

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NUCLEAR ARMS WEEK

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of the nuclear bomb, thoughtful people everywhere came to realize the dire consequences of a nuclear arms race.

Since that time, an army of concerned Americans has been enlisted sharing that same concern about nuclear annihilation. Hundreds of thousands of mainstream Americans this week are raising their voice across this land in protest to the nuclear arms race.

Two nations, the United States and the Soviet Union, possessing nuclear weapons in numbers great enough to reduce the globe to a ball of cinder and ash, now bear the final responsibility for this peril.

No graver issue confronts mankind today than the threat of nuclear war.

This threat, moreover, is compounded by a certain strain of contemporary strategic thinking that posits it may be possible to fight and win such a war.

Such thinking is dangerous, Mr. Speaker. Nuclear war would result in death, injury, and disease on a scale unprecedented in the history of civilization. There is no effective medical response, no effective civil defense. Nor is there a chance for recovery. There are no winners in a nuclear war.

Nor is there anything so important in life to compel us to push the button that would end all life as we know it.

We must find a way to reduce nuclear weapons on both sides.

I am confident that we can.

All across the country, religious leaders, college students, lawyers, business executives, local legislators, to name a few, are organizing to demand a halt to the nuclear arms race.

President Eisenhower once said:

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

There is a sense of immediacy that has not been felt before. And there is a very human cry that is being expressed for the first time: Individuals demanding the right to be allowed some control over their destinies.

And it is an eloquent cry.

Let me share with you one such voice, Ms. Jeane Knox Gibb, whose article I place in the RECORD along with my remarks.

Jeane Gibb is a retired social worker and cochairwoman of Cape Anne Action for Nuclear Disarmament.

She forcefully argues that the freeze offers us a way to halt the nuclear arms race, to reduce the chance of disaster and to proceed with negotiations to preserve our gift of life on Earth. She seeks to "make this a safer world to grow up in."

Our defense planners should share the same sentiment.

I am deeply grateful to Jeane Gibb, and the hundreds of thousands of other Americans who stepped forward to protest the accelerating nuclear arms race. And we all should be.

STOP, BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE!

(By Jean Knox Gibb)

In the main entrance of the Nebraska State Capitol a magnificent bas-relief depicts a prairie family walking West beside their ox-drawn covered wagon. Beneath it is carved in stone, "The Salvation of the State Is Watchfulness in the Citizen."

I used to think my Nebraska grandchildren were safe because they live in a small town near Lincoln, away from nuclear-targeted population centers. Then I learned about the shift in military policy from Mutual Assured Destruction to "flexible targeting," which puts at risk the very missiles in the mid-West that are supposed to defend us across the North Pole. Gradually I came to realize that the risk is much greater than can be calculated in terms of target areas. The change in nuclear doctrine means that the old ideas of "preventive war," which we thought we had rejected as immoral, are still around. The unthinkable has become do-able.

To illustrate: Peace, or at least order, based on the threat of massive retaliation sounds like this exchange between small boys on a playground:

"If you hit me I'll hit you back."

"If you pick up a stick I will pick up a stick."

"If you come at me with your stick I will hit it with my stick."

Deterrence is undermined and the likelihood of a real fight escalates with selective targeting: "If I even think you are going to hit me or my stick, I will hit you or your stick first." At this level of weaponry one boy may win and one may lose.

MAD, or Mutual Assured Destruction, sounds like this: "Our weapons have become so terrible that if either of us strikes first we will both die." This doctrine, which may or may not be what has prevented World War III so far, has now been undermined by "flexible targeting" or the capability of both sides to destroy each other's missiles in their silos. So now offense can be justified as defense, and the threat of a first strike has become a weapon of diplomacy. At the same time, nuclear weaponry has developed a diabolical momentum of its own beyond any human being's conscious intent. This

situation can only lead to all sides losing everything.

Trying to be a watchful citizen and study all sides of the issue, I have been browsing in the Magazine of the Air Force Association and the writings of military experts such as Bellanson and Cohen ("A New Nuclear Strategy," N.Y. Times Magazine, Jan. 24, 1982). It is hard going at first, but once I get over my initial revulsion—a gut reaction that seems to be triggered by macho language—military literature begins to make a lot of sense. I grasp the difference between "counterforce," (against military targets) and "countervalue" (against cities). I learn that 20 million civilian deaths are "unacceptable," and that "fratricide" means that tendency of bombs in a multiple warhead to bump into each other if detonated before launch. With a few hours of this I learn a lot, but something is missing. I am not feeling anything; I am numb. Though brief, the experience takes me back to another time of numbness—the burnout of working in a state hospital. There the staff called it "affective neutrality" in themselves "blunted affect" in the patients.

I have found it healthier to focus on more positive developments. I find encouragement in the words of people who have had a change of mind and heart, who have turned away from death to life-related work. It must be very difficult for a person to confront the possibility that his own life work may be instrumental in the destruction of everything he has lived for. Some brave men have done it. At the end of a long and brilliant career as general and commander-in-chief, Dwight Eisenhower warned of the self-perpetuating power of the military-industrial complex. Shortly before he died, Albert Einstein expressed regret that he had ever written that letter to President Roosevelt, suggesting the A-bomb. Admiral Gene LaRoque spoke almost apologetically of his background as a military man as he addressed 2,000 people at the benefit concert of Musicians Against Nuclear Arms in Symphony Hall. An organization of High Technology Professionals is helping disenfranchised members to relocate from defense industries.

But what can the rest of us do, as watchful citizens? We have already done a lot by participating in the grassroots movement for a mutual Freeze that is sprouting everywhere this spring in the form of petitions and Town Meeting and City Council resolutions. It has come to a head right now in the bi-partisan Kennedy-Conte Resolution before both houses of Congress, calling for a "mutual and verifiable freeze on the production, testing and further deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles and delivery systems."

There is much more to be done. We can support our Congressman, Nick Mavroules, an influential member of the House Armed Service Committee, who has staked his career on his new belief that "any use of nuclear weapons would spell disaster for civilization on this planet." He endorsed the Mutual Freeze in December, even before receiving the petition from over 10,000 citizens of the 6th District. Recently he shared the podium with Dr. Helen Caldicott at a

huge church gathering in Ipswich, discussing "You, Your Family and the Nuclear Arms Race." Now, God bless him, he is taking the initiative in the Massachusetts Congressional delegation for carrying the Mutual Freeze petition to Washington. Even as I write this, comes the news that he has written to President Reagan urging him to meet with President Brezhnev to discuss a Mutual Freeze.

As watchful citizens we can learn about civil defense, study all aspects, and make up our own minds what we will personally do in case of a nuclear alert. We can each write a letter, call a friend, do at least one thing every day to join in the tremendous groundswell of public opinion the world over that is crying out to our leaders, "Stop, before it is too late!"

SENIORS SPEAK OUT AGAINST CLEAN AIR BILL

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, amidst the struggle to preserve the Clean Air Act from crippling amendments a new voice has emerged—that of senior citizens.

Senior citizens have a big stake in the outcome of the Energy and Commerce Committee's markup of H.R. 5252—and they know it. We hear so much in Washington today about the bottom line. The human bottom line for the elderly under H.R. 5252, is that their health is being traded to Detroit for a paltry sum.

Consider the facts. It has long been acknowledged that dirty air conditions cause adverse health affects. Among those effects are serious impairment of central nervous system functions, dangerous blood carbon monoxide levels, severe eye and respiratory irritation, and, in extreme pollution conditions, even increased hospitalizations and death.

What is not so well known, however, is the extreme nature of the adverse health affects on the elderly at pollution levels well below the national standards.

A recent State of Illinois study, indicates the elderly run an increased risk of aggravating lung and heart conditions, as well as asthma, at particulate matter and sulphur dioxide levels less than half of that permitted under the current Clean Air Act.

And a study just completed by the American Lung Association shows that in 66 countries of Ohio alone, there are more than 1 million people 65 years of age or older whose health is threatened because they live in areas where pollution levels exceed national standards.

And that is just in Ohio. All told, there are some 154 million people living in 620 U.S. counties who must breathe dirty air because their county

does not meet health standards. And that is under the current Clean Air Act. One can imagine how much worse it would be if the act was weakened.

Because of my concern for those whose health is endangered, I recently held a press briefing with representatives from the American Lung Association and a number of senior citizen's groups. I would like to share with my colleagues portions of their statements:

NATIONAL RETIRED TEACHERS ASSOCIATION— AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS

Wise people and anyone who suffers from a chronic illness, will tell you that good health is the most important asset for a happy and full life . . . An aroused and concerned nation insisted on tough clean air legislation in 1970 and the public support for it remains strong in 1982.

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1982 supported by . . . Chairman Waxman and others improve the 1970 legislation by streamlining procedures, extending deadlines and addressing the controversial questions of toxic air pollutants and acid rain.

The Associations believe that these amendments offer the best opportunity for clearer air, better health and a better quality of life."

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING, INC.

Since its founding in 1950, the National Council on the Aging (NCOA) has been concerned about protecting the health of our older Americans. We believe that, in 1982, a major aspect of protecting the health of our elderly is protecting and improving the quality of the air they breathe. That means supporting the tougher standards called for in HR 5555 . . .

Whether it's sulfur oxides or particulates or ozone or carbon monoxide, or some combination, it is clear that persons over 65 are more susceptible to different health decrements from air pollution than their children are.

[T]his is a matter that cuts across age groups. Clean air is a heritage that older Americans want to leave their children and grandchildren, one they cannot purchase no matter how high their income, one that the House of Representatives and its Energy and Commerce Committee should preserve by passing the provisions of HR 5555".

NATIONAL CAUCUS AND CENTER ON BLACK AGED, INC.

The National Caucus and Center on Black Aged (NCBA), is very concerned about issues and problems which impact on the elderly—particularly on the Black elderly. The Clean Air Act is one of these.

The majority of Black elderly who reside in urban areas live in and around heavily industrialized portions of the city where . . . the air is more often than not polluted.

Consequently, in addition to their health problems such as arthritis, hypertension, cardiovascular conditions and cardiopulmonary diseases, they are often forced to further curtail their day to day activities, such as shopping and/or visits to the doctor and friends, finding that they must remain inside because they cannot breathe the air in the streets which surround them.

[T]he Black elderly . . . are exposed to an additional health hazard which, in this day of modern technology, can and should be controlled.

The NCBA therefore supports . . . efforts to maintain a healthful and clean environ-

ment—not only for the elderly, but for all of us".

THE GRAY PANTHERS

The Gray Panthers, a national organization of over 40,000 people with local networks in over 100 localities across the United States, support the efforts . . . to maintain standards of air quality control".

THE AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION

It is on the basis of our knowledge of the adverse health effects of air pollution that the ALA places high priority on the reauthorization of a strong Clean Air Act.

Elderly people, over 65 years of age, have more chronic respiratory disease than other segments of the population. In addition, effectiveness of the body's immune system decreases with age, thereby increasing susceptibility to respiratory infections and adverse effects from air pollution.

The Subcommittee on Health and Environment . . . has developed a bill which will significantly weaken the Clean Air Act and have an adverse impact on the programs to provide clean and healthful air for all Americans. The American Lung Association cannot support such action.

The subcommittee action to retain the health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards is a meaningless gesture to the health community upon review of key amendments adopted by a 12-member majority.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ATLANTA BRAVES

HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pride and pleasure that I rise to commend the Atlanta Braves baseball team for its record-breaking performance at the beginning of the 1982 season. With their 12th consecutive win, against the Cincinnati Reds on Tuesday night, the Braves broke the post-1900 major league record set last year by the Oakland A's for victories at the start of the baseball season.

The combination of pitching, defense, and timely hitting that the Braves have displayed throughout spring training and the opening of the regular season are a tribute to Manager Joe Torre, his coaching staff, and his players. I have had the privilege of getting to know this fine group of athletes and I am delighted with the national recognition they are justly receiving.

All of us in Atlanta are looking forward to a most successful season for our Braves and I hope that many of my colleagues will plan to join me in Atlanta during October for the world series.●

**LAURENT AND THE LATE
ROGER LAFERRIERE, RHODE
ISLAND SMALL BUSINESS PER-
SONS OF 1982**

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Small Business Administration selects an outstanding example of small business enterprise in each State. It is an honor to be chosen to represent the many small business owners and operators who play such a vital role in maintaining the health and productivity of our economy. These award recipients are representative of the finest traditions of American energy, efficiency, and productivity. We are glad to honor them during National Small Business Week.

This year the representatives from my State so honored are Laurent and the late Roger Laferriere of Woonsocket, who developed the Red Top Dyeing Corp. into a thriving family enterprise now employing 56 people. As a consequence, the Providence District Office of the Small Business Administration is nominating them as the Small Business Persons for 1982.

Laurent and Roger Laferriere were born in Woonsocket, R.I., a city which at one time was a major textile center of the United States. They were brought up in this field, specifically in the dyeing business. Red Top Dyeing Corp. was a family business operated by the father until his death in 1968. Larry and Roger continued operations for 3 years to pay the creditors of that business. Early in 1971, Larry developed a process for the dyeing of hand knit yarns, in multi colors. The equipment was assembled with spare parts from many types of machinery and hours of hand work. Thus, Sevico, Inc., came into existence. The name is a compilation from the dyeing process known as SEveral VIGoreau COlors. Production at the start was only in the dyeing process of skeins of yarn supplied by the customers. With completion of the dyeing, the yarn was returned and had to be rewound on to cones for a further procedure, known as backwinding by the customer.

In November 1971, the decision was made to expand the operations into the winding process. They proceeded to acquire the machinery needed to add the new procedure. With personal funds of \$1,500 and a bank loan of \$2,500 the conversion began.

Ten machines were purchased from a bank—eight of which were operational and two for spare parts—one 60-spindle backwinder—in pieces which were assembled in a "Rube Goldberg" manner—and other ancillary equipment from a closed-bid sale

of the Internal Revenue Service. When in place, this allowed the firm to dye the yarn and rewind from reel skeins to cones to pull skeins. Full production started in December 1971 with four employees in 5,000 square feet of space. It did not take long for the new phase of operations to grow which required larger quarters and more equipment and the dyeing process was phased out. In July 1972, the Woonsocket Institution Trust Co., with an SBA guaranty, granted a loan of \$62,000 to the firm.

This allowed for the purchase of eight automatic pull skein machines and two backwinding machines. Larger quarters were located and the firm was moved over one weekend. Production capacity increased to allow the processing of 20,000 pounds of yarn weekly but actual production over the year averaged to 10,000 pounds per week. Income for that fiscal year amounted to \$174,000 and increased to \$397,000 in fiscal year ending March 1976.

In August 1976, a new loan by the bank and SBA was granted in the amount of \$90,000. This allowed for the pay out of the balance of the first loan and acquisition of two 6-spindle and two 10-spindle automatic pull skein machines which increased the production capacity considerably. Unfortunately, one of the major customers of the firm, Grants, Inc., filed bankruptcy and income dropped for the fiscal year to \$228,000. To assist in the recovery of income loss, the firm acquired two backwinders to process machine knit yarns and solicited any and all work available. Neither brother was able to take a salary during the summer of 1977 which historically had been a slow period in this field. Sales gradually increased during this period to an amount of \$288,000 in fiscal year 1978. In 1979, another loan of \$40,000 was granted by the bank, with SBA guaranty, to purchase an automatic labeler and an additional automatic pull skein machine. With this equipment, the production capacity improved again. Sales volume for fiscal year 1980 increased to \$391,000. Early in 1981, the machine knit machines were sold and the income allowed for the purchase of an additional automatic machine. Also, in 1981, the bank, on its own, loaned the firm \$42,000 to purchase a second automatic labeler, an automatic bagging machine and installed a second bulking oven to supplement the original oven installed in 1971.

The present operations now occupy 44,000 square feet of floor space on two floors and have a production capacity of 90,000 pounds per week as opposed to the 20,000 pounds per week in 1971. Present weekly capacity is the equivalent of over 5,600 hand-knitted sweaters. The number of employees has increased to 56 people from the

original number of 4 in 1971. Among that present number, 45 are women which includes both handicapped and minority individuals. Two of the minority persons are Laotians who cannot converse in English. The brothers and a number of the employees are of French origin and are able to converse with the Laotians in that language.

This firm has grown steadily since its inception in 1971 through the hard work and dedication of these two brothers. Based on the activity for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1982 and income of \$403,000 in this period, the prospect for the full fiscal year of 1982 would indicate probable income of just under \$1 million. The abilities of these two brothers have dovetailed well in the management of the business. Larry is the production person who has, since the start, devised and improvised in adapting of the equipment to secure the highest possible production capacity. Roger, who unfortunately passed away in August 1981 at his desk, was the office person and responsible for the financial activities of the business. His knowledge and penchant for detail are best shown in the internal financial data included in this nomination. He was seldom far off in the pro forma projections and the actual activities of any given year.

The Providence district office is proud to nominate Laurent and the late Roger Laferriere as the small business persons for 1982. The history of the firm under their direction is a perfect example of the concept upon which the United States has been built. The dream syndrome that anyone with the desire and dedication can be a small business person. The awarding of this honor to Laurent and Roger Laferriere is a small way of saying: "A job well done."●

A TRIBUTE TO BOB LOGAN

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, recently a testimonial dinner was held in the Buffalo, N.Y., area for Robert Logan, who was stepping down after 30 years as executive vice president of the Construction Industry Employers Association, which represents more than 200 contractors in western New York.

Having worked on many public improvements and community issues over many years with Bob, I know the tributes he was accorded at that dinner were richly deserved.

The spirit of that evening and the depth, breadth and quality of Bob Logan's contribution to his industry and our community at large were cap-

tured crisply yet thoroughly in the "Labor Comment" column in the Buffalo Evening News on April 10, 1982.

Written by the News' highly regarded labor writer, Ed Kelly, the article, which follows, is a nice tribute to a sterling citizen:

LOGAN BUILT REPUTATION FOR SERVICE

Many an industry and union leader recently had a lot of nice things to say about Bob Logan. He deserved them.

Logan, who's 66, was stepping down after 30 years as executive vice president of the Construction Industry Employers Association, an organization of more than 200 contractors.

The association negotiates and oversees the implementation of labor contracts with area unions of bricklayers, carpenters, cement masons, ironworkers, laborers, operating engineers and truck drivers.

The occasion for the kudos for Logan, who'll stay on as a consultant for the Contractors' organization, was a testimonial dinner at the Marriott Inn.

Contractors from all over the state noted the contributions he made in his three decades of service to the industry.

Especially indicative of the high esteem in which Logan is held were warm words from representatives of labor organizations who sat across from him, as adversaries, at collective bargaining time.

Bricklayers' business agent Joe McGovern, speaking for the Building Trades Council of Buffalo and Vicinity (AFL-CIO), lauded Logan's ability and fairness. So did Buddy Bodewes, chief of area carpenters.

A former marine combat engineer who saw action in the Pacific in World War II and in the Korean War, Logan served the local construction industry during some of its most difficult and tumultuous years. His record in its behalf is remarkable.

The Bennett High and Penn State graduate figured prominently in the industry's involvement in affirmative action. The experience began here in the 1960, with an early justice training program for minorities with some skills. It exploded in 1969 when Gov. Rockefeller suspended construction of the new State University of Buffalo Amherst Campus when students objected to minority-hiring practices on the project.

