interstate consolidation of banks, pose contraction difficulties for small issuers. Small local banks will no longer be a source for serving the financing needs of local governments.

While all of the above changes have either directly or indirectly contributed to an increased volatility of the market place, the primary causes of this increased volatility are high interest rates and persistent inflation.

Changes in the attitudes of the electorate

Increased conservatism among voters reflects a demand for a new ranking of priorities in state and local finance. Among the top priorities are more efficient government, reduced spending, and greater reliance on financing from the private sector.

ENHANCEMENT OPTIONS TO CONSIDER

All of the changes and financial pressures indicated above suggest that state and local governments must place increased emphasis on developing expertise in planning and handling capital financing. At minimum, the importance given to finance expertise should equal that of corporations that raise hundreds of billions of dollars in the various capital markets. Following are some of the general areas in which sophistication may enhance the quality of state and local government options:

Increased capital access

State and local governments must be able to access, on a competitive basis, large pools of investment capital with maturities that match the asset lives of the facilities constructed. While the current demand among investors for short-term issues is extremely high, short-term capital investment strategy for the issuer is not a solution to long-term capital needs.

Increased forecasting ability with program-specific emphasis

Increased expertise in forecasting long-term capital needs (over a fifteen-year to twenty-year period) combined with more reliance on program-specific, comprehensive planning will enhance the financial positioning of state and local governments.

Effective forecasting on a program-specific basis necessitates considering and quantifying: 1) program estimates, including the volume of services provided and the revenue generated by the program; 2) cost estimates; and 3) time estimates. In addition, attention must be focused on the logistical coordination necessary to plan, develop, and implement the capital program throughout the specified period of time.

Increased flexibility and options

Greater inclusion of planning options will provide for the increased flexibility of structuring which is of critical necessity given the current volatile market. The day is gone when one can simply plug in an interest rate and a sale date.

A question that must be addressed is: What is the cost to state and local governments of not financing a capital improvement program projected over a twenty-year period? If a project enhances the economy and generates jobs, the cost of not undertaking the financing can be highly expensive. Sophisticated opportunity-cost analyses based on quantified projections are required if the classic public finance downside risk is to be avoided.

State and local governments must be able to fine tune project planning and weigh all of the various options in capital planning.

Relating costs of facilities to users

Where appropriate, agency representatives should attempt to relate fees paid by users of a facility to the cost of operating that facility. This process will improve accountability and promote self-sufficiency in operations of the facility. One way to achieve this objective is to spin off projects by creating independent and self-supporting enterprises which can have greater access to capital markets. In addition to self-sufficient financing, another advantage of a spin-off structure is that it takes the politics out of the operations.

Emphasis on community and economic impact

Increased attention should be paid to the fundamental community well-being and economic impact of financing. State-wide financial oversight agencies can advise on what facilities should be built and can assist local agencies in deciding when and how to obtain the financing. In the past, local hospitals which consulted with state health facility financing authorities received a better price than they would have by independent solicitation alone. The concept embodied in Assembly Speaker Stanley Fink's proposal to create "a permanent mechanism" to regulate debt issuance in New York State deserves serious consideration.

Development of investor relations program

The development of a first-rate investor relations program, with emphasis on providing more information to investors, will enhance the agency's marketing potential.

Agencies should model themselves after the corporate sector, which for a long time has committed itself to disseminating various types of information to investors.

A priority objective of such an investor relation program is the development of "effective communication" as opposed to hard-sell strategies used in the past.

Increased communication between public sector issuers and investment bankers

Intensified communication between local and state government agencies and investment bankers is paramount to establishing sophisticated marketing techniques to raise capital through attractive investments.

Agencies need to closely monitor and communicate with the various elements of the market place in order to establish solid relationships with financial advisors. By sustained monitoring, issuers can best decide when and at what cost a financing can be done. In the past, investment bankers have been contacted on a very inconsistent basis.

Paralleling this objective, investment bankers need to closely monitor and communicate with the public sector. This will significantly enhance the professionalism on Wall Street and ensure the most effective results from research, trading, and sales. The ability to analyze and communicate what the public sector is doing and to convert those capital needs into attractive investments must be upgraded.

SUMMARY

Requirements for capital and the mechanisms by which capital traditionally has been raised have changed fundamentally. Increases in the size and diversity of financings required, changes in the market place, and changes in the attitudes of the electorate are major factors affecting today's debt policy and issuance.

In order to be successful in the future, state and local governments must be able to have access to large pools of investment capital and to forecast long-term capital needs on a program-specific basis. Consideration of a range of planning options will provide for the flexibility of structuring necessary in the current volatile market. One option, a

spin-off structure, allows for costs of facilities to be paid directly by users. State oversight or approval agencies should be instituted as a mechanism to regulate debt issuance and to oversee the fundamental community and economic impact of financing.

Success in the future will also be enhanced by the provision of investor relations programs aimed at better disclosure of information to investors. Similarly, increased reciprocity of communication and monitoring between the public sector and investment bankers is a critical ingredient to meeting the capital needs of the '80s.●

REPRESENTATIVE BILL GREEN CONDEMNS U.S. ROLE AS "ARMS SALESMAN" TO THE WORLD

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Weinberger seems to have embarked on the dangerous course of trying to make foreign policy by peddling arms in unstable regions. His recent remarks on strategic weaponry and Mideast policy to the Jordanians betray an alarmingly pro-Arab bias, raise questions about the use of arms sales as a tool of foreign policy, and make one wonder whether the largest peacetime military buildup can be properly overseen by a would-be Secretary of State.

The first major example of our seeking to buy friends with guns was the sale of the AWACS to the Saudis. I was an active and vocal opponent of this sale. In Iran we learned that we could not assure our security interests by heavily arming one despotism and making it the cornerstone of our policy in the Mideast. After the Iranian debacle, I simply could not fathom why we should promote a sale to the Saudis that was unlikely to engender any friendliness from the Saudis, but would definitely endanger our security, NATO's defense structure, and the safety of our best ally in the Mideast, Israel. In the half-year since the sale, the "moderate" Saudis have, sadly, shown my fears were legitimate. They have continued to undermine the peace process, they have reformed their alliance with Libya, and have in fact called us, their supposed mentors, "just arms salesmen—we pay cash." While the administration thinks we're preventing Soviet adventurism, the Saudis think Americans are just arms peddlers. We think their greatest threat is the U.S.S.R., and they think their greatest threat is Israel. The AWACS package was passed with strings attached, yet it turns out we are the only ones who believe the strings have any force.

I had hoped the uproar over the AWACS sale would have convinced the administration that Congress was serious about Israel's security, and that, if not past events in Iran, the Saudis' behavior since the sale had shown us the bankruptcy of seeking friends through transfers of sophisticated technology. Unfortunately, last week Secretary of Defense Weinberger told the Jordanians that he thinks it would be a good idea for us to sell their country Hawk antiaircraft missiles, and F-16 fighters. Mr. Weinberger apparently would not mind selling these even if the Jordanians refuse to cancel their order for similar goods from the U.S.S.R. He also apparently indicated that U.S. aid should be redirected toward Arab countries. Israel was aghast, and rightly so. We all should be aghast at this sort of policy. Jordan has consistently undermined the peace process, and been a consistently hostile neighbor to Israel. Not very reassuringly, the administration has suggested that Mr. Weinberger was not carrying out formal U.S. policy on his trip.

Throughout the public debate over the AWACS sales, the administration seemed to be leaning toward a Mideast policy placing the Arab world, rather than Israel, at the center of our security interests. I have always believed that U.S. interests are best served by maintaining the strength and security of Israel, our best ally in the Mideast. However, apparently Secretary Weinberger believes that arming the Arabs will bring them into the fold. I would like to know the basis of this conjecture. Is the Secretary not aware that Arab arms have traditionally been used against Israelis, not Russians? Does he not understand that arms transfers are inherently destabilizing in most cases, or that by increasing our arms sales to the Mideast we only add fuel to the already raging arms race in the region? Is the Secretary not the least bit cognizant of the legitimate fears his statements would arouse in the Israelis?

Not only in the Mideast, but in other parts of the world we seem to be pursuing a dangerous policy of trying to buy off trouble spots with arms. In the case of Pakistan, we have given General Zia's government military aid to try to prevent it from pursuing a nuclear capability. In the case of El Salvador, we are sending increasing amounts of military aid to a government whose leader says he prefers economic aid. Throughout the world, we are supposedly countering the Soviets with arms transfers. Time reports that a senior administration official recently said, "Our foreign policy is in large part arms sales * * *. Every other week we are selling something to someone."

This policy will not work. Generally speaking, arms transfers simply raise the world's danger level. They heighten regional arms races and tensions, and greatly increase the likelihood that if tensions erupt, the consequences will be severe. Also, it should be clear that spreading sophisticated technology around the world greatly increases the chances that it will be compromised. Supposedly offsetting the dangers of arms transfers are the political gains these sales confer. But history and recent statements by the Saudis prove most of these claims are an illusion. All too often we get nothing in return for our arms offerings, and in fact also damage existing allegiances. Through the sale of the AWACS, we have severely tested our friendship with the Israelis, have no assurances from the Saudis on the use of the AWACS, and no sign that they are ready to cooperate with us. In Asia, India is terrified at the prospect of Pakistan being very well armed, and may as a result strengthen its ties with the Soviet Union. I also question the morality of a U.S. role as gun pusher, especially to nations that lack stability or whose people need butter, not guns.

Perhaps Mr. Weinberger's involvement in foreign policy is the reason we have a defense buildup that is just a rehash of the defense plans former President Carter submitted to us. It contains no new ideas, no improvements, only bigger orders within the defense scheme the administration inherited from former President Carter. An administration which can never be accused of being soft on defense would have a real opportunity to streamline our defense structure and make it more effective. Instead, Secretary Weinberger's defense budget is as indiscriminate as his plans for the Mideast. No strategic choices have been made, no real savings have been achieved, and even the Reagan administration's own projections for growth in 1983 defense spending have grown from last year's estimate of 7 percent real growth to this year's planned real growth of about 13 percent. Maybe if Mr. Weinberger stayed home more often we would have a more thoughtful defense budget, one that acknowledges the strategic world in which we live, and the fiscal constraints under which we operate.

Mr. Speaker, I was deeply disturbed by Mr. Weinberger's junket to the Mideast. Missiles for Jordan cannot be contemplated. Aid for the Mideast cannot be redirected away from Israel. Most important, we must realize the allies cannot be bought with arms transfers. Secretary Weinberger has not distinguished himself as a diplomat, so he really ought to tend the ballooning Pentagon budget. The billions we are spending for defense clearly need an overseer, and foreign policy clearly can do without Mr. Weinberger. Thank you.●

SIXTY YEARS OF SERVICE: AMERICAN HOSPITAL SUPPLY CORP.

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 60th anniversary of American Hospital Supply Corp., located in Evanston, Ill., and the 85th birthday of Foster G. McGaw, American Hospital Supply Corp.'s founder and honorary chairman. I rise today to acknowledge American Hospital Supply Corp.'s dramatic success story in the field of international health care based on its commitment to service.

As Foster McGaw once described this commitment to service:

Our business is more—it's more spiritually rewarding because it's part of an industry in which health is the goal. Our people feel that way. And the thing which has made our efforts successful is a principle which I have always shared with our people; never take more than you give. Now that sounds trite. But it is good business.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is good business. This attitude of humanitarianism and dedication to service is exemplary, and one that is considered to be one of the best in the health care industry.

In 1922 American Hospital Supply was founded by Foster McGaw and two partners on $30,000 of borrowed money. Mr. McGaw built a business with a good idea—the willingness to take risks and work hard—which has served an important need for over 50 years.

American Hospital Supply has maintained a sensitivity to new trends in the health care field and part of its greatness is attributable to its ability to adjust to the changing business climate over the past 60 years. American has come a long way since its first rugged years struggling with vast distances, poor transportation, and some competitors who routinely ignored and deceived their clients. The successful plan Mr. McGaw developed to guarantee his customers services has weathered the Depression, when the Nation and hospitals suffered together, and World War II, when American moved quickly to help the military maintain a constant flow of crucial supplies while many other companies raised their prices opportunistically.

The 1950's and 1960's saw new products, new divisions, and new services added. American continue opening more regional distribution centers and broadened product lines to meet customers' growing needs. By the late 1970's, American began offering inventory management help and cost caps to the Nation's largest hospitals to combat the inability to pay for the ever-increasing demand for hospital care.

Today, 19 out of every 20 hospitals in the United States buy something they need from American Hospital Supply. Its product line expands at an approximate rate of one new item per day. American now employs 35,000 people and in 1981 made more than $2.9 billion in sales throughout 28 countries.

Mr. Speaker, American Hospital Supply has indeed made an impact on the industry, has gained the respect of hospitals, and has set a pattern of excellence in the health care field. American's history reflects its willingness to change and to respond to a dynamic environment as well as its preservation of the idealistic principles of good business in its honest, knowledgeable, and constant service.

I congratulate Karl Bays, chairman and chief executive officer, and Harold G. Bernthal, president and chief operating officer, for their superb leadership at American.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have a corporation of this stature in my congressional district and look forward to its continued service to the community. I have no doubt that the next 60 years will be as valuable and successful as the past 60 have been.

Whether a desire to develop new products or even today to contain health care costs, American Hospital Supply has placed a premium on service. I encourage other businesses to follow American's generous lead and applaud American Hospital Supply for its outstanding accomplishments.●

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER HEARINGS

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Subcommittee on Surface Transportation heard testimony today on the drunk driving issue. The subcommittee is considering several proposals to keep drunk drivers from driving. Among these are H.R. 2052, legislation that I and the the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. RHODES, introduced to streamline and upgrade the National Driver Register. I commend Senator DANFORTH for his efforts in this difficult area and would like to share with my colleagues a copy of the testimony I submitted to the subcommittee.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER

The National Driver Register is an effective and needed safety program to prevent the relicensing of problem drivers. All too often the deaths on our nations' highways are caused by drivers who have had their license suspended or revoked in one state, but have been able to receive another valid license from a different state. The NDR is the only Federal program in existence whose sole purpose is to identify these problem drivers and notify the states involved.

Despite an outdated "batch mail" system, the NDR identifies over 268,000 problem drivers a year. I have introduced legislation in the House, H.R. 2052, to upgrade the NDR with a computer pointer system. This new system would cut the current processing time of between ten days to two weeks to under five minutes. The accelerated processing will increase the number of state inquiries and, as a result, increase the number of problem driver identifications to over one million per year.

H.R. 2052 has won the support of numerous automobile and safety organizations, including the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration and the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, the umbrella organization responsible for the administration and enforcement of motor vehicle and traffic laws. Their endorsement is premised on the long-proven fact that by reducing the number of problem drivers on the road, the number of highway deaths will decline.

The existing NDR is a proven and effective system that has kept many problem drivers off the highways. The streamlining and updating of NDR, as provided for in H.R. 2052, together with adequate funding, will make the NDR an even more successful means of providing improved safety on the nation's highways.

It is my hope that the Subcommittee will support the concept of an improved NDR. It is a needed step to alleviate the continuing human carnage on our nation's highways.●

CUTS IN STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a letter sent from New York State Senator Kenneth P. LaValle, chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee, to President Reagan. Mr. LaValle raises some interesting points concerning the possible effects of further reductions in student assistance programs. I insert a copy of this letter in today's RECORD.

DECEMBER 21, 1981.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Those of us who worked for your election share a deep sense of pride as we witness the significant decline in the national inflation rate. I know of no period in modern history where the leadership of any free country has demonstrated more convincingly the inexorable connection between excessive tax burdens and economic stagflation.

The courage you have demonstrated over the past year provides a model of local, state and federally elected officials as we all set about the formidable task of refining and building upon the basic economic reforms you have set in motion. As in any reform

effort of the magnitude your Administration has undertaken, there will be unintended consequences. The spirit of your administration, however, has been one that invites participation from all Americans, encouraging constructive comment and criticism.

It is in that spirit that I bring to your attention a situation which may warrant your personal intervention to achieve timely corrective action.

For the past several years I have been deeply involved in establishing higher education public policy for New York State. Throughout that period I have kept abreast of federal higher education developments because of their substantial impact upon our state system. New York, like many of the states in the Northeast, has a relatively high proportion of institutions which are independently governed. We have a young State University which has expanded over the past 20 years at an unprecedented rate and, despite that growth, has achieved impressive standards of excellence.

Unlike many other areas of state service, New York has been able to hold its overall higher education expenditures at reasonable levels because of our ability to maintain a healthy balance in enrollments between the public and independent sectors. We have achieved voluntary integration in the process, maintaining a good mix of students based upon income and ethnicity. The key has been to maintain the affordability of both sectors so that students make their institutional choices based upon their personal academic needs and qualifications rather than family economic circumstance.

While New York provides substantially more state student aid than any other state, it is still less than what is made available through various federal programs. And the amount of appropriations to our state institutions exceeds what we provide in need based assistance to students and their families to help bridge the gap between independent and public sector tuition charges.

Nationally, the distribution of state appropriations for higher education shows only four percent targeted to student assistance, the balance going to state universities and public colleges. The exact opposite proportion, 96 cents of every federal dollar appropriated for higher education goes to help students afford the college of their choice.

There is the even more important consideration you addressed in your commencement remarks last spring at Notre Dame University. If institutions like Notre Dame are replaced by government sponsored universities, the academic freedom so precious to America will wither away. I am convinced, as one who has devoted much time and effort to studying the financing of higher education, that independent institutions will become unaffordable to large segments of our population if federal student aid is withdrawn in the magnitude and in the time frame being suggested by OMB and various committees of the Congress. The reductions already accomplished will go far toward eliminating the misuse and abuse of federal student aid . . . a malady which previous administrations unfortunately failed to address. I am equally persuaded that further reductions will generate greater overall tax burdens upon individuals and business as the states react to maintain collegiate access levels.

Mr. President, in keeping with the noble and sensible policy direction you set last May at South Bend, I plead for your personal intervention to avoid consequences which I believe are contrary to your fiscal and philosophical objectives.

Respectfully yours,

KENNETH P. LAVALLE,
State Senator.●

CIVIL DEFENSE AGAINST NUCLEAR ATTACK IS A DANGEROUS DELUSION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post contained another outstanding article by Mary McGrory. It was inspired by the incredible phraseology employed by President Reagan's counselor, Edwin Meese III, who, in discussing the administration's plans to expand spending for so-called civil defense, referred to it as the best way to avoid the consequences of "something that may not be desirable." As Ms. McGrory says that is probably "the ultimate in laid-back description of nuclear war."