Logan was in on many of the subsequent negotiations that led to creating the Buffalo Affirmative Action Program for the construction industry and lifting the UB building moratorium 11 months after it was imposed.

During the years that followed, he played large roles in helping to keep the program viable and guiding it through periods of change.

Logan's foresight aided the Construction Industry Employers Association in reaching historic early contract agreements in 1980. It was the first time the contractors and unions worked out accords 8 months before their then-current pacts expired. The achievement guaranteed industry stability into 1984.

Though busy for his employers, Logan found time for service to his community.

When the state's Taylor Law went on the books in 1967, confronting nervous local governments with the necessity of bargaining for the first time with unions of their employees, Logan volunteered his negotiating expertise to the Town of Tonawanda.

To help it over the trauma of the initial round of bargaining, he represented the town board in contract talks with its blue-collar union and police union.

Logan, who lives in the village, has been chairman of the Kenmore Housing Authority since its establishment 10 years ago. The 100-unit Kenmore Village Apartments for the elderly, at Colvin and Kenmore avenues, was built during his tenure.

Knowledgeable, accessible, co-operative, forthright, he has been successful at projecting to the public the positions and aspirations of his industry.

Throughout his 30 years, in good times and bad, in tense circumstances or calm, Logan has been a true professional.

The construction industry, the labor-management community, and the community at large, are fortunate to have him. ●

OPPOSITION TO LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FUNDING CUTS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for the RECORD a letter from the New York State Bar Association concerning the funding for Legal Services Corporation (LSC). The proposed zero funding for LSC in 1983 represents a major step backward in the society's fulfillment of one of the most basic goals of democracy; equal justice.

Without the LSC the poor of this society will be denied adequate legal representation, and effectively denied even minimal access to our Nation's courts.

The letter from the New York State Bar reads as follows:

HON. ROBERT GARCIA,
Bronx, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARCIA: We have recently learned of the Administration's proposal of zero funding for Legal Services Corporation (LSC) in the fiscal year 1983 and its additional recommendation that funding for LSC be terminated when the current Continuing Resolution runs out of March 31. The New York State Bar Association continues wholeheartedly to support adequate funding for LSC. We have had the opportunity to become more familiar with the work of legal services programs within New York State during the past year. The value of these programs is enormous not only because they insure access to our system of justice which would otherwise not be provided but also because the services are rendered in a high-quality, cost-effective fashion.

I am pleased to report to you that the New York State Bar Association and local Bar Associations throughout New York are working diligently to expand the role of the private bar in providing legal services to low income people. New programs are being established and existing programs are being augmented. Although the private bar is co-operating to a great extent to help fill the void created by the 25% reduction in funding this year, even that void cannot nearly be filled by the involvement of the private bar. There simply are far too many poor people in need of legal services in New York (100,000 low income people were served by

legal services programs in 1981, many with specialized problems) and the private bar can only undertake to represent a small percentage of these people.

The New York State Bar Association will continue its efforts to help insure equal access to our system of justice for poor people; however, we believe that adequate funding from the Legal Services Corporation is essential if meaningful access is to be maintained.

I urge you strongly to resist any attempt to eliminate or reduce funding for the Legal Services Corporation either this year or next year.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

DAVID S. WILLIAMS,

President,

New York State Bar Association. ●

CARIBBEAN INITIATIVES AND CARIBBEAN NEEDS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a pair of recent articles in the New York Times, in which former Ambassador Sally Shelton has drawn on her considerable expertise in Caribbean affairs to put forward some important considerations regarding that area, which is of such crucial importance to the United States. She is a former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and was U.S. Ambassador to five eastern Caribbean countries and Special Representative to five more. She is now a fellow at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University.

While supporting the administration's Caribbean Basin initiative as innovative and long overdue, Ambassador Shelton makes the very valid point that the principal problems of the region are "the severe poverty and double-digit unemployment plaguing nearly every island." She correctly stresses the need for us to pay attention to the West Indians own perception of their problems.

Ambassador Shelton also reminds us that the problems of Central America and of the Caribbean nations are not the same, and that while Central America has a substantial private sector able to respond to stimulation, too many Caribbean nations need significant help in the public sector before meaningful private development will be possible. Such basics as adequate internal transportation and an educated work force will have to be developed if real economic growth is to take place. This means that assistance cannot be limited to the private sector, but will have to address critical public needs as well.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1982]
 THE U.S. AND THE WEST INDIES—I: THE SAME
 CARIBBEAN
 (By Sally Shelton)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—In his generally laudable speech announcing the new Caribbean basin initiative, President Reagan depicted Cuban adventurism and subversion as the core of Central America's and the Caribbean's problems. Whether his grim picture is accurate or not for Central America, it left many West Indians wondering whether he was talking about the same Caribbean they call home.

The Administration's view of the Caribbean, and Cuba's role there, seems based less on West Indian realities than on the Administration's insistence on fusing the Caribbean islands with the Central American isthmus. The roots of today's turmoil in Central America—decades of gross social and economic inequities, authoritarianism, right-wing repression, and, more recently, Cuban exploitation of these problems—generally do not exist in the moderate parliamentary democracies of the Caribbean. Moreover, the nature and extent of Cuba's role in the Caribbean differs significantly from its role in Central America.

Although Cuba's presence and influence in Central America have bloomed through successful support for rebel forces, Cuba's conduct in the Caribbean is different. In the islands, Cuba avoids identification with subversion and, in fact, pragmatically recognizes the benefits of normal diplomatic relations with West Indian governments. Cuba maintains diplomatic ties with virtually all the governments of the Caribbean and uses the diplomatic tools that most governments use to gain influence: scholarships, technical assistance, disaster relief, cultural exchange, friendship associations. Available evidence reflects very limited Cuban financial support for minuscule far-left groups, probably just enough to keep them afloat. And in neither of the two recent instances of revolutionary change in the Caribbean—Grenada and Suriname—can responsibility be laid at Cuba's doorstep.

Nonetheless, not all is going well for Cuba. In recent years, Cuba has suffered a series of blows that appear to have substantially reduced its influence in the Caribbean. Its major setback undoubtedly was the defeat of Michael Manley, Jamaica's former Prime Minister, and the subsequent cooling of relations. Recent elections in six other Caribbean countries have resulted in victories of moderate-to-conservative governments, with leftist groups overwhelmingly defeated in country after country. But Cuba's worst diplomatic setback came in 1980, when a Cuban Air Force plane strafed a Bahamas coast guard vessel in then disputed waters, killing several Bahamians. Cuba apologized and indemnified the families, but the incident sent shock waves through the Caribbean, and washed out much of the good will Cuba had accrued through well publicized programs of health care, education, literacy, and housing.

Cuba's most significant gain has been establishment of a close relationship with tiny Grenada (population 115,000) after the 1979 coup that ousted the island's corrupt and despotic Prime Minister, Eric Gairy. Cuba has since provided fisheries experts, doctors, teachers—and security assistance. Most important has been sizeable Cuban aid to build a new international airport, which every Grenadian—indeed every West Indian—feels his island deserves as the key to expanding

tourism, a prime earner of foreign exchange. But it is possible that Grenada, one of the poorest countries in the Southern Hemisphere and with a not altogether popular government, may end up as something less than an asset for Havana. Marginal improvements in Cuba's relations with Suriname and with Guyana (led by an increasingly isolated and unpopular authoritarian Government) constitute the limited list of Cuban achievements in the Caribbean.

West Indian opinion-shapers unanimously consider the main threat to their security not Cuba but rather the severe poverty and double-digit unemployment plaguing nearly every island.

The Reagan Administration would do well to heed West Indians' own perceptions of their problems rather than insist on an analysis made in Washington. The potential for Cuban mischief-making should not be ignored but neither should it be exaggerated. The United States could enhance its influence far more by promptly and generously responding to the region's pressing economic needs. It could thereby inhibit future inroads that the Cubans might make among West Indians suffering from unemployment and poverty. Washington should deal now with the economic crisis in the Caribbean that spills daily onto United States shores in the form of dramatically increasing illegal migration. Washington should also avoid "Cubaphobe" rhetoric that exaggerates the real threat posed by Havana. Such a mindset contributes to the perception among West Indians that our attention to the region derives more from a preoccupation with Cuba than from a true commitment to economic development and political amity with close neighbors.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1982]
 THE U.S. AND THE WEST INDIES—II: AID THE
 PUBLIC SECTOR
 (By Sally A. Shelton)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—As Prime Minister Vere Bird of the tiny Caribbean country of Antigua puts it: You can't pull yourself up by the bootstraps if you don't have the bootstraps.

He echoes the concern felt by many West Indian leaders that the Reagan Administration's Caribbean basin initiative, in keeping with the President's own philosophy for the United States' economy, focuses on the private sector as the main path to economic development while downplaying urgently needed aid for the public sector. In fact, the main thrust of the Administration's new program for economic recuperation in the Caribbean and Central America does just that: It is aimed largely at stimulating private investment and at steering development aid and technical assistance into private-sector activities; help for the underdeveloped public sector, desperately short of capital, gets short shrift.

In a region suffering from double-digit unemployment, declining production, severe shortages of technical skills, and virtually nonexistent capital markets, an initiative aimed at breathing new life into the sluggish private sector is innovative and long-overdue. That sector can provide much-needed technology, managerial know-how, market development, and, perhaps most important, production for exports. Most Caribbean countries welcome the spirit behind the proposed private-sector plan, which could be an effective tool for dealing with the most urgent problem in the area: rates of unemployment averaging 25 to 30 per-

cent, perhaps double that figure among the young (who, as in many developing countries, account for at least one-half the population).

The problem, West Indians argue, is that a private-sector strategy alone will not suffice. Time and again, West Indian government and business leaders assert that, in addition to a private-sector approach, the United States should assist the fledgling public sector in order to develop the economic infrastructure—roads, water facilities, assured energy supplies, transport, communications, the ability to handle cargo, a trained workforce—without which no investment, local or foreign, is likely to be attracted.

One of the Caribbean's leading businessmen told me of the concern of many others over Mr. Reagan's linking Central America and the Caribbean into one development plan. Central America's main economic problem, he pointed out, is to stimulate the private sector. The Caribbean's, however, is to create a private sector—but first there must be an infrastructure upon which to build that sector.

Even allowing for a bit of hyperbole, the point is well taken. In the tiny country of Dominica, for example, foreign businessmen are faced with a grueling two-hour drive around mountainous hairpin curves just to get from the airport to the capital. That island has yet to supply electricity to one-quarter of its population since the devastating hurricanes of 1979 and 1980. On Grenada, the manager of the major agro-industry plant cannot use his relatively sophisticated machinery because of daily, prolonged power outages. Haiti's agricultural produce, an important source of income, is so seriously damaged by the time it gets to port along poor or nonexistent roads that it neither can be exported nor marketed at home.

The West Indian workforce is similarly handicapped, lacking even rudimentary technical skills. The Caribbean educational system needs to be thoroughly overhauled in order to make it less oriented toward white-collar work and more directed toward teaching basic technical skills and a work ethic to the blue-collar workforce. Both are scarce in the Caribbean yet both are prerequisites to attracting private investment. More than one West Indian country has lost United States investment because the labor force cannot meet production targets.

Civil servants, who help development governments' economic-growth strategies and who deal extensively with the private sector, lack adequate education and technical training as well. In a recent survey, West Indian government and business leaders placed the technical skill of the average West Indian civil servant at 4 on a scale of 1-to-10—a serious indictment of the public sector's ability to provide necessary support for the private sector's development efforts.

West Indian needs are different from those of Central America's, and United States aid programs should recognize the distinction. Private-sector development in the Caribbean will be hobbled by stunted public sectors, unless Washington comes to grips with this fact. The Caribbean basin initiative will not produce the best possible results unless Washington accords the public sector a higher priority. ●

CRIME PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, crime is one of the most serious problems facing us today.

In many communities, law-abiding citizens are becoming victims or live in fear of becoming victims of violent crime. Robberies and thefts are on the increase. The dockets of our courts are jammed with cases, many of which take months for disposition. Reports indicate that the U.S. prison population is increasing at the highest rate in 56 years, and many of our penal institutions are dangerously overcrowded.

All this is happening at a time when many communities are forced by the current recession to lay off police, and many States are unable to take up the slack because of decreased revenues and increased demands of our citizens for needed services.

The need is greater than ever for assistance to law enforcement agencies, and President Reagan recently called for a "war on crime." However, according to a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor, the President proposes to fight crime with little more than clichés.

According to the Monitor, the President has asked for cutbacks of more than one-third of a billion dollars for the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. attorneys, U.S. marshals and immigration officials, including the possible elimination of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Experts say this will cripple local law enforcement agencies, at precisely the time when the need for Federal aid to protect our citizens is greatest.

The article follows:

BUDGET CUTS THREATEN TO TAKE PUNCH OUT OF REAGAN'S "WAR ON CRIME"

(By Brad Knickerbocker)

WASHINGTON.—The Reagan administration may have declared "war on crime," but it will be a battle with reduced troops and equipment. This is the judgment of many members of Congress as well as local law-enforcement officials as they weigh the words from the President's self-styled "bully pulpit" against the actions he is taking.

Federal crime-fighting programs are not being spared the kinds of spending cuts widespread in Washington these days. The administration's recent second round of budget reductions for 1982 raised Justice Department cuts to more than \$350 million. This includes about \$50 million from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and \$35 million from the Drug Enforcement Administration. U.S. attorneys, marshals, and immigration officials will be affected, and there are strong indications that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms will be disbanded, its duties reduced and delegated to other agencies.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Such cuts, says an official with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, are likely to have an adverse impact on local law-enforcement efforts. For example, says IACP spokesman Robert Angrisani, the FBI will no longer be able to search nationwide criminal history records based on fingerprints taken by local officials.

The Drug Enforcement Administration has provided 208 special agents to local task force groups pursuing major drug dealers. But this will be reduced to 94 agents, complains Rep. William J. Hughes (D) of New Jersey, chairman of the House subcommittee on crime.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics reported this week that the US prison population is increasing at the highest rate in 56 years, putting more than 20,000 additional people into already overcrowded facilities. The attorney general's violent crime task force earlier this year recommended a \$2 billion federal program for new prisons, but the White House rejected this as too costly. The administration also has sharply reduced funding for some 400 halfway houses.

"When one looks at the increase in the number of violent crimes and the number of firearms used in those crimes, it becomes clear that the federal government must play a larger role in combating the problem," says Police Chief Pat Minetti of Hampton, Va. Mr. Minetti recently testified on Capitol Hill on behalf of the Police Executive Research forum, a group of police chief executives.

While acknowledging that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF) "does face substantial budget cuts," Assistant Treasury Secretary John Walker says "no final decision has been made to dismantle or abolish BATF." Yet, according to an internal Treasury Department memorandum, a "steering committee on the phase-out of BATF" has been named.

Fire officials and insurance companies, as well as police executives, are concerned about the future of the BATF since the agency provides major support for arson control.

"Many of the Newark arson squad's investigations have progressed beyond our capabilities only because of the intervention of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms," said Battalion Chief Robert Fitzpatrick of the Newark, N.J., fire department.

Noting that arson-for-profit increases during tough economic times, Penelope Farthing of the American Insurance Association says, "now is the least appropriate time to reduce the federal law enforcement presence in arson detection and enforcement."

On Capitol Hill, many Republicans as well as Democrats agree with Representative Hughes who says "we need to praise the Lord and pass the ammunition." Rep. Hamilton Fish (R) of New York (who was robbed at gunpoint on Capitol Hill earlier this year) has proposed a new block grant that would help local authorities hire more police officers.

"Many, many of us are in favor of cuts says Rep. Harold Sawyer of Michigan, ranking Republican on the House crime subcommittee. "But I do think law enforcement is the essence of governmental functions." ●

April 21, 1982

SHOWCASE IN ECOLOGY

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday April 21, 1982

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the Ninth Congressional District is fortunate to have one of the most creative, innovative business operations in America, Mudd's Restaurant in San Ramon, Calif.

In addition to serving great meals, the restaurant is operated with an unprecedented attention and respect for ecology. The restaurant building is designed for maximum use of solar energy and is a model for the homes and businesses of the future. The restaurant operators are to be commended for this demonstration of natural design features that prove to all of us how we can better use nature, rather than abuse it.

The following article from the Oakland Tribune describes the restaurant:

[From the Oakland Tribune, Jan. 24, 1982]

RESTAURANT IS SHOWCASE IN ECOLOGY

(By Patricia Radin)

SAN RAMON.—When Virginia Mudd Madden planted corn and tomato seeds next to her new restaurant last spring, she may have been figuratively planting the seeds of a commercial revolution as well.

She combined a commercial enterprise with a parklike demonstration ecology project.

Mudd's Restaurant, as she dubbed it, and its nine-acre grounds are a working model of water- and energy-conscious technology: solar-heated buildings, organic garden, native-plant landscaping, even a water-saving Swedish toilet.

"I was compelled to do this thing," she shrugs. "I got the idea almost six years ago and—well, you could almost say it possessed me."

The idea of founding a restaurant-ecology center gained an eager following of ecology-minded San Ramon Valley residents.

One follower, Kerry Marshall, became so enthusiastic he quit his job three years ago to help develop the garden and watch over the construction. His staff position now includes responsibility for the visitors' center.

"This project is unusual because most of the time, people who want to see solar power and organic gardening demonstrated go the evangelistic non-profit corporation route," he said.

"We think it's time to take it one step further, to show that the technology can work in a competitive business situation."

The restaurant, with sculptured cedar paneling, brightly woven tablecloths and trellised patios, exudes artless country charm. But underpinning the breezy-looking design is the newest technology.

Eight-inch-thick concrete floors, painted to look like red tiles, absorb the sun's heat by day and release it after dark. The floors function like a sidewalk that warms during a hot summer day and still feels toasty to bare feet in the chilly dusk air.

Like the floors, Mudd's 3-inch-thick plaster walls help keep it comfortable, complemented by double-glazed windows that are

impervious to drafts. The result is even, cozy warmth in winter. There is little use for the backup gas heater.

In the scorching summers of the San Ramon Valley, the same heavy walls and floors stay cool. An evaporation cooling system—outdoor air blown past drizzling water and then circulated through the restaurant—is the building's only air-conditioning system.

Windows and overhangs are oriented to take in the low-lying winter sun but to block out the direct overhead rays of summer.

Thirty-three-year-old Madden attended Stanford University for a year, tried the University of California's Berkeley campus for her sophomore year and then dropped college altogether, concluding that "life was much more interesting."

Devoted to her ideals, she worked in the local office of Rep. Fortney H. "Pete" Stark.

A few years later, she and a woman friend took a cross-continental bicycle trip. The rugged experience, she says gave her the confidence to take other big risks—like starting the restaurant.

Blueprints, photos and books about the project are available in the Visitors' Center, a place with a crackling wood-burning stove and soft armchairs.

Those who become inspired to start their own gardens can even buy carefully chosen seeds, pitchforks and hoes at the center.

Even in midwinter, an organic garden behind the restaurant overflows with cabbage, cauliflower, lettuce, broccoli, herbs and flowers for Mudd's tables. By summer, the garden will be enlarged to a small farm where enough foods and flowers will be raised to supply other Bay Area restaurants, she says.

Mudd's five gardeners eagerly take school groups and restaurant visitors on tours of the plot and lend them books and pamphlets on organic farming.