Although the American Medical Association has formally declared that "no medical response" is possible in the event of nuclear attack, the administration, nevertheless, is proceeding to push an expensive but utterly ludicrous program of civil defense, which has as its heart a so-called crisis relocation plan to remove citizens from their homes and return them after a nuclear attack. As Ms. McGrory points out, the basic flaw in the plan is that it relies on an 8-day warning which, according to the public affairs director of the Civil Defense Association, "we will not receive."

However, there is even a greater defect in the plan. Last year, using the Freedom of Information Act, I got the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to disgorge a 1978 report on little known effects of a nuclear attack. In that report, the agency brought out the fact that, in addition to the blast and fallout from a full-scale nuclear attack, such an attack would destroy most of the ozone layer in the Northern Hemisphere, making it impossible for plants or animals to survive unprotected on the surface of the Earth. One conclusion was that any realistic civil defense program would have to provide sufficient underground food, water, and facilities to enable the population to live below ground for several years.

The fact is that any meaningful civil defense program in a world in which tens of thousands of nuclear weapons exist, as they do at present, would be prohibitively costly, requiring trillions of dollars, and would constitute a total negation of what we think as the American way of life.

Such a program clearly has not the slightest chance of being put into effect or even authorized. Yet anything short of such a program is not only a delusion but could actually bring a nuclear war closer by creating the illusion of protection for the population.

It is time we quit thinking in terms of such dangerous nonsense and get on with the job of nuclear disarmament.

The full text of Ms. McGrory's article follows these remarks:

REAGAN AIDE OFFERS LAID-BACK DESCRIPTION OF NUCLEAR WAR

Ronald Reagan's counselor, Edwin Meese III, yesterday gave what may be the ultimate in laid-back description of nuclear war. He called it "something that may not be desirable."

Meese was addressing the Civil Defense Association at the Shoreham Americana Hotel, bearing the president's warm good wishes and the happy news that Reagan intends to double its budget as part of his strategic planning.

Meese conceded that it is "not an easy task to defend and justify civil defense" because "it is the kind of thing people have a psychological aversion to."

Reagan's plans to add 17,000 nuclear warheads to an arsenal of 25,000 has run into considerable flak. Aroused physicians and scientists are raising the alarm about unspeakable death and destruction. The American Medical Association has formally declared that "no medical response" is possible in the event of nuclear attack. And Jonathan Schell's New Yorker series about the end of the planet is working its way into the national psyche.

But Meese said that civil defense "is a deterrent for a possible attack on this nation" and the Civil Defense Association workers applauded vigorously.

"Preparedness," he declared, "is the best way to avoid the consequences of something that may not be desirable."

The "deterrent," as presently constituted, seems unlikely to give the Soviets pause. At its heart is the crisis relocation plan, an intricate, upbeat scheme that envisions orderly removal of citizens from "target areas" to "host areas" and their return, within a relatively short period of the bomb burst—a return to "a home area" that sounds a step away from normalcy.

A few lines from the literature put out by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which is in charge of civil defense, from a section called "What Home May Be Like" give the flavor of this exceptionally sunny scenario:

"Fuel and food supplies will be rerouted to your home area; however, this may take a day or two. . . . It may be necessary to take extra precautions with waste. Some food stocks will probably have to be carried back in your car. Be sure it is fresh, particularly raw meat."

The whole thing conjures up a picture of an area that has somehow escaped flattened buildings, heaped corpses and the radiated, blinded, or burned inhabitants generally associated with nuclear assault.

The real defect in the plan is that it relies on an eight-day warning which, according to William Murray, public affairs director of the Civil Defense Association, "we will not receive."

But Meese says that "reinvigoration" of civil defense will "give people the confidence that their lives can be protected."

The Civil Defense workers might have benefited more from listening to one of their number who was not at yesterday's meeting. Perhaps the speech given to the Greensboro, N.C., City Council by Marilyn Braun, 37, coordinator of the Greensboro-Guilford Emergency Management Assistance Agency, would have been more to the point.

Braun, charged by her superiors with making a two-year update of war plans, sent instead a letter of protest which, she was told, would "never get to the federal level." But to avoid a fuss, these superiors accepted her protest as an update and confined themselves to complaining to reporters that she is "uncooperative."

Upon presenting the findings of a committee of experts and concerned citizens who studied all aspects of the problem, she told the Greensboro City Council on Feb. 11:

"We have no protection today in Greensboro or Guilford County for this threat . . . the documents and civil defense publications that we have on record fail to address minimal human needs in protecting people from 'blast' and 'fallout'. . . . Given these circumstances, we are presently unable to design an emergency plan to offer protection from nuclear detonations. We do not think it can be done in Greensboro and Guilford County, and we do not think it has been done in any other city or county in the U.S."

Braun, who has become somewhat of a heroine in anti-nuclear circles, speaks very softly on the telephone. She also takes direct action. She removed the "fallout shelter" signs from the 170 buildings so designated by FEMA because, she said, they do not offer shelter from radiation or starvation.

Braun's regional superiors have warned her that her federal funds may be cut off if she does not adopt a more positive attitude. One third of the Guilford-Greensboro allowance comes from Washington, which expects its share to be used for nuclear war planning.

Braun thinks that "as long as people have an illusion of protection, it may very well stand in the way of thinking about the threat."

But at the White House, the illusion is strong.

That's why the man closest to the president can talk about nuclear war not as the last call for the planet but merely as "something that may not be desirable."●

HUD SECTION 202 EXTENSION POLICY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address briefly an issue of great concern to myself and other Members who support the section 202 direct loan program—a program that in its 20-year history has provided decent and affordable housing to senior citizens and the disabled. I do not have to reiterate the strong bipartisan support the section 202 program has earned through its flawless record of sound management on the part of its thousands on nonprofit sponsors. This is one housing program Congress and the Department of Housing and Urban Development can point to with pride. Indeed, it is the only subsidized housing program that the current administration desires to continue through the new construction of additional units in 1983 and beyond.

However, I am deeply disturbed by HUD's official statements recently printed in the Washington Post that describe administrative actions totally contrary to the support that the Secretary of HUD has promised for the elderly housing program. I speak specifically of recent instructions to HUD field offices, made by HUD's Office of Housing that threaten to cancel immediately as many as 5,500 units of much-needed section 202 housing; units that have been committed to sponsors in previous years. The sponsors holding fund reservations for these units have proceeded through the torturous process of HUD development with the good faith and understanding that every effort would be made by HUD to see that these projects would be built.

But suddenly, after years of effort and often thousands of dollars of investment by local church groups, community organizations, and the like, HUD is changing the rules, withdrawing their support and threatening to take the dollars committed to these nonprofit sponsors to build desperately needed housing for the elderly and handicapped and returning the funds to the Treasury.

And who will suffer as a result of this policy? The low-income elderly and disabled, the truly needy we have heard so much about will be denied housing that has been promised. Especially affected will be the projects planned by minority and non-elderly-handicapped sponsors. These groups, aided in the development process by previous administrations, are being abandoned by this administration.

HUD's own telegram transmitting the policy change states that the cancellations are being enacted for budgetary reasons. What HUD actions amount to, therefore, is a de facto rescission of budget authority without the consent of the Congress. Furthermore, the arbitrary new policy does not permit either HUD or the sponsor to determine the feasibility of the project. It simply and without adequate notice and due process, wipes thousands of 202 units off the books. It is inconceivable that 78 percent of the processing pipeline is deadwood, projects that will never come to be. It would appear, therefore, that HUD is not cleaning out the pipeline of infeasible projects, but attempting to cancel the section 202 pipeline.

While I will continue to vigorously support the efficient administration of all housing programs, especially section 202, the pursuit of efficiency must be balanced with responsible program administration. HUD change in policy frustrates the ability of the Secretary to carry out HUD's responsibility under the section 202 statutes. The wholesale denial of reasonable extensions to section 202 sponsors is ill advised and contrary to the intentions of this Congress when appropriated section 202 funds for the purpose of providing desperately needed elderly housing.

The use of such administrative means to cut Federal expenditures is beyond the authority of the Office of Housing, and I urge the Department to immediately withdraw their unwise policy direction and attend to the prompt administration of the section 202 program.●

A TRIBUTE TO FLOYD V. DECKER

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding citizen and noteworthy individual in my home district, Mr. Floyd V. Decker of Butler, N.J. On Thursday evening, March 4, 1982, Mr. Decker, director of safety for the county of Morris, will be the guest of honor at a retirement dinner given by his family, friends, and coworkers.

On January 1, 1962, Floyd V. Decker was employed as the safety director of the county of Morris and created the first county safety department in the State of New Jersey.

In 1972, he was appointed traffic safety coordinator and has held the position of water consultant and secretary of the county municipal utilities authority since 1976.

Mr. Decker has been a volunteer fireman in the town of Butler for over 43 years. He helped organize the Tri-Boro First Aid Squad and remains a charter and life member.

As past fire chief of Bartholdt Hose Company No. 2 and member of the fire prevention bureau, Mr. Decker has remained active in many firefighter organizations on the State and local levels, including the New Jersey State Firemen's Relief Association, the New Jersey State's and Morris County's Fire Chiefs Associations and the Morris County Fire and Arson Investigation Committee.

Floyd Decker's need to help people wherever and whenever he can extends into other service and community organizations as well. Mr. Decker is an American Red Cross instructor, a member of the American Legion, the Knights of Columbus, and the United Way of Morris County.

89-059 O-85-17 (Pt. 3)

Certainly Floyd Decker's family is justifiably proud of him and love him very much. However, I believe that the accomplishments of Mr. Decker in the service to his community and the State of New Jersey over so many years is a true example of the volunteer spirit that has made America the great Nation it is today. No doubt Floyd Decker will remain involved in many activities after his retirement.

On behalf of his family and friends and community, I would like to say that we are all grateful for the dedication and compassion for his fellow man that Floyd Decker has demonstrated in so many ways throughout his life. I wish him and his family the best of health and happiness in the years ahead.●

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, and all freedom-loving Americans, to the observance of the 104th anniversary of Bulgarian Independence Day.

On March 3, 1878, after five centuries of Turkish oppression, the Bulgarian people, after a brave struggle and great sacrifice, regained their freedom and, under self-government, moved to establish democracy.

For over 65 years, until September 8, 1944, Bulgaria was a democratic country, with a flourishing culture. On September 8, the Soviet Army reached the borders of Bulgaria. Despite the fact that Bulgaria had maintained normal diplomatic relations with the Soviets throughout the war, on September 9 the Soviets launched a brutal invasion of Bulgaria and occupied the country. A Moscow-appointed Communist government took over.

From that day in September 1944, a strong and irrepressible resistance movement has struggled to regain Bulgaria's freedom. Thousands of Bulgarian patriots have lost their lives in the struggle, as the Communist government has resorted to severe and bloody oppression.

Throughout the struggle in Bulgaria, the brave patriots have had the invaluable support of Bulgarian emigrants in the United States. These emigrants, most of whom are refugees from the Communist terror in their homeland, have organized the Bulgarian National Front to provide support for the freedom movement at home. I would particularly like to commend Dr. Ivan Docheff, the honorary president of the central executive board of the Bulgarian National Front, Inc., of New York, and Dr. George Paprikoff president of the central executive board of the New York chapter, for their outstanding work in this valiant cause.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of Bulgarian independence is crucial to the cause of freedom everywhere. On this anniversary of Bulgarian Independence Day, I salute the bravery and dedication of the men and women who fight this noble fight, and pledge myself to continue to speak out in protest of the Soviet Union's occupation until the Bulgarian people have regained the freedom they deserve.●

ALLARD LOWENSTEIN CONGRESSIONAL SYMPOSIUM

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 12 through Sunday, March 14, the first Allard Lowenstein congressional symposium will be held in the Cannon caucus room 345. The symposium has been planned by several Members of Congress and Washington friends of our former colleague and friend, Al Lowenstein. Our purpose is to bring together those who knew Al or shared in his causes and commitments in an attempt to carry his tradition of involvement by focusing on the approaches we should take in the future.

Distinguished guests and speakers include several Senators and Members of the House as well as Frances Farenthold, Bobby Muller, Arthur Schlesinger, John Lewis, David Hawk, and Marian Wright Edelman. We hope that many old and new friends will join us and share the thoughts of the many expert speakers who were inspired by Al's spark. For more information, please contact DOUG WALGREN's office, 117 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.●

MORATORIUM ON FARM FORECLOSURES URGED

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of farmers throughout our country who are on the brink of financial disaster and who see little hope for the future. I rise on behalf of people who have not benefited from Reaganomics and the Economic Recovery Act of 1981: farmers whose programs were dramatically changed and funding reduced; they, among others in our society, are bearing the brunt of the administration's massive increase in military spending.

Initial projections by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for 1982 indicated that net farm income may drop an estimated $4.4 billion, to $14.5 billion this year. These projections, which USDA decided not to publish in its monthly Agricultural Outlook for the first time in years, came after a year in which real farm income was at its lowest level since the Depression.

In my home State of Minnesota, one-fourth of the State's 14,000 farmers with FmHA ownership loans are delinquent on their 1981 loan payments. Delinquencies have reached 19 percent for farm operating loans and 15 percent for weather-related emergency loans. Farm foreclosures in Minnesota were up six-fold in 1980 as compared to 1979. Figures are not yet available for 1981, but are expected to be even worse. Officials in the FmHA office for the State of Minnesota have said that if farm prices do not begin to recover, the figure could reach 50-percent delinquency by the end of 1982.

Minnesota farmers have had a 19-percent rise in production costs during the past year. The prices for crops, however, were down an average of 20 percent; and cash receipts were down $1.1 billion last year from the previous year.

The administration's response to the current rural crisis has been grossly inadequate, bordening on neglect. It has said that it will do all it can to help FmHA-borrowers stay in farming. The President's 1983 budget, however, indicates that "doing all it can to help farmers stay in business" means reducing the number of delinquent borrowers in FmHA programs by 20 percent through more agressive collection action and faster resolution of delinquent accounts.

Mr. Speaker, because of the administration's insensitivity to the dire plight of farmers, I feel we need strong action, now. I am today introducing legislation that, during the 1-year period beginning on the date of its enactment, will require the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the deferral of the payment of principal and interest on, and forego the foreclosure of, outstanding loans made under laws administered by the FmHA to farmers who are experiencing temporary economic hardships.

Failure to enact authority for a moratorium on farm foreclosures will lead to the continuing financial ruin of small family farmers, implement dealers, bankers, and small businessmen who are already carrying the burden of the downturn of the Nation's economy and who will face increasing pressures with the worsening of both the farm and national economy.

Mr. Speaker, the current rural economic crisis should not surprise the Members of this House; they knew or should have known that the 1981 farm bill failed to address the critical economic problems facing American farmers. Members knowingly approved a bad farm bill on the thin excuse that the President would not sign a better one. It is unlikely that the House will soon reconsider and rewrite the entire farm bill.

Farmers cannot wait for Congress to repent and reconsider that law. They need emergency relief, and they need it before planting time or it will be too late to save thousands of farms from financial collapse. I urge the Agriculture Committee and this House to act favorably and quickly on this legislation.●

TRIBUTE TO "COUNT" BASIE

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it will be my privilege on Friday, March 5, to have the great "Count," William Basie, perform at my annual birthday anniversary celebration. I am just delighted; and am grateful to Mr. Basie for taking time from his busy schedule to bring the beautiful Basie sound to me and my guests. I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues a brief biography of this outstanding artist.

William "Count" Basie was born in Red Bank, N.J., on August 21, 1904. He played the piano since childhood, studying first with his mother. After working in New York with Sonny Greer and June Clark, Count went on a tour with a theatre unit. When the tour broke up in Kansas City, he went to work in a silent movie theatre. Soon after, he joined Walter Page's Blue Devils and later Benny Moten, whose band he took over when Moten died in 1935.

In the summer of 1935, Basie had a 10-piece band which John Hammond, the noted music critic, heard on a small Kansas City radio station. Hammond helped bring the band to Chicago and then to New York in 1936, where it was enlarged. In January 1937, the band made its first recordings, and the following year became internationally known.

"Plink! Plank! Plink! Plank!" The sound comes at you softly, subtly. Single notes on a piano. Offbeat pauses. Instant recognition. And then one measure blends into the next. A right-hand chord. A stride bass. A surge of anticipation. And then—an avalanche of energy, of all encompassing music. Wham! And the Basie Band is off and blowing.

The pattern is familiar. The explosion of joy constant. This is the Bill Basie touch on piano and the exuberance of his big-band sound. Musicianship. Accent. Punctuation. Humor. Power. Four decades of spreading consistent happiness around the world.

In this day of rock and small groups and electric sounds, the age of the Basie Band, and his loyalty to the blues as a basic form, has remained in the fore. In truth, it has never waned. A look at Basie's recent activities mirrors the worldwide esteem in which he is held. He recently completed a tour of Japan—his second in recent seasons. In August of last year he made a second tour to South America, this time to Brazil. He has completed his 12th consecutive annual tour of Europe and England. His 2-week stay at Ceasar's Palace was a historic occasion in the world of entertainment. Count Basie, Frank Sinatra, and Ella Fitzgerald were on the stage together. King and Queen and Count! If ever there was a royal wedding, this was it—it was truly the Super Bowl of nightclub presentations.

The Basie Band is continuing other innovations in addition to the constancy of concert and nightclub performances. It is the first "big band" to ever play at the St. Regis Hotel in New York, appearing at the Maisonette Room and on the "Roof." The band has played on board the *Queen Elizabeth II* and the *Rotterdam*.

That the talents of Bill Basie and his band have remained at the top of the craft is no surprise to artists, audiences, and critics. And musicians.

Singers have long shouted Bill Basie's praises, as have Jimmy Rushing and Joe Williams, both of whom were so integral a part of the band in their days with it. And then there are the stars who discovered the joys of Basie accompaniments: Frank Sinatra, Tony Bennett, Ella Fitzgerald. He has been with them on television specials, on concert tours, on records, on stage in Las Vegas. Fred Astaire calls the Basie Band his favorite and made certain it was featured with him on his "Fred Astaire TV Special."

One critic wrote, in a national magazine recently:

Bill Basie is nonpareil not only as accompanist but as band pianist. He leads his band with the piano—he rarely gives any visual signal aside from a nod or a look—and he does it with extraordinary variety. In slow tunes, he noodles along behind his soloists, making cryptic musical comments and jokes about what they are playing, and he decorates ensemble passages with approving garlands of notes. In fast numbers, he moves down into the lowest registers and issues rocking, invincible chords that have literally made his listeners and his musicians shout."

The Count has received numerous awards, far too many to list. However, the love and respect in which he is held by our Nation was aptly demonstrated last December, when he received the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts annual medal for outstanding service in the performing arts. The medal was presented to Mr. Basie by President Reagan at a White House reception held December 6.●

CONGRESSMAN BEILENSON SPEAKS ON UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTION. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech recently delivered by our colleague from California, Congressman ANTHONY C. BEILENSON, before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council on February 12, 1982.