The restaurant and bar—featuring live classical and jazz piano music—has been open evenings since June. Lunches will be served beginning this spring. Like most new businesses, the restaurant has not made money yet for its owner. But because of its location and setting, it may become the first profit-making project of its kind. ●

NEW FEDERALISM COMMENTARY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous reports and articles published on the President's program for a New Federalism. Of the commentaries I have seen so far, one stands out as particularly penetrating.

In the March 30, 1982, edition of *Newsday*, my colleague from New York, THOMAS DOWNEY, articulated best what I believe are the true implications of President Reagan's New Federalism plan. I would like to share that article with the rest of my colleagues.

As a Member who helped build the programs the President seeks to dismantle, I can appreciate Mr. Downey's perspicacity in addressing this

complex issue. In the 1960's when many of these programs were conceived, those of us who helped create them felt, and still feel, that programs such as income security, nutrition, and basic health care were national responsibilities. The Federal Government has a role in serving people, providing the most uniform system of health maintenance, and promoting the general welfare of all society.

Are there some responsibilities that can be returned to the States and local governments? Maybe some changes can be made. It may be possible to turn over programs to the States and local governments without drastically diminishing the quality of services and without draining State and local sources of revenue. But now is not the time to be considering such a radical restructuring of State and local responsibility. Rather, we should concentrate on the health of our economy, and how it is affecting the lives of millions of Americans.

NEW FEDERALISM IS BADLY TIMED

(By Thomas J. Downey)

Michael Barone's recent article on "New Federalism and American Poverty" (*Ideas*, Feb. 21) only scratches the surface of potential problems with President Reagan's proposal.

In this period of recession, the President's program for "new federalism" is poorly timed. When we should be concentrating on the problems of rising unemployment, high interest rates, skyrocketing budget deficits, and growing tensions in the Middle East and Central America, the President should not be shifting national attention to his philosophical goals.

This new federalism simply is not an important issue. At no time, in no poll, have the American people given any priority to a fundamental restructuring of powers within the federal system. To throw out such a radical, complex plan at this point deflects attention from our economic problems without responding to any of the most important concerns of the public.

The President has proposed a swap of programs between the federal state governments: federal assumption of the costs of Medicaid, in exchange for state financing of food stamps and Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Even if this turned out to be an equal trade in terms of cost, it betrays surprising confusion over the proper roles of different levels of government. Food stamps, welfare, and Medicaid have one thing in common: They are all income maintenance programs. So why should one of these programs be paid for by the national government and the other two by states?

Whatever else it offers us, the new federalism does not help resolve the debate over what functions belong at what levels of government.

Constitutional philosophy aside, serious consideration must be given to how money would be raised on the local level to pay for programs now financed by the federal government. Even if we accept the argument that local and state governments can operate these programs more effectively and at lower cost, we must realize that local and state tax systems are more regressive than those of the federal government. They depend on such sources as sales taxes, prop-

erty taxes, and excise taxes, all of which hurt ordinary American consumers and homeowners much more than the wealthy.

A dramatic shift of responsibilities to the states threatens to shift more of the burden of taxation onto the middle class, and property taxes will likely increase—not a pleasant prospect for Long Islanders, who already pay the highest property taxes in the nation.

This is not to say that some return of power and responsibility to the states would not be desirable. Some changes certainly can be made, especially in education, public works, roads, transportation and municipal functions. However, federal responsibility for income security, nutrition and food programs and basic health care should be maintained. These are national responsibilities, and we should not encourage those in need to shop among states for the best benefits.

We also must consider the long-range stability of the American economy. According to a recent Congressional Research Service report: "Programs such as unemployment insurance, food stamps and Medicaid provide income to individuals whose earnings have been reduced by recession. Although these transfer payments are unlikely to replace all lost income, they prevent sharp declines in consumer spending which would aggravate the downturn and impose severe hardships."

One reason we have not had a repeat of the Great Depression, and why recessions in the post-World War II years have been shorter and milder than in earlier decades, "is undoubtedly due to the automatic stabilizers which became features of the federal budget after the Great Depression," according to the Congressional Research Service. The President's program would go a long way toward removing these stabilizers. State budgets would not increase automatically to fill the demand gap, because many state constitutions do not allow deficit spending. We had better think about the implications of this for the health of the economy before we launch into a radical redistribution of government responsibilities. ●

A SALUTE TO TOM JACKSON

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the extraordinary community efforts of Mr. Tom Jackson, a member of the city council in Huntington Park, Calif., and one of my district representatives for a number of years.

Mr. Jackson, in addition to his present community duties, is president of the California Contract of Cities Association. He is currently completing his term as the head of this vital association. During his tenure, Mr. Jackson's quality character and genuine concern for the welfare of the community were well evidenced.

Through Mr. Jackson's able leadership, the Huntington Park City Council forged a number of important com-

munity initiatives which positively impacted on the residents they served. As president of the California Contract of Cities Association he provided responsible and professional direction for the entire Los Angeles area.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of his excellence and service as the president of the California Contract of Cities, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the efforts of Tom Jackson. ●

JEFFERSON'S VISION

HON. WILLIAM G. WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress was in recess during its district work period, our country observed one of its most ignored memorable events on April 13—the birthday of Thomas Jefferson.

The contributions of Mr. Jefferson to our developing Nation are, perhaps, unparalleled. Certainly, few persons in our country's brief history can match his awesome intellect and list of accomplishments. The principles for which he stood, including limited government, a balanced budget, and the free enterprise system, have withstood the test of time and remain as pertinent as ever before.

Today I am inserting a column by John McClaughry, who served until recently as senior policy adviser in the White House's Office of Policy Development, which appeared in the New York Times. I think Mr. McClaughry makes a number of keen observations, not the least of which is that the Republican Party should recapture its Jeffersonian heritage.

The article follows:

JEFFERSON'S VISION

(By John McClaughry)

MCLEAN, VA.—It is unfortunate that Thomas Jefferson's birthday, today, is so rarely commemorated, for Americans need to be reminded of the enduring philosophy of that great, many-sided man.

Foremost among his principles were individual liberty and the rights of man. All men, he wrote in the summer of 1776, are endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Writing from France in 1787, he successfully urged upon his friend James Madison a "bill of rights providing clearly, and without aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land."

Jefferson saw that America's experiment in liberty and democracy could not succeed unless most of its citizens were economically independent. Thus, he enthusiastically promoted independent farm ownership, and sought to discourage the importation of the European factory system, in which workers owned no stake in their enterprise.

His prescription of a widespread distribution of ownership of private property, opportunity for the energetic and talented to succeed in competitive free enterprise, and curbs on all forms of monopolistic conduct continue to command the allegiance of most Americans. Today, his policy would call for strong encouragement not only of family-owned farms but also of independent owner-operated businesses and increased employee ownership of larger corporations.

Another Jeffersonian tenet, of particular relevance to modern times, was his abhorrence of public debt, and paper money unbacked by anything of value. Jefferson, like Andrew Jackson after him, recognized that only a stable hard currency could preserve the just rewards of labor, industry, and thrift, and thus the economic health of the Republic. The accumulation of Government debt and the printing of greenbacks (now known as Federal Reserve notes) led directly to financial manipulation, destruction of honest value, and a swindling of the ordinary citizen for the benefit of barons of high finance. One wonders what kind of person Jefferson would have appointed to the chairmanship of the Federal Reserve Board.

Keeping the functions of government limited and close to home, while relying upon the people themselves for works of charity and civic improvement, was another Jeffersonian passion.

"A wise and frugal government," he announced in a first Inaugural Address similar to President Reagan's, "shall restrain men from injuring another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned." His belief in the wisdom of local "ward republics" is echoed today in the strong, growing movement for neighborhood power in cities and the demand for local control in rural areas.

Here, then, are principles Americans can live by. The curious question is why no political leader has arisen—in either party—to explicitly make the Jeffersonian creed his own. Liberal Democrats, wedded to ever-increasing government spending, taxes, and printing of money, are obviously uncomfortable with the Jeffersonian tradition that dominated their party's history until 1844. Republicans, for the most part, do not question Democratic claims to Thomas Jefferson as one of their own, despite the ringing pronouncement of the first Republican national platform (1856) that election of the republican ticket would "restore the action of the Federal government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson."

In Ronald Reagan, this country has probably the most Jeffersonian President since Martin Van Buren. Four years ago, he paid tribute to Jefferson in these words: "Yes, Thomas Jefferson has gone on to that corner of heaven reserved for those who fought for Liberty and the Rights of Man. But we Americans, his spiritual descendants, would do well to pluck a flower from Thomas Jefferson's life, and wear it in our soul forever."

A more conscious affirmation of Jeffersonian principles, and a creative effort to give them practical application in today's circumstances, would do much to win new support for the Administration, and to recapture for America the wisdom and vision of its third President. ●

LUIS VARGAS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report the passing of a good friend and a stalwart worker in the political vineyards, Mr. Luis Vargas, of 1495 Grand Concourse, Bronx, N.Y.

Mr. Vargas was born in Panama almost 78 years ago. For a number of years he made his home in New Orleans, and there he became active in support of candidates for public office that he believed would serve the people well. I have in my possession a copy of a letter Luis Vargas received from the late Hale Boggs, who served for many years with such distinction in this body, expressing his appreciation to Mr. Vargas for his "outstanding support."

I came to know Mr. Vargas in the early 1970's when he became active in the Bronx. He was of enormous help to me on a number of occasions and was a tireless worker, in spite of his advancing years. In 1976 he vigorously supported the Presidential candidacy of our esteemed colleague, Mo Udall; he was named to the Udall Slate in the Democratic primary, running for the post of alternate delegate, but because the popularity of Senator JACKSON in the 22d Congressional District, Mr. Vargas' candidacy was not successful.

In addition to his campaigning, Luis Vargas took an active interest in various social agencies, especially senior citizen centers.

On behalf of my staff and of the many other citizens of the Bronx who knew him as a committed person who was always a pleasure to be with, I extend to his widow and family my deepest sympathy. ●

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER FROM VERMONT

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, was established 35 years ago. This year's theme was "Building America Together." Our Vermont State winner is Heidi Wightman of Danville, Vt. I would like to insert her very excellent speech into the RECORD, for all Members to have.

BUILDING AMERICA TOGETHER

(By Heidi A. Wightman)

"We, the people in order to form a more perfect union,"—the beginning of the Preamble of our Constitution—the foundation for a new government formed by the people and for the people ever striving to build a stronger America together. When the founding fathers wrote the first sentence of our Constitution, they could not have expected to foresee the challenges that we Americans would face today—challenges like equal opportunity for all, environmental resources, energy alternatives, security from terrorism and political intimidation, unemployment, and welfare. Although these and other current challenges would mystify even patriots like Washington, Jefferson and Adams, they understood the ways to solve our country's problems—"we, the people"—together to form a more perfect union—building a better America together.

In January of 1981, we elected a "people's" President, who dared us to increase defense spending in order to strengthen our military defensive capabilities. He also summoned us to help him revitalize our economy, so we would remain a prestigious, prosperous, respected and freedom-loving nation. Our defense and economic system are two major concerns which require our total unified support. All Americans, every one of us, must recognize the importance of solving these two critical concerns. Only by working together can we keep the United States a shining beacon of freedom for the world to admire and respect.

As President Reagan said in his inaugural speech, "the price of freedom is constant vigilance." Throughout our history the United States has always come to the aid of countries where democracy and freedom have been jeopardized by selfish interests. Now, it is the American people's turn to look inward and support our own military system. Our defense must never rest—no matter how much a humanitarian society we are. Sacrifices are sometimes necessary and as American citizens, we should have pride in our democratic beliefs. There should be a willingness of all to serve, defend, and protect our country. The problem of draft evasion is an example of Americans not working together—this lack of unity can be detrimental to building a stronger America. In times of crisis we must be ready to pull together to maintain peace or protect our well-being.

The revitalization of our economy is a longterm investment; not an overnight accomplishment. President Reagan warned us that before we can establish a healthy economy all Americans must make sacrifices. Some Americans are not willing to wait or sacrifice and give our President's proposal ample time to achieve its purposes. Again, it will take a unified effort across our great country to rejuvenate our economy. We must return to the incentives of free enterprise—equal opportunity for all Americans. Together, we can come through these difficult times and make this pursuit successful.

Yes, it is up to us—"we, the people"—working together, in unity, on all issues and striving to reach our common goals as a democratic society. Two hundred years ago our forefathers understood that by working together they could overcome their problems. Today we know this concept is still true. Who knows what new dilemmas will confront future Americans two hundred years from now, but whatever they may be

the same answer to these questions will exist—building a better America together. ●

ADMINISTRATION'S INSENSITIVITY TOWARD STUDENT AID PROGRAMS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the administration's apparent insensitivity to minority rights becomes evident once more. The administration will exclude from Federal civil rights enforcement numerous schools of business and other proprietary schools whose only Federal aid is guaranteed student loans.

The administration not only has decided to exempt the Government's most extensive student aid program from Federal law governing discrimination, but one Education Department official stated:

If those schools wish to discriminate against students in the future, we can't keep them from doing so.

The administration's indifference toward the increasing financial burden of higher education only confirms the unresponsive attitude toward minority, handicapped, and economically deprived individuals.

To add insult to injury, Secretary of Education Terrel Bell wanted the Government to change the definition of "Federal financial assistance" in civil rights laws to exclude grants to needy students, as well as guaranteed student loans, on the grounds that aid went to students, not directly to the schools.

Guaranteed student loans are not only beneficial to the student but to the schools, in that the student uses the aid for tuition which does directly benefit the schools.

Because discrimination policies are individual school administrative decisions, schools that discriminate on the basis of race, sex, and handicap should be vigorously scrutinized. If such schools are unable to comply with nondiscriminatory policies, as set forth by law, the school should bear the brunt of whatever chastisement is necessary for compliance, but the student should not be made to suffer an undue hardship. Redefining Federal financial assistance as it relates to guaranteed student loans would cause an unnecessary hardship for individuals seeking economic prosperity through educational assertion, and would deprive countless numbers of individuals from achieving their educational goals.

The administration's support for tax-exempt status for schools that discriminate not only caused furor throughout the Nation but was totally

consistent with the administration's repeated actions to cut back civil rights enforcement.

Must economically disadvantaged individuals who are attempting to improve their status be forced to suffer the imprudent decisions of an administration clearly insensitive to the needs of an ever-increasing segment of the American population, or should there be a unification of Americans interested in the preservation of what our country was founded upon: The promotion of the general welfare and securing the liberties of freedom and justice for all? ●

VILLA CRESTA SCHOOL TOURS CAPITOL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 22, 1982, 90 young men and women from the Villa Cresta Elementary School in Parkville, Md., will journey to Washington for a firsthand look at their Nation's Capitol.

These students, accompanied by parents and teachers, will tour the Capitol Building.

I am delighted these students have taken the opportunity to visit with us, and I hope their interest in our Nation's political process will continue.

Students who will visit us Thursday are:

Paul Clippinger, Melvin Eberwein, Anthony Fussell, Jeffrey Kloiber, Troy Penman, Andrew Potter, Eric Puppe, John Ramey, Charles Scheiner, Chadd Schneeman, Kevin Trussell, Frank White, Gary Bressler, Donovan Clifford, Richard LeCompte, Jennifer Alvarez, Lisa Bell, Kindra Berwanger, Kami Buckley, Jennifer Franz, Jennene Graul, Kelly Hopkins, Dona McKenzie, and Christine Sturla.

Michael Griffie, Sarah Kelly, Shawn Kelly, Joseph Lease, Michael Martini, Jennifer Moraski, Colleen O'Keefe, David Ricci, Rebecca Rodgers, Jennifer Steffey, Christopher Wagner, Amy Warner, Aaron Albers, David Baraloto, John Bonomo, John Bradford, Richard Coyle, Del Lipscomb, Earl Miller, Tony Phillips, Hongito Shenk, and Nelson Smith.

Elizabeth Bannan, Chris Colaianni, Terry Frick, Tori Horner, Tracey LeCompte, Gina Los, Jennifer Malinosky, Heather Moore, Lisa Sharpe, Bonnie Stith, Alison Thompson, Niki Wilgis, and Kerri Wilson.

Laura Berner, Laura Myers, Amy Greely, Melissa Read, Sandra Flannery, Casey Kavanagh, Dawn Perry, Elene Hartlove, Shannon Schaffner, Emily Reich, Leea McFaul, Michele

Davis, Kristen Wilmot, Kim Garbe, Kevin Lang, Tommy Emich, Paul Snyder, Jason Hines, Kevin Hewitt, Jimmy Edwards, Josh Battaglia, Steven Lindauer, Todd Covert, Jimmy Zavakos, David Trojanowski, Michael Watts, Jimmy Lambert, Danny Jenkins, and Joey Reagle.

Parents and teachers who are visiting us are:

Mrs. Barbara Willson, Mrs. Nancy Clippinger, Mr. Melvin Eberwein, Mrs. Jackie Johnson, Mrs. Kathy Kloiber, Mrs. Natalie Cook, Mrs. Diana Wittler, Mr. John Ramey, Mrs. Sharon Schneeman, Mr. and Mrs. Christopher Clifford, Mrs. Sandra LaFlame, Mrs. Olga Bell, Mrs. Nina Buckley, Mr. Griffiee, Mrs. Warner, Mrs. Horn, Mrs. Moraski, Mrs. Rodgers, Mrs. Ricci, Mrs. Collins, and Mrs. Coyle.

Mrs. Lipscomb, Mrs. Phillips, Mrs. Lorenz, Mr. Shenk, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Colaianni, Mrs. Moore, Mr. and Mrs. Sharpe, Mr. Rowan, Mrs. Berner, Mrs. Greely, Mrs. Flannery, Mrs. Perry, Mrs. Schaffner, Mrs. McFaul, Mrs. Wilmot, Mrs. Lang, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Hewitt, Mrs. Battaglia, Mrs. Covert, Mrs. Trojanowski, Mr. and Mrs. Greensfelder, Mrs. Barbara Lipp, and Mrs. Dorothy Holland.●

A SALUTE TO THE ANGEL DRILL TEAM

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my last appearance as a Member of Congress at the annual performance of the champion Angel Drill Team of the Great Lakes/North Chicago/Waukegan area will occur on Saturday at the North Chicago High School. This outstanding group of young women has been trained by retired Navy Chief Petty Officer Nathaniel Hamilton since the Angel Drill Team was established more than 8 years ago.

The Angel Drill Team has performed throughout the United States and has won many honors and championships across the Nation.

As reviewing officer at this year's eighth annual premiere, I am honored to call this event to the attention of my colleagues in this Chamber. In addition to the Angel Drill Team, other ROTC precision and rifle drill teams, color guards, and drum and bugle corps will perform to the delight of an audience of parents and friends at the North Chicago High School.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the personal pride which I take in this championship drill team group from my congressional district, I will extend greetings from this body and extend warm congratulations and good wishes

to Chief Hamilton and the Angel Drill Team members.●

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE— HOLOCAUST

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, this week, 39 years after the dramatic struggle at the Warsaw Ghetto, we are commemorating this period as "Yom Ha Shoah" or the "Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust."

At first glance, one may ask why we remember this vicious era of genocide and degradation. Is it not better to put these unfortunate memories aside? We cannot and must not forget the atrocities that occurred at Buchenwald, Treblinka, Auschwitz, Bergen-Belsen, and Dachau. Six million innocent children, men, and women were brutally tortured and murdered, not for what they had done, but for the simple fact that they were Jews. The Nazi government successfully divided a nation, splitting human society and eliminated individuals they thought to be undesirable. An annihilation of this magnitude cannot be compared to anything else in history.