In his speech, Mr. BEILENSON examines the present administration's policy toward the Soviet Union and makes some acute observations about disturbing features of American policy.

I think we should all take heed of Mr. BEILENSON's words. He indicates that the Soviet Union is pursuing an aggressive foreign policy, but that should not lead us to conclude that Moscow is behind all of the world's problems. An obsession with the Soviet Union can blind us from seeing weaknesses in the Soviet system and ways of more effectively exploiting those weaknesses.

Congressman BEILENSON's thoughts deserve our attention.

His speech follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION: TOWARD A MORE REALISTIC FOREIGN POLICY

(By Congressman ANTHONY C. BEILENSON)

Along with many other people, I've been uncomfortable with much of the Reagan Administration's foreign policy during the President's first year of office.

It has seemed to me that its attitude toward the Soviet Union was too hostile, too provocative. The President has more than taken a hard line toward the Russians; he has often been, I think, unnecessarily belligerent, such as when he said, "They reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie and to cheat."

Although there were some softenings—the lifting of the grain embargo, the opening of the TNF negotiations, it was mostly an unrelieved political and ideological hard-line—which has, I think, made it even more difficult than usual to deal usefully with the Russians and has, in the bargain, alarmed our own allies and strained our relations with them, as well.

The key element in our foreign policy in recent years has been and must continue to be our relations with the Soviet Union. Difficult and vexing as it certainly is, we must continue to search out the ways and means of co-existing with them on this planet until the time comes when, hopefully, they devel-

op into a better neighbor in the world. But our relations now are more strained than they have been in a great many years; we are barely talking to each other (we had no ambassador there for the first ten months of last year), and there is more mistrust and misunderstanding between us—and thus more potential danger—than at any time in at least 20 years.

The basis of what little foreign policy this Administration has articulated is largely a renewed Cold War mentality—everything is seen in East-West terms; "the President and his advisers," in the words of Raymond Aron in this month's edition of 'Foreign Affairs,' "perceive a Soviet presence underlying all the turmoil which disturbs mankind around the world."

Without running through a list of all the Administration's foreign policy positions, a glance at even a few suggest the avenues down which such a world view leads us:

It leads us into situations we shouldn't be in—in El Salvador, where we are, supposedly, "drawing the line against communism in Central America"—and thus gets us drawn into a civil war that is a revolution of the poor rather than a test between communism and anti-communism, and where the opposition consists of many more Catholics, Christian Democrats and middleclass professionals than Marxists.

And it leads to an arms sales policy to nations who promise they "will stand with us against Russia."

We propose to sell Pakistan $3 billion in arms because they're neighbors of Afghanistan—although we know that 85 percent of their troops and war materiel are on the *Indian* border: and we are thus virtually destroying our relations with India.

We are sending AWACS and F-15's to Saudi Arabia so they will stand with us against the Russians—but the Saudis themselves insist that the primary threat to them is Israel! Most upsetting of all is the total absence of a policy for the Middle East—we are simply sending in arms, which is no substitute for a coherent foreign policy.

Our human rights policy has been skewed so that we are now against human rights violations in "totalitarian" countries (i.e., communist countries) but not in "authoritarian" countries—because they are our friends—especially dictatorships of the right down in South America and elsewhere that we now get along with.

And, the Administration position on nuclear arms control is, to put it charitably, ambivalent: the head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the chief negotiator of ACDA are both personally opposed to arms control agreements with Russia. Our position again is one of "linkage"—we will not negotiate on strategic arms control so long as we disapprove of Soviet actions in Poland, or elsewhere.

And our hard-line policy has led to serious difficulties within the Atlantic Alliance. Our relations with our NATO allies—the immensely important cornerstone of our foreign policy—were not awfully good during the previous Administration, but they are now bad and getting worse. The prime aim of Soviet diplomacy is the breaking up of the Atlantic Alliance, and if the Administration does not want to preside over the dissolution of NATO, it is going to have to start responding to European concerns to a greater degree than it has thus far.

Our allies in Western Europe believe more in detente, and less in confrontation, than we do.

There is less confidence on their part in our judgment when we tend to focus on the evils of communism—of the Soviet Union and its proxies, of Cuban aid to Latin American revolutionaries—and there is a loss of confidence when there is careless talk from Washington about "winnable" nuclear war, and about "limited" nuclear war—limited, that is, to Europe.

As Flora Lewis wrote recently in the New York Times, "denouncing the Soviet menace no longer converts people to admiration of America and trust in its leaders. They know the bad news about Moscow. They are looking for good news, of prospects for peace, reduction of the arms race, effective management of social and economic problems . . . The President must demonstrate that he and his government understand the great issues facing the world and are doing their best to deal with them."

But our policy these days does consist very much of "denouncing the Soviet menace."

If you in fact believe that Russia causes all of the problems of mankind, then I suppose you are stuck with believing that our job is to defeat Soviet objectives, and that we should get involved in all trouble spots where we think we see Russian adventurism, or where the result will seem to us to favor the Soviet Union.

And in that case, I suppose you might agree with Defense Secretary Weinberger that we need a huge defense build-up because, "We have to be prepared to launch counter-offensives in other regions and to exploit the aggressor's weaknesses wherever we might find them . . . We must be prepared for waging a conventional war that may extend to many parts of the globe."

In other words, as Frank Church has said, forty years after the fact, the Reagan Administration is getting the country ready for the Second World War!

But if you don't think that Russia causes all the problems of mankind, if you recognize that there may be other problems in the world—problems of nationalism, political repression, religious upheaval, regional conflicts, poverty and over-population and the instability they bring—then you tend to pursue policies that speak to these problems and not limit yourself to simple reactions to perceived Soviet initiatives.

You are able, in other words, to pursue your own interests in the world.

Unfortunately, we are now following a foreign policy based on the Reagan Administration's view of the world.

And the situation, in their eyes, seems also to be one in which the Russians are winning and in which the Russians are stronger than we—where we are in a position of military inferiority.

But is that correct? What are the realities?

I would suggest that the outlook for us is not nearly so bleak as the President seems to feel it is—in fact, it's a good deal more worrisome for the Russians.

We should try to understand the Russians and how the world looks to them—not in order to excuse them, or sympathize with them—but to understand them; it might help us properly evaluate the nature of the threat they pose to us.

The Russians have concerns, fears and grievances on their mind, too.

The view from Moscow is not reassuring—nor has it been for some time now.

At home, Russia faces problems with its Eastern bloc allies—most of whose economies are in serious trouble; some of whom are refusing to increase their defense spending as the Russians have requested; and all of whose military authorities are quite aware that it is the Polish military—and not the Polish communist party that is playing the leading, central role in Poland today.

The Soviets are becoming increasingly concerned, obviously, about their ability to hold together their Eastern European empire.

They have minority problems: the Russians themselves are now less than fifty percent of the population of the U.S.S.R.

They have productivity and labor problems, housing and food shortages, growing consumer expectations.

They have an aging, conservative leadership and fouled-up bureaucracy that stifles economic progress.

And beyond their borders, they are losing, rather than gaining, strength and influence.

In Europe, Spain and Portugal are succeeding with their democratic governments and both are firmly in the camp of the Western Nations; West European armed forces are stronger and better prepared than they were a few years ago—and U.S. forces in Western Europe are now more heavily armed and mechanized.

In Africa, after years of economic and diplomatic efforts, the Russians have influence in only three countries out of 53, and in one of them Angola, the Cuban troops who are there are being used to protect Gulf Oil's facilities (all of Angola's oil is sold to the West!).

In Asia, the world's most populous nation, China, has moved closer to the U.S., and Soviet-Japanese relations are extremely poor.

The Russians are becoming increasingly isolated in a world that is hostile to them politically and close to them geographically.

We have Canada and Mexico as neighbors—they have a 5,000 mile border with China, plus Iran, Afghanistan, the NATO countries, Japan and the Warsaw Pact nations whose support, in a time of hostilities, they cannot count on. As someone has said, "Fortunately, it is the Soviet Union and not the United States, who is surrounded by hostile communist countries!"

And they are confronted with four nuclear powers arrayed against them, and more likely to concert their efforts against them than at any time since World War II.

We are rightly concerned about Soviet adventurism and intervention in the Third World—but it needs to be put in perspective.

Moscow's failure—the split with China; expulsion from Indonesia, Egypt, Sudan and Somalia; the loss of influence in Ghana, Iraq, Guinea, Nigeria, Mali and Zaire—countries where Soviet influence was once accepted but has since been repulsed; and

Its loss of support from the Communist parties of Western Europe—most recently the Italian and Spanish Communists—all add up to an enormous loss of influence, which far outweighs its few successes.

And, most of its successes are probably temporary: even now, for example, Vietnam—in serious economic straits—is seeking a move toward ties with the U.S.; and

In Ethiopia, relations are badly strained and the Russians are hated by the people there—just as the Americans were when we were there!

And, in Afghanistan, they have been unable to curb the widespread insurgency despite a costly commitment—they control only Kabul (the capital), and they are learning a lesson similar to the one we learned in Vietnam: that there are limits on their abili-

ty to use military force successfully, even in a poor, neighboring country. And, in the process, they have earned the condemnation of most of the Third World.

When you get right down to it, Russia is very much alone in the world.

While we have strong and powerful allies throughout the world, what allies do they have?—six Eastern European puppet states, whom they cannot trust; plus Vietnam, Cuba, Ethiopia, Angola, Libya, Mozambique, South Yeman and, while it is occupied, Afghanistan.

And that's about it! Who'd want to trade positions with them?

In addition to their concerns about internal economic problems, and worries about being able to keep control of their Eastern European allies, they also are fearful about what they perceive to be external threats to their security.

They are perhaps most concerned about our policy of "playing the China Card" and what they see as our tilt toward China, and, noting their long border with China, argue that they could not tolerate another hostile government along the 1,700 mile border with Afghanistan—hardly an adequate excuse for their invasion of Afghanistan, but possibly a real insight into their insecurities.

And, while we considered Afghanistan the last straw—and even Jimmy Carter abandoned detente while Soviet troops remained in that unhappy country, it's also relevant to point out that when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan the trade, technology transfers, and arms control offers—many made in the Nixon-Kissinger years in the 1972 Trade Agreement—as promised rewards for Soviet restraint, had still not materialized: neither expansion of Export-Import Bank credits, nor conferral of most-favored-nation trade status had been granted—and the Soviets felt that we had reneged on the terms of the '72 agreement, and that they had nothing to lose in terms of benefits from us if they were to invade Afghanistan.

They were, and are, extremely concerned about our scuttling of the SALT II Treaty after they had negotiated it through three American administrations; and they are concerned about our unilateral abandonment of the Indian Ocean arms control negotiations of two years ago.

They saw our willingness to send a half million U.S. troops halfway around the world to Vietnam to within 1,800 miles of their borders (and many tens of thousands of our troops to Korea, just a few hundred miles from their own borders)—can you imagine our response if they were to send 500,000 troops to intervene in a civil war in Central or South America?

They see us going ahead with a new MX missile that was ostensibly designed to be mobile and thus invulnerable, only for us to be planning—until yesterday—to emplace them in existing, vulnerable silos—and they plausibly conclude that the new weapon is, in fact, a first-strike weapon that threatens their own nuclear deterrent in just the same way the Pentagon says heavy Soviet missiles threaten the U.S. deterrent. They may be even more alarmed than we since many more of their missiles (three-fourths) are land-based, and thus vulnerable, while the U.S. deploys far more of its inter-continental missile force on invulnerable submarines.

They are concerned about the NATO decision to deploy U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe because they feel that the number of theater nuclear weapons is now in balance—they are especially concerned about those of our missiles which can hit Russia and thus, from their point of view, are the equivalent of strategic weapons (none of their TNF can hit the U.S.), and

They are most worried about the Pershing II missiles which we plan to deploy in West Germany and which can reach Moscow in only five or six minutes, which means that a well-executed first strike could wipe out the entire Soviet leadership and much of their command and control system as well.

And the cruise missiles we shall be deploying by the thousands in and around Europe will also not be able to be seen until they reach their target nor, because of their small size, will their numbers be known or verifiable to the Soviets.

In sum, the "American threat" is as real to them as the "Soviet threat" is to us.

It helps, I think, to look at these things—it gives a better perspective to our relative situation in the world, and it helps one see that some of the imagined problems are more manageable and less frightening than we often are led to believe.

The same thing is true about our military situation vis-a-vis the Russians.

Without any major reversal or precipitous shift in the balance of power between East and West, Mr. Reagan proposes to double the budget for defense expenditures over the next five years (a total of $1.6 trillion)—and a cost by 1986 of $1 billion a day for defense—in the stated aim of seeking military superiority over the Russians, which is probably not possible.

And the President proposes to go ahead with this enormous expenditure of money—and this huge arms build-up—

Despite the fact we're already, with our NATO allies, outspending the U.S.S.R. and its Warsaw Pact allies by more than $20 billion a year for defense (and almost 40 percent of their expenditures are for weapons and forces for their 5000-mile Chinese border);

Despite the fact that we and our NATO allies have 600,000 more men under arms than the U.S.S.R. and the Warsaw Pact countries—and fully half their combat-ready forces are stationed on the Chinese border, not in Central Europe. And a great many of their troops in Central Europe are drawn from Eastern European states—and their reliability is thus very uncertain.

Despite the fact that we have a good many more nuclear warheads than they;

Despite the fact, for example, that the nuclear warheads carried on one U.S. submarine could destroy every large and middle-sized city in Russia—and we have 41 such submarines.

Plus 356 B-52 Bombers, each of which can carry several nuclear bombs;

Plus 1,054 ICBM's, most of them with multiple warheads.

The Reagan Administration's alarming outcries about U.S. vulnerabilities, its constant denigrations of our defense capabilities and exaggerations of Soviet power, do not reflect the overall military balance which exists, and are probably harming our security. As former Defense Secretary Harold Brown remarked, "We remain the military equal of or superior to the Soviet Union . . . and those who suggest the United States is weak and helpless not only are playing fast and loose with the truth, they are playing fast and loose with U.S. security."

Plunging ahead into this spending spree—Without having first formulated, or even articulated, an underlying defense or national security strategy that the defense build-up is supposed to implement, is not the way to go about strengthening our national security.

What is important is how we spend the money, and what we spend it for—not simply how much we spend.

There are some things we need to do: we need to concentrate on training, maintenance and readiness of existing forces rather than on the continued mindless procurement of more and more complicated and costly weapons systems—we would get dramatically more military effectiveness for a lesser amount of dollars.

What we don't need are such things as—

Three nuclear aircraft carrier groups (at a cost of $7 billion apiece).

Four old battleships being brought out of mothballs at a cost of $½ billion apiece—which would probably be sunk in the first 10 minutes of a war with Russia.

A revived B-1 bomber at a cost of $400 million apiece—although it will be obsolete 3 years later (the Defense Department admits that it will not be able to penetrate Soviet air-space by the end of this decade)—and although next year our B-52's will start to carry cruise missiles.

And a new strategic weapons race in the absense of SALT talks.

One last word on this subject: when we talk about military spending we would be wise to keep in mind a lesson we should have learned in recent years—that

More arms won't necessarily make us more secure.

Despite our great military strength, and our thousands of nuclear weapons, we were unable to prevent any of our recent major foreign policy set-backs:

Vietnam
Loss of Iran by our ally, the Shah
Quadrupling of oil prices by OPEC
Taking of our hostages in Iran
Death of our friend, Mr. Sadat

Nor could our Department of Defense by usefully used to prevent the Russian invasion of Afghanistan or the imposition of martial law in Poland.

These are things worth thinking about when we are asked to double our defense budget.

Our preoccupation with reacting to what Russia does, our tendancy to view the whole world with a Cold War perspective, often keeps us from doing things we ought to be doing in our own interest in other areas as well.

There are a number of initiatives we should be undertaking that would, I think, serve our interests:

We should concentrate on working to bring about settlements in difficult, dangerous and volatile regions of the world whose potential explosiveness may drag the U.S. and U.S.S.R unintentionally into confrontation (Middle East) or where continued internal unrest and civil war afford Russia or her surrogates opportunities to cause mischief and to drag the U.S. into unwarranted and unnecessary involvements (Central America—where we should be strongly supporting the efforts of other regional nations such as Mexico and Venezuela and Costa Rica to effect political solutions).

Rather than seeking a means to intervene in Central America as a way of demonstrating U.S. toughness toward Russia, it would be wiser to make real efforts to coordinate policy with the other powers of the region in order to try to deal with revolutionary change.

And, seeking an overall peace settlement in the Middle East between the Arab nations and Israel is the most productive diplomacy we can practice to counter possible Soviet expansion of influence in that important area.

We should seek normalization of relations and rapprochement with Vietnam, Angola, and Cuba.

If we are really worried because these countries appear to be in the Soviet column, why not try to woo them over to our side—or at least to a position of neutrality?

Both Angola and Vietnam are seeking closer relations with us; Cuba has done so in the past and would, I think, quickly do so again if we gave them the chance. Our embargo of Cuba has left is entirely dependent on the Soviet Union, and there is no way we can have any leverage on it in the absence of any economic and diplomatic ties.

And, while we're at it, an intelligent policy would include a real effort to improve our relations with India—the world's largest democracy and second largest country, and the biggest power in South Asia. Our shared democratic values and ideals make a closer relationship both sensible and desirable, and an added dividend would be our gaining a friend with great Third World influence.

We should again be a champion of human rights in all parts of the world—we should express as much outrage, for example, at the imprisonment of labor and political leaders in South and Central American countries as we have done, quite properly, over that of Lech Walesa in Poland. Ironically, and tragically, we are talking loudest and criticizing most harshly those countries where it does the least good, and we are keeping quiet about political imprisonment and torture by regimes we consider friendly—where we could have enormous influence in mitigating those inhuman practices.

A concern for human rights is, in the words of Jimmy Carter, "a natural and historic American trait and also a valuable tool for building our own spirit and meeting the totalitarian challenge among millions of people in other nations who hunger for liberty and justice. . . . The strongest weapons in the American arsenal are our ethical and moral values based upon the fair treatment of human beings here and abroad."

We should make better use of those weapons.

And always, we should keep in mind that our comparative advantage over the Soviets lies not in building weapons, but in the strength of our economy, our ability to use foreign aid as an arm of our diplomacy, and to maintain alliances with those who share our values.

We should concentrate on improving our economy and our ties with our allies.

Both are big subjects and can't be dealt with here—but both are crucial, and must be tended to.

Most important of all, our preoccupation with maintaining a posture of implacable hostility, distrust and confrontation keeps us from recognizing, and working to resolve, those interests and concerns we happen to share with the Soviet Union.

We must remain strong—but just as important, we must learn to be firm and consistent with the Soviets—so they come to accept us as reliable partners in detente and so they know what we expect of them and what we consider unacceptable behavior.