The world's failure to recognize the truth over 40 years ago permitted this action to happen. Methodically, the Nazis attempted total destruction, one step at a time. With each move—from the establishment of concentration camps to the extermination of human beings—they waited for a reaction. None came and thus the genocide began. Butchers and bankers, mechanics and merchants, students and teachers were all systematically killed and, sadly, few spoke up.

Today, we remember this despicable era in history. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, chaired by Elie Weisel, was established to remind us that this dreadful period in history did exist. Legislation that this Congress passed last year provided for a memorial to be established that will speak, not only of the victim's deaths, but of their lives—"a memorial that can transform the living by transmitting the legacy of the Holocaust." We can hope that all who see this memorial will be reminded of our past omissions and of our determination to prevent a recurrence of such actions anywhere on this planet in the future.

George Santayana once wrote that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Today, let us remember the heroes of Warsaw, the children of Dachau, and the other victims of repression throughout Europe during this era. Let our reaffirmation of human rights for all individuals ring clear at this

time, and let us work together in the future to erase prejudice, racism, and terrorism from this world forever.●

MR. JOHN RODGERS

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to have this opportunity to memorialize one of my constituents, Mr. John Rodgers of Belleville, Pa. Mr. Rodgers was an exemplary citizen and spent his 71 years in service of his fellow man.

A native of Pennsylvania, John Rodgers graduated from the Pennsylvania State University in 1935 and began his career in business in Lewistown. He served as president and chairman of the board of Mann Edge Tool Co. and on the board of Metimex Corp. and American Hickory. Before the merger of the First National Bank of Lewistown with Central Counties Bank, John Rodgers was its chief executive officer and president. After the merger he served on the board of Central Counties Bank. He had also been instrumental in the earlier merger of the Citizens National Bank and the Mifflin County Bank into the First National Bank of Lewistown. John Rodgers made many contributions to the Mifflin County area during his years as a banker and businessman.

In addition to his banking and business interests, John Rodgers was the chairman of the board of Capital Blue Cross and its representative as a charter member of the Health Systems Agency. He carried his love of his fellow human beings into his work in the health and insurance areas.

John Rodgers will long be remembered for his contributions to the betterment of the lives of those around him. He was an active member, trustee, and elder of his church and served three terms as president of the Mifflin Juniata United Fund. He and his wife Rebecca were the recipients of the Brotherhood Citation in 1970 for their many years of outstanding community service.

I had the privilege of knowing John Rodgers for many years, and I feel blessed that I could bask in the glow of such a fine man. He set the highest standards for himself and never ceased to look for ways to benefit those people whose paths crossed his own. However, despite the exemplary life that he led, John Rodgers' greatest contribution was the fine family that he and Rebecca created. He leaves behind to carry on the fine traditions of the Rodgers family two children and nine grandchildren. I have never met a more wonderful man, husband,

father, and grandfather than John T. Rodgers.●

THE PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY ACT SHOULD BE REPEALED

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of eliminating unnecessary and outdated Federal regulation, particularly when it imposes undue burdens on American businesses and the public they serve. In this regard, I am today introducing legislation to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

Congressional review of the Public Utility Holding Company Act (PUHCA) is long overdue. The purposes for which it was enacted in 1935 were accomplished many years ago, and its continued existence imposes severe and unnecessary burdens on utility companies with resulting disadvantages for electric and gas consumers. Repeal of the act has been recommended unanimously by the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has sole responsibility for its enforcement.

It is clear that the main purposes of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 have been accomplished. The public utility holding company empires of 1935 have been eliminated. The few remaining holding company systems have been reorganized. Their electric or retail gas utility operations are limited, in most cases, to a single geographically integrated electric or gas utility, and their capital structures have been simplified. Implementation of the act's reorganization and simplification requirements has been so complete that only 12 active holding company systems remain subject to direct regulation under the act.

The provisions of the act limiting activities of public utility holding companies were intended to prevent recurrence of the abuses by public utility holding company systems which led to its original enactment. However, these abuses have been virtually eradicated. Such abuses appear unlikely to recur, even absent continued regulation under the act, given the regulatory requirements of other Federal statutes, the significant changes since 1935 in the accounting profession and the investment banking industry, and the ability of State public utility commissions to regulate utilities.

The Nation's electric and retail gas utilities are currently experiencing significant financial difficulties which raise questions concerning the industry's ability to meet the future energy needs of individuals, communities, and businesses dependent on it or to pro-

vide an adequate return to investors. The act imposes significant additional regulatory burdens that are no longer necessary or appropriate on those few holding company systems that remain registered under it. The act also imposes limitations on the structure and business activities of those electric and retail gas utility holding companies operating pursuant to exemptions from the registration and other provisions of the act and, in addition, effectively precludes other electric or retail gas utilities from using a holding company structure. These burdens and limitations have hindered the electric and retail gas utilities in developing innovative methods for meeting the changing needs of the utility industry and the needs of their consumers and investors. In addition, the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 discourages nonutilities from becoming involved in projects for the generation of electricity or cogeneration projects, contrary to the national interest in encouraging the development of new energy sources.

Even in the absence of the Public Utility Holding Company Act, the interests of consumers and investors in public utility holding company systems would continue to be protected under other Federal statutes. The full disclosure and financial reporting requirements of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and, where applicable, the Trust Indenture Act of 1933 assure that adequate information will continue to be made available to the public in connection with the purchase or sale of the securities of public utility holding company systems.

In addition, State regulation can adequately protect the interests of consumers. State legislatures can and have enacted public utility legislation that, as implemented by State public utility commissions, protects the financial integrity of local public utilities and assures the reasonableness of charges included in the rate base, including charges made in transactions between the utility and other companies within the same holding company system.

I feel that Congress should review the need for the continued existence of the Public Utility Holding Company Act and that repeal of the act, as provided in my bill, should be seriously considered.

The text of the bill follows, along with a letter from SEC Chairman John S. R. Shad to Senator ALFONSE M. D'AMATO presenting the SEC's position in favor of repeal:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE

COMMISSION,

Washington, D.C., December 21, 1981.

Re proposals to Amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (S. 1869, S. 1870, and S. 1871).

HON. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Securities,
Committee on Banking, Housing and
Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN D'AMATO: In response to a request from your staff, I am writing to advise you of the Commission's general views relating to the above three bills. These bills would substantially reduce regulation under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. The Commission, however, unanimously believes that Congress should instead repeal the Act. Based on the information available to the Commission and its experience under the Act, we believe that this statute has served its basic purpose and that continued federal regulation of utility holding companies is unnecessary and inappropriate.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has administered the 1935 Act for nearly forty-seven years. There is a consensus—shared by the Commission—that the Commission's task of reorganizing the Nation's gas and electric utility holding company systems was completed twenty years ago. The Commission's administration of the Act in more recent years has primarily involved review of registered holding company financings, mergers, and acquisitions and the consideration of requests for exemptions from the Act. These remaining Commission responsibilities are intended to prevent recurrence of the abuses which led to the original passage of the Act. The Commission believes, however, that these abuses are unlikely to recur in light of the extensive changes since 1935 in the public utility and investment banking industries, the accounting profession, state utility regulation, expansion of the disclosure requirements under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the development of more efficient and well-informed securities markets. If the 1935 Act is repealed, all publicly-owned utility holding company systems will, of course, continue to be subject to the financial disclosure requirements and other provisions of the federal securities laws.

Moreover, certain features of the 1935 Act set it apart from the other statutes which the Commission administers. The federal securities laws focus primarily on disclosures to investors and on the integrity of the securities markets. In contrast, acquisitions, financings, and other actions by registered public utility holding company systems require prior Commission approval under the 1935 Act. The Commission must base its approval or disapproval of these transactions on its determination of their economic merits. Thus, unlike the other statutes it administers, the 1935 Act involves the Commission very deeply in the substance of fundamental management decisions.

Only twelve active holding company systems remain subject to direct regulation under the 1935 Act. The Act, however, continues to have significant influence on the financing and diversification decisions of a much larger portion of the industry. Approximately eighty holding company systems operate under various exemptions from the Act, and many utilities may be reluctant to form holding companies because

they would then have to register under the Act or qualify for an exemption. Furthermore, in this time of energy shortages and the recognized need to develop new energy resources, the Act may deter non-utilities from participating in cogeneration projects or other such activities because of the consequences of becoming subject to the Act.

The Commission finds it difficult to support any of the three legislative proposals presently before Congress because each primarily addresses only those aspects of the Act that affect one segment of the industry. Each would have the practical effect of virtually repealing the Act as it affects that particular industry segment. Taken together, the three proposals approach total repeal and would leave the Commission with responsibility for administering only the very limited surviving provisions of the Act with no clear regulatory purpose. None of the three proposals takes the further step of addressing the basic rationale for continued regulation under the Act.

For these reasons, it is appropriate and timely for Congress to revisit the 1935 Act. Congress should not, however, limit its evaluation to the merits of these specific proposals, but should also reexamine the underlying premises of the Act to determine the extent to which those premises have continuing viability today.

Because of the importance I attach to eliminating unnecessary regulatory burdens, I wanted to inform you promptly of the Commission's general positions on the pending bills. The Commission will submit a detailed, formal statement of views at an appropriate time. In the interim, if members of your staff would like additional information, they should contact our General Counsel, Edward F. Greene, or Elinor Gammon in the Office of the General Counsel.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. R. SHAD.

H.R. 6134

A bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that—

(1) the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 is no longer required to prevent the abuses and practices which led to its enactment;

(2) public gas and electric utilities organized as either exempt or nonexempt holding companies under such Act are subject to regulation under a broad array of other Federal and State laws which are adequate to prevent the recurrence of such abuses and practices and to protect consumers and investors;

(3) the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 unnecessarily impedes utility managers without regulatory benefit from making investment and operational decisions in a manner which best promotes the financial health of utilities and the reliability of their services to consumers; and

(4) the Congress, through appropriate oversight activities, can review the activities of Federal and State regulatory agencies to assure that the interests of investors and consumers are adequately protected and can take appropriate action to supplement those authorities should such action be determined to be necessary or appropriate.

SEC. 2. The Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (15 U.S.C. 79 et seq.; 49 Stat. 803) is repealed.

REPEAL OF RELATED PROVISION OF THE FEDERAL POWER ACT

SEC. 3. Section 318 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 825; 49 Stat. 863), providing an exemption from that Act for persons subject to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, is repealed.

SAVINGS PROVISION

SEC. 4. This Act shall not be construed to affect any enforcement proceeding instituted under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 prior to the date of enactment of this Act.●

PROBLEMS WITH THE LAW OF THE SEA: PART I

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the Convention on the Law of the Sea is presently meeting in New York to decide on a draft treaty which would regulate nearly every activity involving the oceans. This draft treaty, which has been referred to as the "Cartel of the Sea" and the "Global Money Grab" has been criticized by such diverse entities as the National Review, the New Republic, U.S. News & World Report, and the Wall Street Journal.

Unfortunately, much of the discussion has centered around those provisions of the draft treaty that deal with seabed mining. This ignores other serious problems which affect the U.S. fishing industry and the oil industry, to name two. I think that the Members of this House should recognize that this is not a simple argument over who gets to mine the ocean floor but rather a fight to prevent the giveaway of all ocean resources.

The following analysis of those portions of the draft treaty which affect the U.S. fishing industry was prepared by my staff. I ask that it be included in the RECORD so that Members can understand the dangers that we will face if this treaty is signed by the United States.

IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA ON THE U.S. FISHING INDUSTRY

In 1981, President Reagan announced that his administration would conduct a review of the proposed Convention on the Law of the Sea (CLOS) to determine whether U.S. interests were adequately protected. Upon completion of the review, the President identified six changes that he felt should be made for CLOS to be acceptable to the United States. These changes primarily dealt with deep sea mining. However, the problems with CLOS are much broader. In particular, ratification of CLOS by the U.S. would result in an unfavorable situation for the U.S. fishing industry.

Generally, the sections of CLOS having an effect on U.S. fishing interests are found

in Part V. Additional references are found in Part VI, Article 77; Part VII, Section 2; Part XV, Article 297; and Annex V, Section 2.

Part V establishes an exclusive economic zone (EEZ) for each coastal State extending 200 nautical miles from the baseline from which the territorial sea is measured.¹ This corresponds to the existing U.S. Fishery Conservation Zone (FCZ) established pursuant to the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MFCMA).

Within the EEZ, the coastal State has sovereign rights for the purpose of "exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing the natural resources, whether living or non-living, of the sea-bed and subsoil and superadjacent waters." This would seem to give a coastal State the authority to fully manage the fisheries within its EEZ. However, this is not necessarily the case.

Article 59 speaks to conflicts between a coastal State and other States within the coastal State's EEZ. While the language seems general enough, one needs to look further at Part XV and Annex V, Section 2, where one finds that the States involved may be forced into compulsory conciliation on matters concerning: 1) the determination of the total allowable catch; and 2) the allocation of the surplus to other States. This works directly against the "fish and chips" policy established in the MFCMA, whereby fisheries allocations to foreign States are based on certain criteria established by U.S. law. The "fish and chips" policy is the major tool available to the U.S. government for insuring that fisheries allocations result in benefits to the U.S. fishing industry in terms of market access (including the purchase of fish at sea from U.S. fishermen), cooperation in research, and technology transfer. At best, compulsory conciliation would delay the management process. At worst, it would force the U.S. to modify allocation policies in favor of other States that fish in the U.S. EEZ. For example, the "delayed release" policy adopted by the Department of State this year has come under attack by Japan and Korea. Since this policy involves the allocation of surplus fish, it would be a likely subject of dispute and thus conciliation. The easiest course for the Department of State to follow in this event would be to suspend the "delayed release" policy, regardless of the adverse effect on the U.S. fishing industry.

Article 62 further erodes the benefits available to the U.S. fishing industry under existing U.S. law. Paragraph 2 provides that coastal States shall give other States access to any surplus amount of fish which is not entirely harvested by the coastal State. Refusal to do so leads to the compulsory conciliation mentioned above. While full utilization of marine protein resources seems to be a laudable goal, experience has shown that, in the short term, a requirement for full utilization can prevent U.S. fishermen and fish processors from gaining access to markets because of competition with foreign-caught fish. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council and the Department of Commerce recognized this in 1980 by decreasing the optimum yield for tanner crab in the Bering Sea, thus prohibiting further Japanese harvest of tanner crab in the U.S. FCZ, even though U.S. fishermen did not harvest every last crab that

¹Note: For the purposes of the Convention, "State" refers to a nation, not a political subdivision of the United States.

might possibly be available. Although U.S. crab fishermen would presumably continue to be protected in view of the fact that tanner crabs are creatures of the continental shelf pursuant to Part VI, Article 77, CLOS would prevent future flexible use of optimum yield figures for economic gain involving other species.

Paragraph 3 of the same Article discusses the factors which should be considered by a coastal State in providing access to its resources. Although the list can be construed as being similar to the "fish and chips" language found in Section 201(e) of the MFCMA, there is one important distinction: the coastal State must consider the need to minimize economic dislocation of the nationals of other States who have traditionally fished in the EEZ. Thus, for example, the U.S. could be required to allow access to the EEZ by Japan, Korea, Mexico, and the Soviet Union, among others, even though it might not be in our best interest to do so. Further, the question would be raised as to what level of fishing by these countries is necessary to prevent economic dislocation.

Article 64, concerning highly migratory species, seems to provide some protection to U.S. tuna fishermen. However, the language is vague in regard to how access to tuna stocks is to be handled. Article 56 appears to grant jurisdiction over highly migratory species to the coastal States. Article 61 describes the management guidelines to be used. Articles 63 and 64 merely require coastal States to cooperate in conserving stocks and achieving optimum utilization. These Articles do not continue the protections for U.S. tuna fishermen that are not found in international practice and domestic law. Although the provisions of Article 62 requiring a minimization of economic dislocation may provide some protection to U.S. tuna fishermen, these same provisions work against the rest of the U.S. fishing industry. Further, Mexico, and perhaps other Latin American countries could point to other language in Article 62 which requires consideration of the significance of the living resources (i.e.—tuna) to the economy of the coastal State.

Finally, it should be noted that billfish are considered to be highly migratory species for the purposes of CLOS. This does not conform with domestic law. Thus, even if the case were made that highly migratory species were to be managed by international organizations, we would lose the control over billfish that is found in domestic law. Either way, some segment of the U.S. fishing industry would lose.

Article 66, dealing with stocks of anadromous fish, poses another problem. For many years, Japan has conducted a gillnet fishery for salmon in the Bering Sea and Western Pacific. Due to the intermingling of stocks, the gillnet fleets have harvested considerable numbers of salmon of North American origin, thus depriving U.S. and Canadian fishermen of fish in the near-shore fisheries. Both the U.S. and Canada have worked through the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission to decrease the Japanese high-seas harvest, with the goal of eventually ending such harvest. Under the terms of Article 66, however, coastal States must minimize the economic dislocation of other States which fish on anadromous stocks in all of the areas in which fishing has occurred. Further, Part VII, Article 116, grants States the right to allow their nationals to fish on the high seas. Thus, it is unlikely that sufficient pressure can be brought to bear to terminate the high seas gillnet fishery.

Articles 69 and 70 also work against the U.S. fishing industry. Pursuant to these articles, land-locked States and States with special geographic characteristics can gain access to the EEZ (and thus the fish stocks) of a coastal State in the same region, even though the coastal State may have the capacity to fully utilize all fisheries resources in its EEZ. Thus, the upper limit on harvesting capacity of a coastal State may be below that which could be biologically and economically sustained. To date, no definition of "region" has been developed. Pursuant to these Articles, coastal States eligible for special access to the U.S. EEZ might include Mexico ("western hemisphere region"), Cuba (Caribbean region), South Korea (Pacific region) or Bulgaria ("Western Europe and others" region).

In a recent appearance before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Ambassador James Malone, the head of the U.S. delegation at the CLOS Conference, indicated that the administration did not plan to reopen discussions on any of the fisheries issues in CLOS. He did suggest that some changes would be sought through consensus but that no attempt would be made to renegotiate any of the language dealing with fisheries. Given that the existing language is far more beneficial to foreign nations than it is to the U.S., it is highly unlikely that consensus can be achieved. Further, no attempt has yet been made by the U.S. delegation to seek such changes.

There have already been attempts by two nations (Japan and Korea) to change existing fisheries agreements in order to reflect language in CLOS, even though such changes would be contrary to U.S. law and policy. To date, the Department of State has refused to comply with these suggestions. However, if CLOS were to be signed and ratified by the U.S. with the fisheries language in its present form, these agreements would have to be changed, as would domestic law. Even if CLOS was not ratified by the Senate, there would be pressure on the U.S. government to change U.S. policies so as to reflect what would be new international law. This could be done fairly easily. For example, Section 201(e) of the MFCMA allows the Secretary of State to consider "other matters as he deems appropriate" when granting fishing allocations. This would allow the Secretary to consider the economic dislocation which might be suffered by Japan, for example, if allocations were reduced. This alone would be a serious setback to U.S. fisheries management efforts.

It appears that the U.S. fishing industry would fare better under existing domestic law and international policy than it would under CLOS. Thus, from the standpoint of the U.S. fishing industry, CLOS should either be changed significantly or rejected.●

A TRIBUTE TO OUR NATION'S VOLUNTEERS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, this National Volunteers Week we pay tribute to the thousands of Americans across the country who so unselfishly

give of their time, talents and energies.