Soviet behavior depends, in the words of Alexander Dallin, "in large measure on how the U.S. and its friends behave, what they say, and how Moscow perceives and interprets their purposes and policies." Excessive volatility of American foreign policy tends to undermine the mutual credibility that is a necessary foundation of successful relations and negotiations.

One necessary part of a wise foreign policy is to start dealing daily and in depth with the Soviet Union on a whole series of differences between us. The better we become at talking out these differences, the less likely either of us is to make a dangerous mistake. We should pursue dialogue at all levels in order to clarify interests and sensitivities and to manage situations where U.S. and Soviet interests, influence and presence overlap.

This should include regular, periodic meetings between our two defense secretaries and between our Secretary of State and their foreign minister—and more frequent meetings between working groups from Defense and State—and it should include the establishment of a permanent, joint crisis-management group (such as has been proposed by Senator Sam Nunn) to serve as a mechanism to help prevent the mistaken or accidental use of nuclear weapons by either of the two superpowers, and to help prevent the retaliation by one of our countries or the other in the mistaken notion that one was at fault in the event of the use of a nuclear weapon by a terrorist organization or Third World country.

We should increase our cultural relations and economic ties with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries.

Trade and financial relationships serve as buffers and serve also as links between East and West in times of tension and crisis when practically everything else is divisive.

It is probable that Poland's huge debt of $27 billion has been a crucial factor in dissuading Moscow from direct military intervention. The Soviet Union would then either have had to help repay Poland's obligation or share the responsibility for a default, which would ruin its own credit as well as impose enormous new burdens just to keep Poland going.

Increased cultural exchanges with communist and Third World countries means more Fulbright scholarships and International Visitor Program appropriations, not less.

By turning away thousands of future leaders from all over the world, we deprive ourselves of a great national advantage—the attraction a free society, and particularly its academic institutions, holds for people from other countries. These programs have brought this country more influence and good will in the world than any comparable outlay of taxpayer money in the last twenty to thirty years.

We should be pursuing a strong nuclear non-proliferation policy. Unfortunately, this administration has largely abandoned our earlier efforts in this area and is concerned mainly with being a "reliable supplier" of nuclear fuels, technology and equipment.

The greatest risk of use of nuclear weapons is by countries other than the two superpowers—or by terrorist groups—and the Russians have long been more serious about this than we. We can and should be partners in pursuing policies to discourage the adding of fifteen or twenty additional countries to the nuclear club over the next few years.

Lastly, nuclear arms control is the most important issue in the world in terms of human survival—and a shared interest in avoiding an all-out nuclear war is the central element of U.S.-Soviet relations.

The United States should be doing something about starting to move again with the Russians with respect to strategic nuclear arms limitations—and not let it seem to the rest of the world, quite correctly, that the Russians seek limitations but we do not.

It is absolutely foolish of us—it was a profound error—for this Administration to allow the Soviets to appear to much of the world—and especially to the peoples of Western Europe, our most important allies—to be the champions of arms control while we had to be dragged to the conference table.

We should be proposing any number of initiatives to the Soviets:

Immediate equal reduction of nuclear weapons of all categories (as proposed by George Kennan); or

A mutual, verifiable freeze on all further testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, which would make possible the "negotiations leading to a definite, verifiable reduction in strategic nuclear weapons" that President Reagan has called for.

Or, we should get back to SALT II, with some changes, if necessary; or, if not, a SALT III that builds on it. The main elements of the SALT II Treaty were agreed to by previous conservative Republican Presidents and are overwhelmingly favorable to the U.S. in terms of our present and future security interests. We have never had a public explanation by this President or his Administration as to why this Treaty was being scrapped.

In any case, this Administration's decision to postpone SALT talks because of Soviet actions in the world is absolutely the wrong thing to do.

We need to do away with the concept of "linkage". An arms control treaty should only be negotiated on the basis of whether it's good for our security interests—it's not a favor to the Russians, and it should not be dependent upon their behavior in other areas.

In fact, the need for SALT limitations is probably greater when tensions arise because of the misbehavior of the Russians in some other field.

We expect them to misbehave—that's why we need treaties to regulate their behavior in such a vital area as nuclear arms. If they behaved well—and if we trusted them—we wouldn't need SALT agreements: we don't seek them with the British or the French!

If the U.S. continues to shun strategic arms negotiations, and builds up our nuclear forces as the Administration proposes, we commit ourselves to ten or fifteen years of an unnecessary, dangerous, and highly inflationary nuclear arms race in which the Soviets will certainly keep pace with us. And we will be no more secure at the end of it.

Our attempts to achieve strategic superiority are completely meaningless. Any nuclear arms build-up by us will be matched—as it always has been—by the Soviet Union, and will result in thousands of additional Soviet nuclear warheads that will be targeted on the United States.

With almost ten thousand intercontinental nuclear weapons, the United States is not in any way inferior to the Soviet Union or subject to Soviet coercion; what we have is nuclear parity—a stalemate which neither side can break without committing suicide.

Under these circumstances, the only rational policy is to take the initiative in proposing arms control agreements. Any further nuclear arms build-up is insane.

One final word. I want us—I think it's important for us—to feel good about ourselves again—about what we are doing here at home, and around the world—and what we stand for in our own eyes and in the eyes of others.

We've got to stand for something.

We no longer are perceived by others or by ourselves, for that matter, as a nation that stands up against oppression, tyranny and human cruelty wherever they may be found.

We do not appear to the rest of the world, even to our own allies, to be a peace-loving or at least a peace-seeking people.

We are fast forfeiting any kind of moral leadership we once had.

By playing down the importance of arms control and nuclear non-proliferation, ignoring under-developed countries and backing off from human rights stands, we jeopardize the future support not only of our allies throughout the world but, more importantly, our own people. When we do these things, we surrender the most powerful weapon of the West—the arsenal of principles.

We must start acting again like a great and a free people.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

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

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

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

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 5

8:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee
To resume open and closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the sea-based deterrent program.
224 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Tactical Warfare Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the Army's M-1 main battle tank.
235 Russell Building

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
To continue hearings to review current economic conditions
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee
Closed briefing by officials of the Department of State on the status of POW's and MIA's.
S-116, Capitol

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for the month of February.
Room to be announced

10:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Investigations and General Oversight Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Cancer Institute and the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for human development services of the Department of Health and Human Services.
1318 Dirksen Building

Armed Services
Preparedness Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy/Marine Corps operational readiness.
224 Russell Building

Armed Services
Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee
Closed intelligence briefing on naval warfare threat with regard to proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense.
Russell Building

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee
To resume open and closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on air-breathing deterrent program.
212 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 3663, proposed Bus Regulatory Reform Act of 1981, and on the deregulation of the intercity bus industry.
235 Russell Building

*Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1858, declaring that the United States holds in trust certain lands in Nevada for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, and providing for the transfer of certain other lands in Nevada to the U.S. Forest Service, H.R. 4364, declaring that the United States holds in trust certain land in Pima County, Ariz., for the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona; and to hold oversight hearings on the Department of Education's impact aid program for Indians.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Budget
To resume hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

Finance
To hold hearings to further discuss budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for those programs which fall within its legislative jurisdiction.
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the current situation in Afghanistan.
4221 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Armed Services
Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee
Open and closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy programs.
212 Russell Building

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review the capacity, distribution and status of the strategic petroleum reserve.
3110 Dirksen Building

MARCH 9

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the defense budget with regard to proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense.
1223 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Economic Regulatory Administration and the Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and the National Agricultural Library, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation unifying and clarifying the product liability tort law.
235 Russell Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
6226 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the public and private sector role in U.S. energy research and development.
3302 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider S. 1785, increasing the penalties for violations of the Taft-Hartley Act, requiring immediate removal of certain individuals convicted of crimes relating to his official position, broadening the definition of the types of positions an individual is barred from upon conviction, increasing the time of disbarment from 5 to 10 years, escrowing a convicted official's salary for the duration of this appeal, and clarifying the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor relating to detection and investigating criminal violations relating to ERISA.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Secretary of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building
Finance
To continue hearings to further discuss budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for those programs which fall within its legislative jurisdiction, focusing on the Department of Health and Human Services.
2221 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider pending nominations and other committee business.
4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee
To continue open and closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the CINC, Southwest Asia/Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force.
212 Russell Building

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2109, authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
324 Russell Building
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Bureau of Prisons.
S-146, Capitol
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine certain financial institution practices restricting individuals from withdrawing funds represented by checks deposited to their accounts.
5302 Dirksen Building
Judiciary
To hold hearings on the proposed divestiture of American Telephone & Telegraph, focusing on its effect on local rates.
2228 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to resume consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4232 Dirksen Building
Special on Aging
To hold hearings on problems associated with the medicare reimbursement system for hospitals.
Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review foreign assistance programs with regard to proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of State.
1318 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Social Security Administration and refugee programs, Department of Health and Human Services.
1224 Dirksen Building
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4200 Dirksen Building
Finance
To continue hearings to further discuss budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for those programs which fall within its legislative jurisdiction, focusing on certain spending reductions.
2221 Dirksen Building

1:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Health Resources Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Farm Credit Administration.
1318 Dirksen Building
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 11

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to review the President's proposals on new federalism.
3302 Dirksen Building

Office of Technology Assessment
The Board, to hold a general business meeting.
S-205, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2109, authorizing funds for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
324 Russell Building