I want to add my compliments, to those of my colleagues, to the people who have made life so much more livable and enjoyable for their fellow man and woman by their volunteer efforts.

Volunteers represent every race, creed, color, and social class—in essence, every phase of American life, and it is the spirit with which they so willingly serve that keeps this Nation strong.

During National Volunteer Week, I extend my sincere thanks to these individuals who ask so little, and yet give so much.●

TAX LEGISLATION

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to address the issue of tax deductions for conventions and business meetings held outside the United States.

The bill attempts to inject some reason into the determination of what meeting and convention expenses would be deductible, in contrast to the arbitrary rules and exemptions in the current Tax Code (section 274(h)) which are based primarily on artificial geographical considerations. I have consistently maintained that the test for deducting business convention expenses should be based on what goes on at the meetings, not where they are held.

I have no intention of opening the door for taxpayers to claim deductions for the cost of exotic junket vacations, disguised as a convention of some sort, and my bill contains language limiting deductions to legitimate business conventions. To qualify as a deductible expense under the terms of my bill, the purpose of a convention must be directly related to the active conduct of a taxpayer's trade or business, and the time spent at the convention must be primarily devoted to business-related activities, rather than social, leisure or recreational activities.

Only business-related expenses would be eligible for a deduction, and no deduction would be permitted for the cost of personal activities, such as social entertaining, sightseeing, or recreation, incidental to a business convention. No deduction would be permitted for expenses that are considered lavish or extravagant.

If the purpose of restrictions on deductions for foreign conventions is to eliminate abusive writeoffs for pleasure junkets, then the language of the Tax Code should be so directed. How-

ever, the current restrictions, adopted in 1980, permit deductions for conventions held in the United States, its possessions, Mexico, Canada, and now Jamaica—through a tax treaty agreement rather than a normal change in the Tax Code via an act of Congress. No expenses for conventions held in other countries are deductible under section 274(h) unless that it can be determined that it is as reasonable for the meeting to be held outside the North American area as within it. Such geographical factors have nothing to do with the nature of business conducted at a convention, and are quite arbitrary.

It seems obvious to me that an abusive junket convention can be held in Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Miami, or Acapulco just as easily as other locations not on the approved North American list. It is ironic that a taxpayer could be denied a deduction for attending a hard-working, legitimate business meeting in London or Bermuda and receive one for attending a leisurely convention in Mexico, Palm Springs, or Jamaica.

The denial of deductions for meetings and conventions held aboard cruise ships also appears to be misdirected. Most organizers of business meetings from whom I have heard agree that a meeting aboard a ship is far more conducive to conducting legitimate business than most locations on land. Those attending a meeting on a ship are essentially captive, and are far more likely to attend the meetings, seminars, and so forth, than they would be if they could wander off to the golf course or on a shopping trip.

The Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures recently examined the convention issue during consideration of a bill offered by my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GUARINI) to permit deductions for conventions held on board U.S.-flag cruise ships, H.R. 3191. While the bill is perhaps a step in the right direction in eliminating the current restrictions, it does point to the irrationality of permitting deductions for activities conducted in one place while denying deductions for identical activities held somewhere else. Allowing a deduction for a convention on a U.S. cruise ship but not on a foreign-flag ship operating in generally the same waters is clearly discriminatory, and could be considered a protectionist subsidy.

The U.S. travel and tourism industry generally does not want such protection, and the organizations who have contacted me support eliminating the geographical restrictions on convention deductions. In fact, concern has been expressed by some international organizations that other nations, particularly in Europe, might consider limiting the ability of their citizens to claim deductions for business conven-

tions held in the United States, in retaliation for the restriction we have enacted. In the interest of preserving free and open trade, our income tax laws should not include the discriminatory restrictions now contained in section 274(h).

I want to point out that President Reagan expressed similar sentiments in a November 1980 letter to the editor of *Travel Trade* magazine. In that letter, the President said, in part:

With respect to proposals intended to discourage American corporations from holding conventions outside the United States, my general approach is that such decisions should be left in the hands of business groups and companies themselves. Punitive taxes to restrict legitimate business expenses serve no useful purpose and constitute unwarranted interference by government into the decision-making prerogatives of the private sector.

In summary, there are many valid reasons for changing the section 274(h) restrictions on deductions for foreign convention expenses. The restrictions do nothing to eliminate deductions for junket conventions, an abuse that we all want to prohibit. They are arbitrary and discriminatory, based on artificial geographical factors. By discriminating against conventions held abroad, our Tax Code might be construed as contrary to principles of free trade, possibly in violation of our multilateral trade agreements. President Reagan has indicated his opposition to such restrictions on business activities.

It is my hope that this bill will serve as a vehicle for considering this issue, and I look forward to a more thorough and rational examination of the foreign convention deduction issue in the Committee on Ways and Means. ●

THE IRS STRIKES—WITH X-RATED BEHAVIOR

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have been outraged by the overzealous practices of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices. Passage of my bill H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA), will correct these overzealous actions and restore the public's confidence in our voluntary tax system.

The integrity of our tax system is often dependent upon the acts of its representatives or agents. Some examples of IRS agents' activities that damage this integrity and which management does not seem prone to root out have been made public in the press, whether it is the "mooning" of certain IRS agents as recently reported in the media or the following ac-

count of what appears to be a whole nest of "kinky" agents.

[From the New York Post, Oct. 28, 1981]

COPS SMASH KINKY IRS SEX RING

(By Mike Pearl, Charles Lachman and George Carpozi)

A phantom "movie producer" who has plagued the metropolitan area for more than six years by spanking thousands of college coeds in a phony search for the perfect "screamer," was unmasked yesterday as a Manhattan IRS collector.

Authorities suspect a number of other tax agents are involved in the widespread racket that produced tens of thousands of color photographs of the spankings he administered.

The photos were said to have been sold to girlie magazines, pornography stores in Times Square and distributed among IRS employes at 120 Church Street, Manhattan, where the agent worked.

He was arrested yesterday morning at the World Trade Center's Path Station by Manhattan District Attorney detectives Michael Lopez and James Lynam.

DA Robert M. Morgenthau identified the suspect as Stephen J. Davidson, 42, a \$50,000-a-year tax collector from Glen Rock, N.J.

He was charged with victimizing women undergraduates from NYU, CCNY, Columbia, Hofstra, and other colleges by inviting them for "auditions" in a studio he maintained on West 56th Street.

Last night, Davidson phoned a doleful plea to his home for bail money. His wife's angry response, according to a DA's source, was:

"I'm not getting you out on bail. I'm not coming to pick you up."

A DA's investigator told the *The Post* that Davidson's duties as a tax agent enable him to carry on the scam.

A 22-year old NYU student, Karen Carreras, played detective and cracked the case.

Miss Carreras, who works in the student employment office, tumbled onto the scam after Davidson listed his phony movie jobs and her fellow students complained.

"He seemed to get off on the spankings," the DA's investigator said. "He acted out elaborate fantasies. There were many sexual overtones, but so far we have no direct evidence of any overt sex."

However, he did have one "hangup," according to the prober.

"He always asked the girl afterward whether she got any sexual gratification from the spanking."

Davidson had what the investigator termed "way-out Victorian techniques."

"The girls, who were always topless, were always give a red micro-mini-skirt to wear, a straw boater's hat, and Peter Pan collar. He administered 25 spanks to each of his movie hopefuls, who really believed he was going to sign them to a film contract if they gave him the screams he wanted to hear.

"He would put the girls across his knee, lift their miniskirts, and slap their buttocks until they were screaming for mercy."

Davidson recorded all the sounds in addition to filming the "auditions," according to the DA's man.

The DA's office had heard bits and pieces about the phoney movie producer since 1975, but couldn't turn up leads on him.

Then two weeks ago—after an NYU girl answered the audition call—she went to Morgenthau's office and told her story to

Assistant DA Linda Fairstein, head of the Sex Crimes Unit.

With a search warrant, detectives entered Davidson's office and secreted a television camera in the false ceiling. While there, the probes culled office records and found lists of girls who had been given "auditions."

The women who complained, returned to the studio on Miss Fairstein's instructions, stepped into the paraphernalia Davidson supplied, and let herself be spanked—giving an Academy Award performance with her screams.

So far, from the names that came into their possession, the DA's probes have found 20 young women who admitted they were victimized by Davidson.

"We believe there are thousands of others," said Miss Fairstein. "Now that the story is out, we expect those who were too ashamed to come forward and complain, will do so at last."

The investigator who spoke with The Post shook his head.

"Would you believe the irony in this whole thing is that none of the girls had anything bad to say about Davidson for the spankings he gave them? They were merely angry because he didn't pay them." ●

NEED FOR 20-CENT INCREASE IN CIGARETTE EXCISE TAX

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the health effects of cigarette smoking cost the American economy billions of dollars annually. The Federal Government should do more to insure that those costs are borne by those who incur them.

The excise tax on cigarettes has been 8 cents per package since 1951. The Consumer Price Index has increased 260 percent in that period.

I have introduced H.R. 5629, which would increase the tax to 28 cents per package. Twelve of our colleagues have already joined in cosponsoring H.R. 5629.

The American Heart Association has prepared an excellent paper in support of the increase in the excise tax on cigarettes. I ask unanimous consent to include this paper at this point in the RECORD. I urge the Members of this House to review the paper and join with us in supporting an increase in the cigarette excise tax.

CIGARETTE SMOKING, HEALTH AND THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX

I. CIGARETTE SMOKING HEALTH FACTS

Cigarette smoking is the single most preventable cause of premature death and illness in the United States.

Cigarette smoking is a causal factor for coronary heart disease and arteriosclerotic peripheral vascular disease.

Cigarette smoking causes cancer of the lung, larynx and cavity and esophagus, and chronic bronchitis and emphysema.

Maternal smoking is associated with retarded fetal growth, an increased risk for spontaneous abortion and prenatal death.

Cigarette smoking acts synergistically with oral contraceptives to enhance the probability of coronary and cerebrovascular disease; with alcohol to increase the risk of cancer and with occupational hazards (such as asbestos, cotton dusts) to increase the risk of a variety of diseases.

Cigarette smoking accounts for over 300,000 premature deaths per year and accounts for the disability of an additional ten million persons.

II. THE ECONOMIC COSTS OF CIGARETTE SMOKING

Cigarette smoking continues to place a heavy burden on not only the health of the American people but also on the health care system and on the economic productivity of the Nation as a whole. As was pointed out in both the 1979, "Surgeon General's Report on Smoking and Health," and the more recent "Smoking, Tobacco, and Health; a Fact Book," smokers are ill more often than nonsmokers, lose more days from work and are more apt to suffer from chronic conditions which limit activity. The National Center for Health Statistics estimated that each year, "an excess of nearly 150 million days in bed are due to the extra amounts of illness experienced by cigarette smokers who also have more than 81 million "excess" days of absenteeism."

Although it has been difficult to estimate the actual costs of cigarette smoking on the American people and the economy some attempts have been made. One thing is for certain however, and that is that the costs are high. The National Center for Health Statistics has recently compiled some figures which although they are approximations highlight the economic and health burdens imposed on the Nation by cigarette smoking. These are noted below:

1. 1980 Estimated Medicare and Medicaid Expenditures for Persons Suffering from Tobacco-related Diseases.

Luce and Schweitzer (in New England Journal of Medicine, March 9, 1978, v. 298, no. 10, 569-571) estimated health care costs of smoking at \$8,224,000,000, for 1976.

The Health Care Financing Administration estimated total Personal Health Care Expenditures at \$131,276,000,000 in 1976 (Health Care Financing Review, Summer 1980).

Thus, costs of smoking were 6.2 percent of total expenditures in 1976.

In 1980 HCFA estimates Medicare expenditures at \$35.6 billion and Medicaid expenditures at \$25.3 billion for a total of \$60.9 billion. Taking 6.2 percent of this total gives an estimate of \$3.78 billion of Medicare and Medicaid expenditures for persons suffering from smoking.

2. Medical Costs of Smoking.

The Health Care Financing Administration estimates personal health care expenditures at \$131 billion in 1976 and \$218 billion in 1980, an increase of 66 percent between 1976 and 1980.

The Luce and Schweitzer study estimated medical costs due to smoking at \$8.2 billion in 1976. Inflating this by the 66 percent increase in personal health care expenditures between 1976 and 1980 gives an estimate for medical care costs of smoking in 1980 of \$13.6 billion.

3. Value of Production Lost Due to Smoking.

The Luce and Schweitzer study estimated production lost because of smoking at \$19.1 billion in 1976. The primary factor that would cause this to increase between 1976 and 1980 is the increase in worker earnings. Between 1976 and 1980 private sector earn-

ings increased 35 percent (Employment and Earnings, v. 28, no. 6, June 1981, p. 1971).

Inflating lost production in 1976 by the increase in earnings gives an estimate for 1980 of the value of production lost due to smoking of \$25.8 billion.

4. Social Security Beneficiaries and Families Receiving Disabled-worker Allowances.

The Luce and Schweitzer study considers neoplasms, disease of the circulatory system, and diseases of the respiratory system to be related to smoking with the factor being 20 percent for neoplasms, 25 percent for diseases of the circulatory system and 40 percent for diseases of the respiratory system. In 1975 the Social Security Administration allowed benefits to 592,049 disabled workers. (Characteristics of Social Security Disability Insurance Beneficiaries, 1975, SSA Pub. No. 13-11947, December 1979). This included 59,821 for neoplasms, 117,276 for diseases of the circulatory system, and 39,472 for diseases of the respiratory system.

Applying the Luce and Schweitzer factors for smoking to the number of disability allowances: (.20) of (59,821) equals 11,964 for (Neoplasms); (.25) of (117,276) equals 44,319 for (Circulatory); and (.40) of (39,472) equals 15,789 for (Respiratory) for a total of 72,072.

This gives an estimated number of allowances due to smoking of 72,072 or 12 percent of the total allowances.

As of December 31, 1978 there were 4.87 million disabled worker beneficiaries (Social Security Bulletin, v. 44, no. 6, June 1981, p. 90). Multiplying this by 12 percent gives 584,000 beneficiaries receiving allowances due to smoking. As of December 31, 1978 there were 2.88 million disabled-worker families. Multiplying this by 12 percent gives 346,000 disabled-worker families receiving allowances due to smoking.

Summing Up Some of the Approximations by the NCHS:

	[In billions of dollars]	
	1976	1980
Total medical costs due to smoking.....	8.2	13.6
Lost productivity due to smoking.....	19.1	25.8
Total.....	27.3	39.4
Cost to medicare and medicaid program.....		3.78

III THE FEDERAL CIGARETTE EXCISE TAX

The present federal excise tax of 8 cents per package was first imposed in 1951 and has not changed in the intervening thirty year period.

In 1951 the cigarette excise tax yielded 2.7 percent of all federal revenue but today accounts for about only 0.6 percent.

Each year there are over 600 billion cigarettes or over 30 billion packages of cigarettes sold in this country. Cigarette consumption has continued to climb since the beginning of this century. For example, in 1915 only about 18 billion cigarettes were consumed in this country.

Since 1951 when the 8 cent tax was first imposed federal revenues have continued to grow—the increase being tied to the increased consumption. Increased consumption has in turn resulted in an increase in death and disabilities which has added to health care costs and lost productivity.

Federal tax collected on cigarettes (1951-80)

	Thousands
1951.....	\$1,294,000
1952.....	1,474,100
1953.....	1,586,800

	Thousands
1954.....	1,513,700
1955.....	1,504,200
1956.....	1,549,000
1957.....	1,610,900
1958.....	1,668,200
1959.....	1,771,100
1960.....	1,863,600
1961.....	1,923,500
1962.....	1,956,500
1963.....	2,010,500
1964.....	1,976,700
1965.....	2,069,700
1966.....	2,006,500
1967.....	2,023,100
1968.....	2,066,200
1969.....	2,082,100
1970.....	2,036,100
1971.....	2,149,500
1972.....	2,151,200
1973.....	2,221,000
1974.....	2,383,000
1975.....	2,261,100
1976.....	2,434,800
1977.....	2,279,200
1978.....	2,374,100
1979.....	2,356,100
1980.....	2,604,400

Source: "The Tax Burden," Tobacco Tax Council (1980).

COMPARISON OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAX WITH MEDICAL COST AND LOST PRODUCTIVITY DUE TO CIGARETTE SMOKING

	1976	1980	Percent change
Federal excise tax (all tobacco products).....	\$2,487,900,000	\$2,648,300,000	+6.4
Medical costs due to smoking.....	8,200,000,000	13,600,000,000	+66
Lost economic productivity due to smoking.....	19,100,000,000	25,800,000,000	+35

Comparison of Federal, State and local taxes on cigarettes with total health care costs and care and lost economic productivity due to cigarette smoking 1980

Federal, State and local excise taxes on cigarettes, \$6,551,084,000.

Health care costs and lost economic productivity due to cigarette smoking, \$39,400,000,000.

The Federal cigarette excise tax compared with the changes of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) 1951-80

Federal Excise Tax: No change.
Consumer Price Index: (rate of inflation), +255.9 percent.

TAXES (STATE AND FEDERAL) AS A PERCENT OF ACTUAL RETAIL PRICE OF CIGARETTES 1954-78

Year	Cents per pack			Taxes as percent of actual retail price ¹
	Weighted average price	Equivalent 1967 prices ²	State and Federal taxes	
1954.....	22.7	28.2	11.0	48.7
1955.....	23.2	28.9	11.0	47.4
1956.....	23.8	29.2	11.0	48.8
1957.....	25.0	29.7	12.0	48.0
1958.....	25.6	29.6	12.0	46.6
1959.....	26.1	29.9	13.0	48.9
1960.....	26.3	29.4	13.0	48.6
1961.....	26.9	30.0	13.0	48.3
1962.....	26.8	29.6	13.0	49.3
1963.....	27.9	30.4	14.0	49.3
1964.....	28.2	30.4	14.0	49.3
1965.....	30.0	31.8	16.0	51.4
1966.....	30.5	31.4	16.0	50.8
1967.....	32.3	32.3	16.0	49.2
1968.....	32.8	31.5	16.0	48.7
1969.....	37.1	33.8	18.0	47.7
1970.....	38.9	33.4	19.0	46.8
1971.....	40.0	33.0	20.0	47.7
1972.....	40.3	32.2	20.0	48.4
1973.....	41.8	31.4	20.0	47.6

TAXES (STATE AND FEDERAL) AS A PERCENT OF ACTUAL RETAIL PRICE OF CIGARETTES 1954-78—Continued

Year	Cents per pack			Taxes as percent of actual retail price ¹
	Weighted average price	Equivalent 1967 prices ²	State and Federal taxes	
1974.....	44.5	30.1	20.0	44.5
1975.....	47.9	29.7	20.0	41.4
1976.....	49.2	28.9	20.0	40.5
1977.....	54.3	29.9	20.0	37.1
1978.....	56.8	29.4	20.0	35.5

¹ Calculations by Office on Smoking and Health.
Source: Tobacco Tax Council, Inc.

No one will disagree with the view that this country's economy is undergoing some very difficult times. With the Social Security System said to be close to crumbling it does not make sense for the federal government (through taxpayer dollars) to continue to pay for unnecessary health care costs or for businesses to pay for lost economic productivity that results from the number one preventable cause of death and disability in the country—cigarette smoking.

Our free enterprise system and in particular the mood of the present Administration to keep government out of the private sector whenever possible will not allow the cigarette to be banned from the market place nor is such action a realistic alternative. However, it is equally not right for the American taxpayer to bear the burden of increased costs and lost productivity that results from the use of cigarettes.

The need for a cigarette—user tax

The Tobacco Tax Council in its most recent edition of *The Tax Burden on Tobacco* (1980) noted that there is an "injustice imposed upon cigarette users who secure no special benefits by virtue of their paying the tax." (Emphasis added.)

Presently the 8 cent tax revenue goes into the general treasury, and therefore is only very indirectly being applied to the costs attributable directly to cigarette smoking. If the federal cigarette excise tax is to be increased it is important that the increase be levied for the purposes of earmarking the revenue to those particular areas where those who pay the taxes may benefit in a positive way. Such a "user tax" could be earmarked for the purposes of paying medical expenses associated with cigarette smoking as well as funding a moderate educational program through the Department of Health and Human Services aimed at informing persons about the specific dangers associated with cigarette smoking.

The Issue of Elasticity

One of the arguments which has been made against a substantial increase in the present 8 cent tax is that it will be seriously disruptive to the tobacco market. How disruptive will of course depend upon the size of the increase.

Great Britain has recently increased its tax on cigarettes in a two step process by close to 30 cents per package, bringing the average retail price of a package of cigarettes to \$1.75. Tobacco company executives in Great Britain have reported that the increase in the tax has resulted in a decrease in consumption by 10 percent.

Assuming that the British and American smokers are comparable we could, based on a twenty cent or less increase, expect to see less than a 10 percent disruption. It should also be pointed out that the average price of a package of cigarettes would be \$.83 with the twenty cent increase while the average price in Great Britain as we noted above is \$1.75.

Studies on the elasticity of demand for cigarettes have made varying estimates. This is because price is only one factor in determining whether or not a person will continue to smoke. Other social, psychological and economic concerns enter the picture and such influences varying from person to person.

Projected revenues based upon estimate of 30 billion packages of cigarettes sold:

28¢ tax (CPI)—Estimated total revenues, \$8,400,000,000; 25¢ tax—Estimated total revenues, \$7,500,000,000; and 18¢ tax—Estimated total revenues, \$5,400,000,000.●

WOMEN AND CHILDREN: ALONE AND IN POVERTY

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic findings of the changing demographics of our Nation is the increasing "feminization" of poverty. Increasingly, it is women who find themselves mired in poverty. Female-headed households have the highest incidence of poverty of any type of households. Thus, the budget cuts in support and income assistance programs are especially damaging to women and their children. I submit today a report published by the late National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity entitled: "Women and Children: Alone and in Poverty." Other Members will be submitting individual sections of this valuable document. I urge my colleagues to study this report and heed its findings.

WOMEN AND CHILDREN: ALONE AND IN POVERTY

(By Diana Pearce and Harriette McAdoo)

FINANCIAL SUPPORTS IN FEMALE-HEADED FAMILIES

Ironically, as the proportion of female family heads who are widows has decreased, the financial and social security of widows has increased. Table 2 indicates the wide variation in the incidence of poverty by marital status, which reflects class differences (desertion is often the "divorce" of the poor) and the different sources of support each marital status group receives.

TABLE 2.—TYPE OF FAMILY IN 1980 AND 1970 AND MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN 1979 AND 1969 BY RACE: UNITED STATES

Year and race	All families	Married couple families		Male householder, no wife present	Female householder, no husband present
		Wife in paid labor force	Wife not in paid labor force		
PERCENT					
All races:					
1980.....	100.0	40.7	41.8	2.9	14.6
1970.....	100.0	34.1	52.6	2.4	10.9
Black:					
1980.....	100.0	32.8	22.7	4.3	40.2
1970.....	100.0	36.3	31.8	3.7	28.3

TABLE 2.—TYPE OF FAMILY IN 1980 AND 1970 AND MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN 1979 AND 1969 BY RACE: UNITED STATES—Continued

Year and race	All families	Married couple families		Male householder, no wife present	Female householder, no husband present
		Wife in paid labor force	Wife not in paid labor force		
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME					
All races:					
1979	\$21,521	\$24,973	\$17,791	\$16,888	\$9,933
1969 ¹	\$18,677	\$23,025	\$17,580	\$16,513	\$9,547
Black:					
1979	\$11,648	\$20,704	\$11,616	\$12,497	\$6,907
1969 ¹	\$9,916	\$15,099	\$9,277	\$10,287	\$5,523
Black as percent of all races:					
1979	54.1	82.9	65.3	74.0	69.5
1969	53.1	65.6	52.8	62.3	57.9

¹ In terms of 1979 dollars.
Source: Paul Glick (Senior Demographer, Bureau of Census), "A Demographic Picture of Black Families," in Harriette McAdoo (ed.) *Black Families*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers, 1981.

The typical outcome of a marital breakup in a family with children is that the man becomes single, while the woman becomes a single parent. Unlike widows whose economic loss has been made less devastating by Social Security, including Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Old Age Survivor Disability Insurance (OASDI), other groups of single parents rarely find private and public transfers sufficient to make up the deficit.

A national survey in 1975 found that only 25 percent of those eligible actually received child support, and that 60 percent of those who did, received less than \$1,500.²⁶ These awards tend to be low, in part because they are based on the needs of two-parent families with no child day care costs, and in part because judges permit the absent parent to deduct the cost of maintaining his household—including the costs of time payments on cars, recreation and entertainment—from what he would pay as child support. The result is that half the fathers who did pay support were contributing less than 10 percent of their income.

In the group of single families that result from divorce, black women fared worst in terms of child-support payments. Child-support payments were awarded by the court to 71 percent of the white women, 44 percent of the Hispanic women, and only 29 percent of the black women. The level of support payments showed the same pattern: The white mother was awarded \$2,800; the Hispanic mother, \$1,320; and the black mother \$1,290.

Poorly educated women are less likely to receive alimony, child support or maintenance payments.²⁷ Less than half of the 12 million divorced women received property following divorce, but in 1979 the median value of property received was only \$4650.²⁸

For the 1.4 million mothers who have never been married, the situation is extremely bleak. Only 8 percent were slated to receive support, and only 5 percent ever received any payments.²⁹

For women who rely on public transfer payments, the picture is equally dismal. Depending on the state, welfare payments range from 49 to 96 percent of the poverty level.³⁰ The average family payment in 1977 was \$241 per month. (The average size of a family on welfare is approximately three persons.)³¹ The real value of the average welfare payment, accounting for inflation

and the declining size of recipient households, has decreased by approximately 20 percent in the last decade.³² Table 3 shows payment levels of some states. Female-headed families that were maintained on non-employed income averaged \$5314 in 1978, while all female-headed families averaged \$10,689.

TABLE 3.—Maximum monthly AFDC payments per mother with 2 children, Jan. 5, 1981 (by State)

	Maximum Payment
Mississippi.....	\$96
Alabama.....	118
Texas.....	118
Illinois.....	302
Indiana.....	255
District of Columbia.....	286
New York.....	394
Maine.....	279
North Dakota.....	334
Arizona.....	200
California.....	463
Washington:	
Area I.....	442
Area II.....	408
Virginia:	
Region I.....	217
Region II.....	237
Region III.....	288

Source: Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law, Memorandum to Welfare Specialists: "AFDC—A Review of Current States Needs Standards and Maximum Benefits" (1029 Vermont Ave., NW., Washington, D.C. 20005), Jan. 5, 1981.

These amounts stand in stark contrast to the average income for families headed by men (including husband-wife families), which was \$21,703.³³ While death halts the "private transfer," or sharing of income from husband to wife, divorce or desertion has virtually the same effect on a woman's economic status. The woman whose former partner is still alive is likely to be more devastated economically than a widow, whose plight is addressed through Social Security and other assistance programs.

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) originally grew out of concern about the damage the loss of a father would be to the family, yet today there is virtually no sanction, either legal or informal, against the father who contributes little or nothing for the support of his offspring. Nor, where fathers cannot or will not pay, is the attempt to ameliorate the poverty of the mothers and children even minimally adequate.

STRESS, POVERTY, AND THE SINGLE MOTHER

The most vulnerable aspect of the female-headed home with minor children is finances. All families of all races experienced a loss of real income between 1973 and 1978.³⁴ The lower income of black families, and specifically black female-headed families, placed many at or below the poverty level (Table 1). To meet even the most minimal developmental needs of children and mothers, the family support system must be augmented by external resources. Since not all single mothers function with a kin-help network, their support needs must be augmented by community-based programs.

Research has shown that single-parent mothers experience a level of stress significantly higher than that experienced by other groups. Within the single-parent mother population, those who have never been married experience even greater strain. Their children, often the result of out-of-wedlock teenage pregnancies, are born into the most precarious mother-child units in our society. Several authors have

detailed the unfavorable physical, emotional and social impact of teenage pregnancy.³⁵

The ecology of the black family predisposes it to continuous stress, in addition to the normal developmental strains experienced by all families. Despite the cultural preference for meeting crises and family needs within the extended kin-help network and then through friends, families may often experience a level of stress and lowered personal satisfaction that forces them to seek assistance from the wider community.

Even when they were well above the poverty level, single mothers in one study experienced significantly more tension than those who were married.³⁶

The stress experienced by low-income mothers is occasioned by crises as well as ongoing conditions—especially insufficient money to meet basic human needs. On a checklist of 91 life events requiring change and readjustment, most community surveys have shown that individuals experience an average of two such events a year.³⁷ In contrast, mothers in a Boston study of 43 black and white low-income women reported an average of 14 such events during the past two years.³⁸ Though their lives included violent and emotionally exhausting events, the lack of money took greatest toll on their mental and physical health. Depression levels were high in these women living in high-density, high-crime urban areas.

A later study showed that working-class single mothers who were employed but still earned salaries that placed them just above the poverty level, were under extreme stress caused by finances, housing concerns and problems at work, in that order.³⁹ Many felt they were underpaid but wanted to work because, as one woman stated, she had once been on welfare and that was "the worst experience in my life." Safe, dependable and affordable/subsidized child day care was needed. Mothers tended to be particularly bothered by the conflicting demands of motherhood, employment and their social and private lives.

EXTENDED FAMILY HELP PATTERNS

One of the strongest black and ethnic-minority cultural patterns is extensive help systems. The family's effective environment is composed of a network of relatives, friends and neighbors that provide emotional support and economic supplements and, most important, protects the family's integrity from assault by external forces.

Viewing the higher proportion of one-parent families as unstable ignores the extended family adaptation bonds.⁴⁰ Many groups maintain a strong extended family system despite mobility.⁴¹ Only recently have researchers begun to recognize similar patterns in black families. Functionality of the home is positively related to the parent's ability to manipulate the American economic system. The black extended family has demonstrated that it is a source of strength and a protection against isolation in the larger society.⁴²

The degree of kin interaction is often overlooked in research studies that focus only on structural features. There is a need to determine the norms and values of family interaction and to examine how the process related to the forces shaping it.⁴³ The kinship network is more than an extension of family relationships.⁴⁴ It can be considered a system of social relationships derived from birth and marriage and pertaining to an individual's place in society. The major activity of the kin network is the exchange of ma-

Footnotes at end of article.

terial and nonmaterial help. Friends and relatives often support the mother's activities outside of the home, but they may not attempt to intervene as a family member might do. They also care for the children when the mother must be alone or when she attempts to establish a social life.

The use of social networks has been shown to be important to the functioning of successful single parents.⁴⁵ In one study, the support system and proven coping patterns of single Puerto Rican mothers were found to be most important to maintaining their stability. Their support structures were composed of their relatives (usually their mothers and sisters), boyfriends or former husbands, neighbors and religious beliefs. Ability to control their own fertility and the ability to participate in community affairs and advanced education were most helpful.

Of course, inherent in any support is a degree of reciprocity. These informal supports are often the only means of survival for a mother working outside the home. Not all mothers live near relatives or desire to be totally dependent upon kin. The ties they form with other mothers and close friends increase their ability to cope with the stress of their multiple roles.

Many tactics are used to increase the number of individuals who share in the reciprocal obligations. Enlarging the circle of persons who may be called upon in cases of need beyond the household increases the security of the individual. The "friend-network" can be considered a kind of community, a social world outside of the single parent's home.⁴⁶

While often emotionally supportive, the extended family can provide only limited financial help to a poor family in poverty, for kin networks are not responsible for creating or alleviating poverty itself.

FOOTNOTES

⁴⁵ Joanne Schulman, "Poor Women and Family Law," Clearinghouse Review, February 1981.

⁴⁶ Child Support and Alimony, Special Study, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-23, No. 106, 1978.

⁴⁷ "Divorced Women: The Myth of Alimony, Property Settlements and Child Support," Marriage and Divorce Today, November 24, 1980.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Sar A. Levitan, Programs in Aid of the Poor for 1980's, Fourth Edition, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press) 1980.

⁵⁰ Dorothy T. Lang, "Poor Women and Health Care," Clearinghouse Review, February 1981.

⁵¹ Unpublished memorandum.

⁵² Characteristics of the Population, op. cit.

⁵³ The Status of Children, Youth and Families, 1979, op. cit.

⁵⁴ W. Hambridge, "Teen Clinics," Obstetrics and Gynecology, Vol. 43, No. 3, 1974; M. Lane, "Contraception for Adolescents," Family Planning Perspectives, Vol. No. 1, Winter 1973; and J. Dravits and S. Smith, "The Acceptance of a Family Clinic by Recently Delivered Teenagers," Southern Medical Journal, Vol. 67, No. 7, July 1974.

⁵⁵ H. McAdoo, "Factors Related to Stability in Upwardly Mobile Black Families," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 40, No. 4, 1978.

⁵⁶ B. Dohrenwend, "Social Status and Stressful Life Events," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 28, 1973.

⁵⁷ E. Bell, et al., "Depression and Low-Income Female-Headed Families," Families Today, Vol. 1, NIMG Science Monograph, (Rockville, Md.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services) 1979.

⁵⁸ H. McAdoo, "Role of Black Women in Maintaining Stability and Mobility in Black Families," L. Rose (Ed.), The Black Woman: Current Research and Theory, (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications) May 1980.

⁵⁹ C. Hamilton, "Just How Unstable is the Black Family?" The New York Times, August 1, 1971.

⁶⁰ M. Sussman, Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin) 1974.

⁴² R. Hills, The Strengths of Black Families, (New York: Emerson Hall) 1971.

⁴³ R. Staples, The Black Women in America, (Chicago: Nelson Hall Publishing) 1973.

⁴⁴ E. Farber, Kinship and Class, (New York: Basic Books) 1971.

⁴⁵ A. Barry, "A Research Project on Successful Single-Parent Families," American Journal of Family Therapy, Vol. 7, No. 3, Fall, pp. 65-73.●

U.S. ENERGY POLICY DOES NOT REFLECT REAL WORLD

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, as we confront the task of expanding our energy supply options in the 1980's, it is vital to our national security and economic well-being that we do everything possible to take extra care not to impede the development of alternative energy sources.

According to the Department of Energy, the United States relied on fossil fuels—oil, gas, and coal—for 92 percent of its energy consumed in 1980. Hydropower and geothermal energy accounted for an additional 4.3 percent of our energy consumption. Nuclear power, despite past Government subsidies running in the billions of dollars, accounted for only 3.7 percent of our 1980 energy consumption.

The fact that we only reduced our dependence on fossil fuels since the Arab oil embargo 10 years ago from 96 percent to 92 percent does not mean that our efforts in those years were a failure. In fact, I happen to believe that we are on the verge of a major breakthrough in the development of alternate energy sources. These breakthroughs clearly are due to the leadership and investments our Federal Government has made in the past decade.

Perhaps more now than ever before, Federal Government involvement is needed to bring promising new energy technologies to the marketplace. Because of current high interest rates and the scarcity of private capital, the current investment climate in the United States is not conducive to the development of many of these new technologies that show such great promise.

Critics are quick to say that solar energy, alcohol fuels, decentralized power generation, and other small scale energy projects cannot cut it in the marketplace. Commonsense and experience, however, tells us that decentralized energy sources, including conservation, can and will make a large impact on our energy future. All we need to do is release these technologies from the restrictive Federal policies that are holding back their development. We must balance out or eliminate the huge Federal subsidies that our Government hands out to favored

energy options, such as fossil fuels and nuclear power.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out what the administration is planning to do to the photovoltaic research and development program at the Department of Energy. Photovoltaics is an exciting energy technology first developed in this country as part of our early space exploration efforts. In the past decade the cost of photovoltaic systems have been reduced to the point of being price competitive for installation in developing countries. They are already used in communications systems and other remote access applications throughout the world.

The Department of Energy projected that photovoltaics would be economical for domestic residential use here in the United States in the mid-1980's. Now that goal is in jeopardy.

In recent years the budgets for DOE's photovoltaic research programs were:

\$150,045,000—Fiscal year 1980
\$160,200,000—Fiscal year 1981

For fiscal years 1982 and 1983 the Department of Energy has proposed to cut the photovoltaic research budget to:

\$53,000,000—Fiscal year 1982
\$27,000,000—Fiscal year 1983

These cuts obviously reflect the Reagan administration's intention to dismantle one of the Federal Government's most soundly conceived and well managed research and development programs.

"Soundly conceived and well managed" are the words of the Solar photovoltaic Energy Advisory Committee (SPEAC), a group of businessmen and energy experts that reports directly to the Secretary of Energy, making recommendations as to the course of DOE's photovoltaic programs. SPEAC states in its October 30, 1981, report to Energy Secretary James Edwards:

A cutback of the scope and severity now being contemplated would seriously retard progress in the near term and would jeopardize national preeminence in the field in the long term, with adverse economic consequences.

Much of the activity in the private sector has been undertaken in response to enthusiastic government leadership, not simply government support. The result has been vigorous and wholesome growth. This healthy trend is on the verge of being destroyed.

The retrenchment that is setting in occurs at a most-inopportune moment. Instability in other regions of the world upon which the Nation is dependent for energy supplies emphasizes the continuing importance of renewable energy sources. If the government program in photovoltaics is abandoned now, the results would be economically and politically detrimental both domestically and abroad.

In view of all that is transpiring, we believe that continuing vigorous federal effort in photovoltaics is clearly required to undergird and complement work in the private sector. Private industry still needs to be en-

couraged by sustaining the climate for growth. In summary, it is important that the federal presence be maintained at a level of funding commensurate with the benefits that photovoltaics now clearly offer.

In stark contrast to the United States, other nations are developing rational energy strategies that balance near-term needs with long-range goals. I attended the United Nations Conference on Energy in Kenya last summer as an official observer for Congress. The consensus at the conference was that renewable energy sources, most notably photovoltaics, will provide the long-term energy solutions that will emerge in the coming years. Many of our Nation's world economic competitors are designing their national energy and economic plans to meet the challenge of supplying the world market with renewable energy technologies.

I quote now from a Japanese Trade Center Information Service report dated March 17, 1980:

[Our greatest national priority is to establish long term energy security. For that purpose, diversification of energy sources and conservation of energy are essential.

Japan must seek to diversify sources of oil supply as well as to develop alternative and new energy sources, to increase stockpiles and to step up energy conservation efforts. . . . Japan must emphasize investment in energy measures and technological development. Japan must stimulate investment by the private sector in equipment for energy conservation.