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Economic Research Service, Statistical Reporting Service, World Agricultural Outlook Board, Office of the Secretary, departmental administration, Office of Governmental and Public Affairs, and the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Earthquake Hazard Reduction Act (Public Law 95-124).
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).
4232 Dirksen Building

Small Business
To hold hearings on the Small Business Administration's surety bond guarantee loan program.
424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review foreign assistance programs and operating expenses with regard to proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Agency for International Development.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Panama Canal Commission, Research and Special Programs Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.
1223 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue hearings to further discuss budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for those programs which fall within its legislative jurisdiction, focusing on certain spending reductions.
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To resume hearings on the President's January 28, 1982, certification concerning military aid to El Salvador.
4221 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on H.R. 3731, extending the period of time, in which the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and submit to Congress a plan for the use and distribution of Indian judgment funds, within 1 year after appropriation; to be followed by a business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
424 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 12

8:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2133, providing for the redevelopment of the Mount St. Helens national volcanic area in Washington.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Agency Administration Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on S. 1483, making the U.S. Government liable for damages to residents and participants arising from the fallout from certain atmospheric tests, establishing an advisory panel to study the adverse health effects, and transferring from the Department of Energy all functions relating to research regarding the health effects of radiation on human beings to the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Agency Administration on S. 1483, making the U.S. Government liable for damages to residents and participants arising from the fallout from certain atmospheric tests, establishing an advisory panel to study the adverse health effects, and transferring from the Department of Energy all functions relating to research regarding the health effects of radiation on human beings to the Department of Health and Human Services.
4332 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Special Trade Representative, Legal Services Corporation, and the Civil Rights Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation unifying and clarifying the product liability tort law.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine export lending activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation, focusing on overdue payments to the U.S. Government and private banks by Poland and other Soviet bloc nations.
324 Russell Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the office of Inspector General and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the Department of Transportation, and the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.
1318 Dirksen Building

Budget
To continue hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1983 setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues and new budget authority.
6202 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue hearings to further discuss budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for those programs which fall within its legislative jurisdiction, focusing on certain spending reductions.
2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of Frederic V. Malek, of Virginia, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service.
3302 Dirksen Building

MARCH 15

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the railroad financial assistance program, Department of Transportation.
235 Russell Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the National Transportation Safety Board.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for elementary and secondary education and education block grant programs, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 16

9:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
Arms Control, Oceans and International Operations, and Environment Subcommittee
Open and closed hearings on United States and Soviet civil defense programs.
4221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.
2175 Rayburn Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Commerce, focusing on the Office of the Secretary, general administration, and the Economic Development Administration.
S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
6226 Dirksen Building

*Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1929, proposed Comprehensive Smoking Prevention Education Act of 1981.
4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the extended family.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Office of Revenue Sharing (New York City loan program).
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for impact aid, vocational and adult education, libraries and learning resources programs, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
To hold hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.
2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to review the President's proposals on new federalism.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1894, permitting Indian tribes to enter certain agreements for the disposition of tribal mineral resources.
357 Dirksen Building

11:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nominations of James L. George, of Maryland, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Multilateral Affairs, Robert T. Grey, Jr., of Virginia, to be Deputy Director, and Norman Terrell, of California, to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Nuclear Weapons Control, all of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research programs, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 17

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
1224 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.
2175 Rayburn Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, International Trade Administration, and the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration.
S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1748, exempting certain employers from withdrawal and plan termination insurance provisions of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for student financial assistance, student loan insurance, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loan and insurance, college housing loans, educational research and training activities overseas, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.
2221 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

*Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on the Department of the Interior's proposal for the use and distribution of Wichita and Caddo

Indian judgment funds awarded by the U.S. Court of Claims.
6226 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for foreign assistance, focusing on the Caribbean basin initiative.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Education, fund for the improvement of post-secondary education (FIPSE), and education statistics, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 18

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for conservation programs of the Department of Energy.
1224 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on Senate Resolution 231, providing for an inventory of U.S. assets, to estimate their market value, identify which are unneeded and can be sold, and recommend legislative and administrative actions to streamline the liquidation process.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 2036, H.R. 5320, and H.R. 5461, bills providing for State and local employment and training assistance programs, and on other related measures.
4232 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Office of Transportation, Agricultural Cooperative Service, and the Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Patent and Trademark Office, Scientific and Technical Research Service, and the Minority Business Development Administration.
S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Trade Commission, and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.
235 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings, in closed session, on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
6226 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Agency Administration Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1775, making the Federal Government liable for constitutional torts and generally the exclusive defendant in all tort suits involving Government employees acting within the scope of their employment.
5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for special institutions, Howard University, departmental management (salaries and expenses), and the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building

Finance
To continue hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.
2221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to review the President's proposals on new federalism.
3302 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Trade Commission, and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Finance
To continue hearings to review the administration's tax proposals for fiscal year 1983.
2221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Budget Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

MARCH 22

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce.
235 Russell Building

MARCH 23

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, and the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Human Nutrition Information Service, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of the Census, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and the Economic and Statistical Analysis.
S-146, Capitol

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the statute of limitations relating to Indian affairs.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Veterans' Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Helsinki Commission, Board for International Broadcasting, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the International Communication Agency.
S-146, Capitol
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Internal Revenue Service's taxpayer assistance programs.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.
1318 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to review the President's proposals on New Federalism.
3302 Dirksen Building

MARCH 25

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Indian Education, Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and the Office of Rural Development Policy, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain international organizations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Chrysler Loan Board.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1932 and H.R. 2098, bills establishing an Office of Inspector General in each of the Departments of Defense, Justice, and Treasury and in the Agency for International Development, and on other related measures.
3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Secretary of Agriculture, to review the general agricultural outlook, and to review the overall budget for the Department of Agriculture.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 26

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Vice Adm. James S. Gracey, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and Rear Adm. Benedict L. Stabile, U.S. Coast Guard, to be the Vice Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard; to be followed by hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the U.S. Coast Guard.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the role of the Federal Government in the operation of U.S. payment systems.
5302 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 29

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the Civil Aeronautics Board.
1318 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review proposed authorizations for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 30

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review budget proposals for fiscal year 1983 for energy conservation programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on State grant, research, and development, and solar energy programs.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, food-for-peace program (Public Law 480), Office of International Cooperation and Development, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Federal Grain Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building
*Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on title X of the Public Health Service Act relating to health aspects of teenage sexual activity.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the U.S. Coast Guard of the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume markup of proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act (Public Law 95-95).
4200 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.
318 Russell Building

MARCH 31

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for strategic petroleum reserve and naval petroleum reserves of the Department of Energy.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.
235 Russell Building
Judiciary
Agency Administration Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1775, making the Federal Government liable for constitutional torts and generally the exclusive defendant in all tort suits involving Government employees acting within the scope of their employment.
5110 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for certain health programs of

the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environmental and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To continue hearings to review proposed authorizations for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the substance of S. 1724, proposed Federal Employees' Compensation Act Antifraud Amendments of 1981.
3302 Dirksen Building

APRIL 1

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to review budget proposals for the Department of Agriculture's Inspector General, and agricultural aspects of the General Accounting Office.
1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on expanding employment opportunities for older workers in the private sector.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Selective Service System.
1227 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the United States Railway Association, and Conrail.
S-128, Capitol

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of indirect costs and contract provisions of the Indian Self-determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93-638).
6226 Dirksen Building

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the railroad safety program, Department of Transportation.
235 Russell Building

APRIL 14

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Supreme Court, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Maritime Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 15

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the land and water conservation fund, and to receive testimony from congressional witnesses.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Judiciary, International Trade Commission, and the Marine Mammal Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for the National Science Foundation.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD—Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the Council of Environmental Quality.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the tribally controlled community college program.
6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on productivity in the American economy.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 20

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain functions of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of State, focusing on the Office of the Secretary and administration of foreign affairs.
S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for health programs and the National Science Foundation.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for foreign assistance activities of the Department of the Treasury.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 21

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Small Business Administration, Federal Communications Commission, and the Maritime Administration.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the Federal Railroad Administration of the Department of Transportation, and Amtrak.
1318 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1889, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the establishment of a national institution to promote international peace and resolution of international conflict.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 22

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain functions of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain related programs.
S-146, Capitol

*Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on promoting volunteerism in America.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Labor-Management Services Administration, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the Employment Standards Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration of the Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, (OSHA), and the Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for Bureau of Labor Statistics, departmental management services, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Department of Labor.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 26

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for the Federal Aviation Administration of the Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 27

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, and the National Endowment for the Arts.
1318 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Science Foundation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 28

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from congressional and public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for certain transportation programs.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for fossil research and development and fossil construction programs of the Department of Energy.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on community social support systems.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from congressional and public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, on certain transportation programs.
1224 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings to receive Amvets legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.
Room to be announced

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on programs of the Departments of Labor,

Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from congressional and public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 and proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, for certain transportation programs.
1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 3

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 4

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Smithsonian Institution, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD—Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 6

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and the National Capital Planning Commission.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to receive testimony from congressional witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 11

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, Institute of Museum Services, and the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Building Sciences, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and National Credit Union Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 13

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 18

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1224 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of Indian education programs.
6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of Indian education programs.
6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 24

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain program under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To receive testimony from public witnesses on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1224 Dirksen Building

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for the appointment of special magistrates to serve each Indian reservation over which the United States exercises criminal jurisdiction under existing law.
6226 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 21

10:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive American Legion legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1983.
318 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 4

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983 which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Inspector General, Agency for International Development.
S-146, Capitol

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to review the report of the Commission on Fiscal Accountability of the Department of the Interior on national energy resources.
6226 Dirksen Building