We need to develop and introduce local energy sources including solar energy, geothermal energy, small and medium-scale hydroelectric power plants, factory waste heat, methane reproduced by fermenting waste, wave power, wind power, tidal power and biomass.

This Japanese trade document goes on to describe their government's role in the development of these alternative energy technologies:

In the area of energy-related technologies and in other pressing areas requiring a large amount of development funds, the government must launch national projects on its own initiatives.

Efforts must be made to increase the budget available for research and development of (alternative energy) technologies.

Recognizing that research and development of technologies are for the nation's best interest, the government must make every effort to find a new source of funds for funding such projects.

This national resolve on the part of the Japanese Government is in dramatic contrast to our present administration's reliance on the laissez-faire approach to our energy future. I quote from the Reagan administration's national energy plan:

Public spending for energy-related purposes is secondary to ensuring that the private sector can respond to market realities. The collective judgment of properly motivated technical innovators, businessmen, and consumers is generally superior to any form of centralized programming. Public spending is appropriate (and will continue)

in long term research with high risks, but potentially high payoffs. In most cases, however, using public funds to subsidize either domestic energy production or conservation buys little additional security and only diverts capital, workers and initiative from uses that contribute more to society and the economy.

It was obvious at the United Nations World Energy Conference that the United States stands alone in this hands-off energy philosophy. Both the lesser-developed countries and the other industrial nations of the world are following the Japanese approach by encouraging the development and commercialization of alternative energy resources. The U.S. Government meanwhile, is pursuing the hazardous course of committing us to such harmful near-term solutions as nuclear power, questionable synthetic fuels programs, and increased use of nonrenewable fossil fuels. This dangerously echoes the attitudes that got us into our energy mess in the first place. Our present national energy plan commits us even further to the capital intensive, centralized energy systems that pollute our environment, encourage monopoly pricing by a limited group of suppliers, and continue our dependence on scarce and unstable fuel sources.

Again in contrast to other nations' energy policies, we are slashing budgets for energy conservation, solar, geothermal, hydroelectric power, biomass, wind, ocean thermal, and energy storage research and development efforts. While development of these decentralized technologies is being discouraged by the Reagan administration, centralized energy sources such as nuclear power and synthetic fuels are being subsidized by billion dollar Government research and development outlays and multibillion-dollar tax breaks.

This is a very critical period for our society. I believe the future course of events in the world may well be determined by how we approach our long-term energy supply problems. The health of our economy and our national security are at stake. It disturbs me greatly that the priorities set by this administration are so inadequate and shortsighted. ●

DR. SAMI I. SAID, CHIEF OF THE PULMONARY DISEASE SECTION, OKLAHOMA CITY VA MEDICAL CENTER, WILLIAM S. MIDDLETON AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 14, 1982, the Veterans' Administration's highest honor

for medical research, the William S. Middleton Award, was presented to Sami I. Said, M.D., Chief of the Pulmonary Disease Section at the Oklahoma City VA Medical Center.

Dr. Said, an endocrinologist and pulmonary physiologist, received the award at a special ceremony in Washington, D.C. The award, named for the late Dr. Middleton, a researcher, clinician and educator who led the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery from 1955 to 1963, was presented by VA Administrator Robert P. Nimmo.

Dr. Said was one of the first to look at the lung as something more than an animated bellows. He has worked to demonstrate the metabolic nature of the lungs and has shown that the lung is the site for the synthesis, metabolism, and release of biologically active substances that play a role in several serious pulmonary disorders.

In his acceptance remarks at the Middleton ceremony, Dr. Said noted that, "Today there is a growing consensus that this type of research holds the clue to many of the remaining mysteries or unsolved problems of lung disease, including emphysema, bronchial asthma, and some forms of pulmonary edema."

His research could have a major impact on veterans' health problems. VA has more than 41,000 veterans on its rolls with disabilities due to emphysema and bronchial asthma, and in fiscal year 1982, more than 5,600 veterans were treated and discharged from the agency's medical centers for these ailments.

Dr. Said also participated in the discovery of vasoactive intestinal peptide (VIP). This is one of the first peptides identified outside of the nervous system that has wide neurotransmitter and neuroregulatory effects. Dr. Said's characterization and assay for VIP have become benchmarks for the identification of a growing number of peptides.

Dr. Said's clinical and research careers have been closely associated with the VA. After serving as a pulmonary consultant to the Richmond VA Medical Center from 1970-71, he became Chief of the Pulmonary Disease Section at the Dallas VA Medical Center from 1971 to 1981. He has been Chief of the Pulmonary Disease Section at Oklahoma City since July 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dr. Said on receiving the Middleton Award. It is the dedication and accomplishments of individuals like him who are responsible for the excellence of the VA's medical research program. ●

THE IRS STRIKES—AND PEOPLE DIE

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA), is the following story wherein the IRS arbitrarily drew an unauthorized check on a taxpayer's account of \$39.65. This citizen decided to fight the illegal practice, and as all too often happens, he lost—in this case his life.

There are many episodes involving death attributed to the strain of dealing with the IRS but the facts outlined in this account make it especially tragic.

DONALD McGRATH

Donald McGrath did not believe that he owed the IRS \$39.65. He wrote to them and told them so. He asked to have an Internal Revenue Service official meet with him and explain to him why he owed thirty-nine dollars and change. The IRS never did respond.

According to McGrath, "Sensing that the IRS may try to implement a seizure on my account, I wrote to the bank and asked them not to honor any IRS demands other than by my consent or an order issued from a competent court. I then received a note from the bank stating that they . . . would honor an IRS levy. . . . Shortly I received another letter from the bank stating that they had turned my money over to Mr. Thoen of the IRS and sent me a canceled check they had forged on my account (\$39.65)."

It was a small sum, but Mr. McGrath was furious. Donald McGrath, crop duster and farmer, acting as his own attorney, filed a claim against his bank in district court.

In the meantime, McGrath agreed to pay half of a \$3,000 loan he had taken out with his bank to purchase combine, but, because of displeasure with the bank over the IRS incident, he refused to pay the remainder until the courts made a decision on the levy made by the IRS. The battle in the local courts between McGrath and his bank and the IRS raged on for months until Tuesday, July 29, 1980, when an order to seize McGrath's combine was issued by a local court.

The Grand Forks, Minnesota, *Herald* carried the following account of the next fateful day:

"The incident occurred after Schroeder, Lt. Larry Bangle and Sheriff Deputy Robert Rost escorted an implement dealer's truck to a farm field where McGrath's combine was located. Officers had served notice on McGrath Tuesday warning him that they intended to seize the vehicle.

Sheriff Taylor said the deputies arrived at the field about 11:30 a.m. and were told by someone on the site that McGrath had said not to move the combine because he was coming back with a gun. Taylor said the person was not a member of the McGrath family."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The combine was picked up and sheriff's vehicles escorted it toward Grand Forks on County Road 4 with one car heading the entourage and another behind.

Taylor said McGrath's car approached the group from the rear when they were less than two miles from Grand Forks and passed one car and the truck with the combine, cutting in front of the two vehicles.

McGrath, his wife and son were in the car. McGrath jumped out and words were exchanged, Taylor said. He said one sheriff's car pulled in front and blocked the road, warning McGrath on his loudspeaker that they were from the sheriff's department and that he was under arrest and should drop his weapon. The trucker towing the combine pulled into a ditch.

Taylor said McGrath got in his car, which drove straight toward the sheriff's car. His son was driving while McGrath leaned out of the passenger's side window with a pistol. A number of shots were exchanged between McGrath and Schroeder, Taylor said, and the flurry ended when McGrath was shot [in the head] through the windshield with a 12-gauge shotgun. Schroeder was the only one from the department to fire. [The police report admits that Schroeder may have fired first. McGrath was the only person injured in the fray.]

Taylor said that McGrath, 51, appeared to be the only one in the car who fired at officers. [It is far from clear that McGrath was actually firing at the officers since his bullets only hit the tire of the other car.]

The sheriff said McGrath apparently has no criminal record.

McGrath was taken to the hospital in critical condition. His son, who had driven McGrath's car during the incident, was charged with attempted murder. Mrs. McGrath was charged with being an accomplice to attempted murder—even though she was merely riding in the back seat of the car when her husband was shot.

A week later, Donald McGrath died from extensive brain damage he suffered as a result of "a shotgun wound to the head and massive loss of blood leading to shock from the time he was injured until he received medical care." *All of this stemming from a disagreement over \$39.65—arbitrarily assessed and arbitrarily collected.*

SOME TRUTHS ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the environmental movement is becoming a powerful and active force in American politics. Environmental groups have organized political action committees to finance and assist environmentally oriented candidates. A coalition of environmental groups recently released a report which strongly denounced President Reagan's environmental record. The environmental organizations have made it clear that their enemy is not merely Interior Secretary James Watt, but President Reagan and his entire administration.

These are fairly powerful accusations to be issued by a coalition of or-

ganizations which claim to represent the bipartisan interests of environmental protection. In light of the growing activism of the environmental movement, I think my colleagues should be aware of the composition and motives of environmentalists. In an insightful article entitled "The Environmental Era," William Tucker concludes that environmentalists are typically elites and are "a privileged minority." He suggests that the affluent status of most environmentalists and their desire to preserve their privileged social status contributes to their environmental protection views.

Although Mr. Tucker's argument is provocative, I think it is fundamentally sound and merits careful consideration by my colleagues. Therefore, I insert excerpts from William Tucker's article which appeared in the February/March edition of the American Enterprise Institute publication *Public Opinion*.

EXCERPTS FROM "THE ENVIRONMENTAL ERA" (By William Tucker)

*** The environmental movement has become an extremely conservative doctrine—fearful of the future, despairing of human effort, worried about change, and wed to the status quo. What has soured these people on progress? The unavoidable answer is: privilege. The environmental movement has entwined itself with the protection of privilege.

THE NEW ELITE

*** Who are they, and why do they do the things they do? The answer is that environmentalists are simply an elite. They are people who have benefited from the economic system much more than the average person. Then, instead of wanting or allowing others to do the same, they have set their sights much higher than normal—much higher than anyone who is not in a privileged position could set them. The unintended effect of these efforts has been to make it much more difficult for people who have not already climbed the ladder of affluence to achieve what environmentalists themselves have already attained. Far from being a new departure, this behavior exactly matches the way most elites in history have reacted to their positions of privilege. Their values and positions are those of a nation's aristocracy.

Yet, there is nothing that environmentalists resist more than the idea that they are elitists. They will respond by waving polls showing that 80 percent of the nation wants cleaner air. They will point to impoverished residents of an obscure valley in Virginia who joined them in opposing construction of a new dam when the people found their homes were to be obliterated. They will tell the story of Minnesota farmers who locked hands with environmentalists in opposing construction of a power line.

It is easy enough to see why, in certain instances, almost anyone would be personally opposed to a particular form of economic advance. Even the staunchest advocate of progress may have a few misgivings when the state transportation department starts drawing plans to run a new expressway through his living room. But why do environmentalists oppose every form of econom-

ic growth and progress in every instance? What motivates them?

The same questions can be addressed to the argument that everyone is in favor of cleaner air. This may be true, but it is not the whole story. People may be in favor of clean air, but at what cost? One of the fundamental accomplishments of environmental groups has been in persuading Congress to adopt legislative provisions that clean air and clean water regulations will be determined without regard to cost. The question, "How can you put a price on clean air?" can be answered very easily. You put a price on it the way you put a price on any other good or value that people have the option of pursuing.

Yet the current legislative enactment of environmental goals does not allow for many such choices. Environmental goals must be pursued regardless of their relative benefits to other social purposes. They are not weighed against other social endeavors but are given priority above every other activity of a modern industrial society. Environmentalists have essentially rediscovered, and in some cases reinvented, the conventions of aristocratic conservatism.

THE MOVEMENT'S EVOLUTION

*** the birth of environmentalism represented a withdrawing of upper-middle-class attention from the interests of the poor and a turning in another direction. The liberal agenda represented an effort by upper-middle-class people to leap over their adversary neighbors in the lower middle class and make friends with the poor. But by 1970 this effort was showing its limitations.

And so, many original thinkers in the upper middle class began to realize that there was still another possible "enemy-of-your-enemy" alliance in the other direction. This was the old wealth, lying on the far side of the business elite, above the upper middle class on the economic scale.

Every survey that has ever been taken (including the Sierra Club's extensive polling of its own membership) has shown that support for environmentalism has been concentrated in the upper-middle-class, professional segment of society.

In addition to numbers and energy, the upper middle class brought skills to the cause of aristocratic conservatism. Aristocrats, besides being small, also have a habit of letting their skills erode. Upper-middle-class people are, above all, immensely skilled at legal and bureaucratic performance. They know how to draw up laws, lobby legislators, write newspaper stories, sway public audiences, and generally push their opinions both popularly and legally upon the public. The rafts of environmental literature and the astonishingly rapid institutionalization of the environmental movement after only a few short years in the public domain are the monument to these abilities. With almost religious intensity, the upper middle class has made environmentalism its sacred cause.

THE CONSERVATISM OF THE LIBERALS

Environmentalism has been the mass adoption of aristocratic values by America's burgeoning upper middle class. It is the "conservatism of the liberals." Once the liberal program of upper-middle-class people creating government programs to sponsor disadvantaged people began to exhaust

itself, a very predictable turn of events occurred. Upper-middle-class people decided that they too were "disadvantaged" and derived a liberal program. This accounts for one of the more annoying aspects of the environmental movement—the tendency of its exponents to borrow rhetorical terms from previous liberal programs and try to picture themselves as an "abused minority." The truth is, in fact, the very opposite. One does not become an environmentalist until one achieves some kind of privilege and feels one has something worth protecting. Environmentalists are a privileged minority.

Environmentalism, because it is oriented toward the status quo, had an inevitable appeal to people toward the top of the social ladder, and a negative appeal to those nearer the bottom. When environmentalists said "we already have enough," and "it's time to stop all this growth-for-growth's sake," they were very accurately representing their own newly acquired position of economic security. But anyone who was further down the scale and was depending on future growth and progress to improve his lot would be instinctively opposed to the environmental doctrine. The basic flaw of environmentalism—and indeed of all the previous "environmental movements" of history—was beginning to emerge. At heart, environmentalism favors the affluent over the poor, the haves over the have-nots.

Who was against environmentalism then? Initially, blacks were one of the few groups heard expressing some reservations about the sudden turn in liberal thought. On Earth Day, 1970, when a group of California college students buried an automobile in order to symbolize their renunciation of materialism, the event was picketed by a group of black students, who said that resources, rather than being wasted in such a conspicuous fashion, should be put to work in improving the lot of the poor.

This constant dissent of articulate blacks from the environmental agenda has been a running source of embarrassment to a movement that has tried desperately for over a decade to preserve the illusion that it is a liberal crusade. As late as 1979, for example, Vernon Jordan, director of the Urban League, was asked to attend a joint conference on urban and environmental affairs, intended to heal the breach in the liberal ranks. He responded with these remarks:

"Walk down Twelfth Street [in Washington, D.C.] and ask the proverbial man on the street what he thinks about the snail darter and you are likely to get the blindest look you ever experienced. Ask him what he thinks the basic urban environmental problem is, and he'll tell you jobs. I don't intend to raise the simple-minded equation of snail darters and jobs, but that does symbolize an implicit divergence of interests between some segments of the environmental movement and the bulk of black and urban people ***

"[Environmentalists] will find in the black community absolute hostility to anything smacking of no-growth or limits-to-growth. Some people have been too cavalier in proposing policies to preserve the physical environment for themselves while other, poorer people pay the costs."

Labor unions have also been in the forefront of opposition to the environmental

movement. By the early seventies, labor columnist Victor Reisel was repeating the joke about God telling Moses that before He parts the Red Sea, He is first going to have to get permission from the Environmental Protection Agency. The bumper sticker "If You're Hungry and Out of Work, Eat an Environmentalist!" was originated by labor unions. Considering that many, many environmental campaigns have involved opposition to large-scale construction projects, power plants, highways, and factories, this is not at all surprising. Whenever enthusiastic college students go out to picket a nuclear plant, they always find a group of hard-hat construction workers ready to throw bricks at them. As one union official put it: "These environmentalists are a bunch of bloody elitists ***. [I]f it's 'no growth' they're advocating, then what they're really saying is: 'We've got enough for ourselves, but you stay down there.'"

The working-class, labor-union revolt against both environmentalism and the poor-oriented thrust of the Democratic liberal agenda, finally made up the major factor in Ronald Reagan's 1980 presidential majority, particularly in the western part of the country. This revolt has often been called "populist," and I think the term is justified. In general, this neopopulist revolt against environmentalism has been literally a quarrel between the "haves" and the "have-nots," between the urban and suburban liberal establishment intent on protecting its positions of privilege and the broad reaches of lower-middle-class and poor people, who feel that they do not yet have enough.

WAITING FOR DOOMSDAY

Perhaps the most perceptive criticism of this upper-middle-class conservatism was written right at the dawn of the environmental era by Chicago newspaper columnist Jon Margolis. In an article entitled "Our Country 'Tis of Thee, Land of Ecology," published in *Esquire* in 1970, Margolis noted:

"Searching for their hundred-fifty-year-old Vermont farmhouses, conservationists wonder how people can actually want to live in a new, \$25,000 split-level in the suburbs, apparently never thinking that for most people the alternative is a three-room walk-up in the downtown smog. The suburbs are open to them, as is Vermont to the more affluent, because of technology, because draining swamps and dirtying streams and damming rivers and polluting the air gave them high-paying jobs. Shouting about the environmental catastrophe, urging an end to growth, the conservationists are \$20,000-a-year men telling all the \$7,500-a-year men simply to stay where they are so we can all survive."

Writing in a similar vein about affluent prep-school boys and how they were adjusting to the "era of limits" in the late 1970s, Nelson Aldrich, Jr., penned this prescient sentence about modern Domsday attitudes: "Just discernible in this new Preppie idealism is a wish, barely disguised as a fear, that the era of economic growth may really be finished, and that a New Dark Age may be upon us."

It is this fervent wish for an environmental day of reckoning—the hope that some grand historical turning point has been reached where economic growth will be halted—that constitutes the secret of the upper middle class's fervent embrace of environmentalism. If further progress is im-

possible, then perhaps the status quo will harden and remain forever.

In this kind of framework, the only disappointment occurs when the great Environmental Domsday doesn't come.●

HANDGUN BODY COUNT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the handgun body count for the month of February totaled 632. I am particularly disheartened by the fact that 110 of the reported handgun deaths occurred in my own State of Florida. Such tragic news does not surprise me, since the number of handguns being purchased by people who claim to fear the violence in our society has drastically increased. Presently, a new gun is purchased every 13 seconds.

Stronger gun control laws may not have saved all these persons, but I am convinced that many of them would be alive today if we had had the courage to pass antihandgun legislation.

The list follows:

HANDGUN BODY COUNT

ALABAMA (3)

Horace Goodwin, Wallace Havis, James Vandiver.

ARIZONA (8)

Francis Capaldi, Ramon Gonzales, Earl Johns, Herbert Meacham, Howard Mitchell, Police Officer J. Ross, Jesus Urias, Willie Williams.

ARKANSAS (10)

Alyene Ballard, John Crossno, James Dobbs, Roosevelt Duncan, Phyllis Griggs, Larry Jarry, J. N. Maples, Dixie Morris, William Naramore, Mark Turner.

CALIFORNIA (64)

Rafael Anaya, Yolanda Aragon, Mary Barker, Francisco Barrera, Steven Beaumont, Debrah Bedwell, Wayne Bedwell, Brook Bettencourt, Debbie Bettencourt, Iain Black, Ken Blyth, Melvin Brown, Adelaido Candelas, Frank Carso, Henry Castro, Gall Cook, Joseph Crampton, Donald Dixon, Jeffrey Dixon, Pedro Erami, Vincent Gonzales, George Griffiths, David Hernandez, Francisco Herrera, Terry Land, Fidel Lepe, Rafael Lopez, Delin Martin, Guadelupe Martinez, Urbano Martinez, Molly McGowin, James McGuire, Roderic McKenney, Matthew Milan, Lisa Miller, Ronald Milliron, Francisco Mireles, Gonzalo Moreno, David Myles, Sr., Roy Nakase, Rollin Newton, James Nolan, Librarda Olivarez, Delissa Pitts, Ernest Powell, Jr., Barbara Poure, James Poure, George Purdon, Carlos Ramirez, Frank Saltzman, Blanche Skinner, Linda Taylor, Larry Tsuji, David Wallace, Charles White, Vicie Youngblood, Tony Zatata, unidentified males (7).

COLORADO (10)

Galen Broyles, Patrick Burke, Michael Cates, Anthony Duran, Fritz Elie, Arthur Garcia, John Garrick, Jr., Deborah Haynes, Elaine Reynolds, Roland Witkowsky.

CONNECTICUT (4)

Edwin Berrios, Leonardo Delavega, Evelyn Faford, Ella-Jean Streeter.

DELAWARE (2)

James Feeley, Sr., John Hillard, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (5)

Clifton Carrey, Paul Dixon, Arlene Flowers, Reginald Lee, Thomas Meyer.

FLORIDA (110)

Lance Anderson, Juan Araujo, Jorge Arias, Fabian Barrientos, Mark Blackford, David Brown, John Brown, Charles Benjamin, Larry Brown, Carlton Butler, Ellen Cilibert, James Cilibert, Ijany Clark, Orazio Colella, Robert Colleton, Fawn Coon, Alan Coull, Thomas Cowler, Jorge Cruz-Alonso, Carlos Dager, Michael Dalfo, Daniel Davis, Guillermo Diaz, Frances Dickey, Douglas Dodson, John Downing, Steven Early, Ruth Edward, Richard Florenza, George Galton, Ramon Garcia, Edward Gibbons, Florence Gibbons, Peter Gibbons, Donnie Gillis, Edna Goldberg, Alfredo Gonzalez, Jorge Gonzalez, Horace Goodwin, Allen Green, William Hammond, Richard Healey, William Hemmer, Oscar Hernandez, Eliadi Hidalgo, Collin Hixon, Kenneth Holtman, Ibad Ireliia, Patrick Johnson, William Kamin, Henry Kluger, Noah Lane, Samuel Lattimore, Albert Lennon, Margaret Lewin, Betty Marshall, Carlos Martin, Arnaldo Mellado, Pate Miller, John Mitchell, Jorge Moreno, James Murphy, Vernon Odum, Richard Padgett, Osmel Patterson, Carlos Perez, Nelson Perez, Silvio Perez, Gerard Pitner, Linda Ponton, Charles Rankin, Oliver de Jesus-Rendon, Rafael Roca, Nestor Rodda, Henriquet Rodriguez, Derrick Scott, Paul Shaddinger, Carlynda Shannon, Jacob Shaw, Nancy Sheppard, Elizabeth Shulkin, Larry Silver, Michelle Silver, James Stephan, Gwendolyn Terry, Ronald Thagard, George Thompson, Edward Threw, Felix Toca, Ceasar Vitale, Patricia Vitale, Louis Vitolo, Tharale Ward, Saint Weaver, Gordon Yost, unidentified males (15).

GEORGIA (6)

Alexander Bailey, Jean Breedlove, Elizabeth Combs, Welton Dodson, Alice Ridgeway, Arthur Riggs.

HAWAII (1)

Laureto Valdez.

ILLINOIS (57)

David Action, Gregory Baker, Melvin Brown, Patricia Burke, Dong Kuen Cha, Garcia Chacon, Miguel Chacon, Donald Ciesewski, Robert Clarkson, David Cobb, Robert Conway, William Cox, Jerry Davis, Donnell Douglas, Patrolman James Doyle, Bernice Elrod, Henry Ervin, William Fahey, Bruce Foys, Odon Garcia, Art Gilmore, Thomas Gordon, Walter Grace, Nick Guerrero, Winford Gurley, Claudette Hampton, McArthur Harris, James Hauad, Tyrone Wilson, Jerome Johnson, Fred Kemp, Lee Lampley, Earl Leavy, Karen Marquez, Shirley Marshall, Ismal Martinez, William Maupim, Samuel McBride, Bobby McCray, Andre McCullum, Joseph Moran, Casimir Novak, Sr., Inocencio Noyola, Richard O'Brien, Edwin Pedrza, Bruce Reynolds, Eugene Rodriguez, Curtis Schwartz, Earl Steele, Nina Thorne, Lester Todd, Jerome Unick, Jesus Valdivia, Frankie Vaughn, Juanita Wheeler, Dwight Whitley, Police Officer Valentas.

INDIANA (12)

Robert Anderson, Nancy Corley, Billy Evans, Keno Lewis, Joseph Middy, Roy Edwards, Stephen Plummer, Evelyn Ramer, Nancy Rehm, Bonnie Thomas, James Thomas, Daryl Winston.

IOWA (1)

Lloyd Lindsley.

KANSAS (2)

Epimerio Otero, Shirley Otero.

LOUISIANA (13)

Sherry Alford, Irma Allen, Richard Blaire, Donald Borne, Hudson Burton, Jeanie Burton, Diane Doss, Terri Edwards, Daryll Landry, Henderson McInnis, Telfy Moses, Clifton Portalis, Limaous White, Jr.

MARYLAND (20)

Andrew Anderson, Jr., James Brown, Beatrice Butler, Gary Coleman, Scott Crist, Llewellyn Hall, Raymond Hubbard, Lebard Jones, Victoria Kalbarczyk, Jack Lowery, Henderson McInnis, Edgar Mercer, Keese Milford, Kevin Miller, Calvin Peacock, Jr., Steven Poindexter, Charles Rawlings, Doris Shaumburg, Witold Szukiewicz, Frank Wooten.

MASSACHUSETTS (6)

Ralph Freeman, Enrique Hernandez, Bobby Manzo, Kenneth Ridley, Charles Silvestri, John Tinker.

MICHIGAN (41)

Csi Jin Ahn, John Barnes, Jr., Ricky Bell, Jamie Burgess, Jessie Turnage, Herby Colbert, Mary Combs, Herbert DeFoe, Jackie Eaton, Mary Ferrin, Ronald Ferrin, Margaret Furca, Harry Hamacker, Mae Henry, Dwight Hudson, Clyde Irby, Eric Irvin, William Jamieson, Irvin Jefferies, Felix Jefferson, Mark Kroll, Joseph Marlin, James McCanney, Claude McConner, William Mitchell, Darnell Moore, Christopher Morde, William Nabors, Douglas Pageau, James Parnell, Diane Ray, Craig Scott, Sylvester Scott, Frank Siemion, William Simons, Eddie Sterling, David Stewart, Milton Taylor, Jr., Kenneth Welch, Ernestine Wright, Frank Yermaka.

MINNESOTA (4)

Dennis Breene, Derrio Green, William Hall, Albert James.

MISSOURI (19)

Warren Bell, Jeffrey Bronaugh, Leonardo Binion, John Crackler, Dennis Callaway, Gregory Critten, Ernest Curry, Terry Ford, Dr. Mary Groom, Adell Hardy, Steven Houston, James Montgomery, Billy Morris, Herbert Pruitt, Brian Reece, Mae Riley, Damon Robertson, Don Voepel, Hemer Ware.

NEVADA (3)

Benito Martinez, Bert McMahon, Ken Stewart.

NEW HAMPSHIRE (3)

Alan Miner, unidentified female, unidentified male.

NEW JERSEY (9)

Miguel Benites, Lynn Falzarano, Thomas Kerr, Frank Kormady, Melvin Mann, Patricia Riley, Mario Smeriglio, James Smith, Henry Smith.

NEW MEXICO (5)

David Eastman, Alejandro Mahle, Jane Overby, Juan Serrano, Matthew Shorty.

NEW YORK (30)

Vito Ajello, Howard Baker, Kent Beam, Francis Breakey, Rose Curatolo, Leatrice Davis, Lois Delacruz, Pearlene Early, John Garvey, Mark Hertzan, Alexander Innis, Bonnie Martin, Tomas Mendez, Daisy Miranda, Miguel Montalvo, Roberto Ortiz, Juan Rivera, Luis Rivera, Robert Scheff, Stanley Stoerher, Carlos Torres, N. Triantafillou, Ibram Wahba, Officer Werdann, Lorraine Young, unidentified female, unidentified female, unidentified male (3).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NORTH CAROLINA (12)

Pervis Baize, Cheryle Bolton, Bobby Hord, Irene McMillan, Terry McMillan, Cindy Milton, Troy Milton, Lou Montgomery, Clyde Robinson, Roger Stowe, Ralph Thomas, Linda Walters.

OHIO (24)

Michael Bell, Richard Boyd, Deanna Campbell, Raymond Childers, Sammy Conner, Rodney Cupe, Harold Gibson, Kathy Hillis, Donita Hoffman, Robert Lowrey, Tim May, Brian McConaha, Sandra Meade, Willie Ousley, Corey Perkins, Eric Polzin, Rev. H. Rickerson, Mattileen Ringer, Boyd Ross, Jr., Ivan Schoen, Arthur Stewart, Steve Tinch, Catherine Wanner, David Wolfe.

OKLAHOMA (5)

Deborah Brown, Lawrence Huffman, Marilyn Buffman, David Tackett.

OREGON (6)

Daniel Patrick, Mrs. Daniel Patrick, Michael Palumbo, Gerald Spears, Mrs. Gerald Spears, unidentified female.

PENNSYLVANIA (23)

Mohammad Aslam, Ronald Cunningham, Lillian DeNicola, Dominick DeVito, Michelle Dymkoski, John Hilliard, Billy Hool, Jr., Robert Johnson, Charles Jones, Hwa Kim, William Lawrence, Thomas Mangeri, Howard Maynard, Michael Palumbo, Joseph Pileggi, Douglas Redden, Benjamin Repep, Larry Repep, Jr., Larry Repep, Sr., Ruth Repep, Riley Sederick, Ralph Yellets, Jr., Thomas Zylinski.

RHODE ISLAND (2)

Joan Ditiberio, Thomas Iozzi.

SOUTH CAROLINA (1)

Michael Ward.

TENNESSEE (12)

Rayford Bond, John Bright, Willie Caruthers, Hazel Hinton, Paige Leonard, James Mitchell, James Nichols, Kenthearl Pope, Rebecca Summerhill, William Turner, Frank Williams, Maggie Williams.

TEXAS (71)

Ellen Aleman, James Armstrong, Raymond Banks, Leroy Barcelo, Sr., W. L. Barnes, Luis Bautista, Kenneth Beck, Enrique Calderone, David Carreon, Henry Carroll, Jr., Adrian Castro, David Chatham, Joseph Cipolla, Fortunato Cordero, Gary Cousins, Florentino Delatorre, Baudelio Delgado, Otto Diaz, Donna Dunn, Genie Dunn, Joel Evans, Larry Foster, Michael Fowler, Daniel Garcia, Manuel Garcia, Ruben Gillezeau, Virginia Gillezeau, Niel Grueland, Abraham Guerra, William Hale, Wanz Hanson, Victor Hernandez, Har Hey, Teng Meng Hey, Gilbert Hutchins, Jr., Eustace Ible, Ralph Jackson, Rick Jackson, Lonnie Jones, Cerildo Labrada, Warren Lassen, Ed Martin, Lazaro Martinez, Michael McConnell, M. Mendoza, Leonel Ochoa, Deborah Ozuna, Jona Palvadore, Rogelo Ponce, Orlando Portillo, Maria Proscelle, Robin Randall, Harold Rhone, Evelyn Richardson, Ronald Rothman, Oscar Salinas, Randal Smith, Ralph Thomas, Earnest Warner, Paul Watson, Kenneth Whitt, Dwight Wilson, Merlyn Wright, Joseph Zapollo, unidentified male (7).

UTAH (1)

Guy O'Bannion.

VIRGINIA (14)

Roy Alexander, Nicky Beasley, Ercelle Cook, Mae Dunford, Joseph Kancso, Sr., Howard Kauffman, John Lindamood, Police Officer Maloney, Kevin Maltby, Franklin

Mann, Thomas Roy, Larry Wilson, unidentified male (2).

WASHINGTON (7)

Robert Becker, Joseph Chapman, Alvin Hunter, Michael Johnston, Rodney Lindemuth, Larry Stover, John Widman.

WEST VIRGINIA (1)

Carl Davisson.

WISCONSIN (5)

Karl Blami, Derrio Green, Lula Stinson, Debra Taylor, Lloyd Vanzant.●

A LEGACY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to four outstanding individuals from Los Angeles, Calif., who will be honored at the fourth Annual Mothers Day Luncheon sponsored by the Good Neighbor Council on May 8, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, these four outstanding mothers, Annie P. Sharpe, E. Grace Payne, Montana McNealy, and Theresa Mary Johnson, through their timeless commitment to improve the community have touched the lives of countless people in a special way. Each one deserves special recognition here today.

Mrs. Annie P. Sharpe has been actively involved in community affairs for a great number of years. Her activities include offering assistance in the summer youth employment program, summer lunch program, Community Activities Group, community garden program, and Foundation for the Junior Blind. Mrs. Sharpe also served as my community representative for the 29th Congressional District.

Annie Sharpe has been the recipient of numerous awards including a Congressional Medal of Merit for 20 years of outstanding community service.

Mrs. E. Grace Payne currently serves as executive director of the Westminster Neighborhood Association, Inc., a community service center in South Central Los Angeles which offers invaluable assistance to needy residents. Mrs. Payne has always been active in community affairs and has an outstanding record in civic activities.

In July 1979, the city of Los Angeles honored Mrs. Payne by naming and dedicating a city-owned facility auditorium in her honor, "The E. Grace Payne Auditorium." On March 4, 1981, KUSC-FM radio station honored Mrs. Payne for the "Women of Achievement Award" with a live radio interview.

Mrs. Montana McNealy has been a resident of Los Angeles since 1933. She has been involved extensively in civic, social and community services, having

performed volunteer work as director of the National Association for Colored Girls; chairwoman of the World Fellowship of the Angeles Mesa Branch YWCA; Basileus, Gamma Phi Delta Sorority, Alpha Delta chapter of Los Angeles; and assistant secretary and chairperson of the Moral Philosophy of the Phys Art Lit Mor Club.

Mrs. Montana's sorority honored her with the "Regional Woman of the Year Award" for the most outstanding service to the community.

Mrs. Theresa Mary Johnson is the mother of 10 children and 25 grandchildren. Her participation in community affairs started in 1955 when she initiated a petition drive to erect an overpass at Manchester and Avalon Boulevards for safe crossing for children as a result of the death of a youngster.

Mrs. Johnson's community work encompassed the following activities: Campaign work for Assemblyman Bill Greene; president of the 107th Street School PTA; board member for the Federation of Nursery School; community advisory chairperson for Locke High School and representative for the community.

Mrs. Johnson has also served as a youth counselor; a den mother; Head Start program representative; teacher and representative on the Los Angeles Housing Urban Development Committee from the eighth district.

Mr. Speaker, I only mentioned but a few of the community activities and positions achieved by these remarkable women. There is no way to measure the countless hours they gave in pursuit of bettering the community. Through their meritorious community activism they have graced South Central Los Angeles with a distinctive quality of excellence and service.●

LOUISVILLE WINS NATIONAL DEBATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House, the recent victory of the University of Louisville's debate team at the National Debate Championship.

Although the university has consistently placed in the semifinals and finals for regional and national tournaments, this is the first time in the 4-year history of the team, that Louisville has won a national championship. A total of 62 schools from across the country participated in the tournament.

I commend the efforts of the team's two seniors, Dan and David Suther-

land, whose skill and preparation lead the university to victory, as well as the efforts of Dr. Thomas Hynes, the team's coach.

I extend my congratulations and best wishes to the team for an honor well deserved, and wish them much continued success.●

THE IRS STRIKES—WITH KILLER INSTINCT

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have shared many examples of some of the outrageous practices used by the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices. Another example of these heavyhanded and abusive practices, which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA), is the following letter I received from a former IRS agent.

DEAR SIR: Just wanted to let you know that your book on the IRS is right on the mark. Having been a Revenue Officer with the Internal Revenue Service (for five years) . . . perhaps I can add a few personal comments you might be interested in reading.

First, the entire IRS has a virtually automatic reaction to anyone who thumbs his nose at them—and especially anyone who does so publicly. In sports I think it would be known as the killer instinct. When I was in (name of city withheld) I saw a file on its way from the Washington office to a Revenue Officer in (another city) on (name withheld) in which Washington said that a levy on royalties from his writings had to be served because this dirty so-and-so is really a pain in the rear and included clippings. He was a speech writer for (a U.S. Senator) once—if he was less of a public figure he might not have gotten so vigorously chased.

Second, no matter what it says in the Internal Revenue Manual, Part V about a careful definition of what constitutes an "illegal tax protestor" the typical Revenue officer probably believes that all those he comes into contact with are illegal tax protestors. And I think IRS management does little if anything to try to change that impression. You have to realize that there are two completely different things: The way the IRS operates according to the way the Manual says it operates and then the way it really operates. Most Revenue officers, strange as it may sound, are decent people and if it were not for management breathing down their necks they would treat people like human beings. However, management has everything on their side, if the Manual favors what they want to do anyway, then to heck with the individual problems of a particular taxpayer and they can write up (give a bad chit) to a Revenue officer who doesn't follow the Manual. If they want to do something that doesn't follow the Manual, they just tell you to do it and if you balk they find some method for a reprisal on you later. I personally was ordered to (and did) seize a vehicle from a woman that was old and of hardly any

worth at a group manager's orders. As that group manager . . . said one time in response to a question about treating the taxpayers equitably: "Of course, sock it to those whole bunch of mothers."

Third, the IRS is absolutely paranoid about the posse comitatus. Even though in the areas I worked there wasn't any known activity by that group, we frequently heard about it. As a matter of fact, in 1980 we were told to be careful not to meet anyone who wanted to get together on some lonely country road late at night because it might be one of those posse guys wanting to kill you. It was alleged they had made such a threat or had some such plans. As a matter of fact, I got the impression the IRS had infiltrated that group or had informers. In my five years with the IRS, I was only threatened once and never was assaulted—as a matter of fact I know of only one Revenue officer of my own acquaintance who was attacked in his work (an angry patron—a third party—in a bar threw a beer bottle at him, he wasn't seriously hurt). In a way that is strange considering the nature of the work—but then again I guess it is pretty common knowledge that an assault on a Federal officer is a serious matter.

Fourth, the way the IRS treats its own people is probably the reason IRS people frequently treat "the people" so poorly. The pressure is unbelievable and Revenue Officers burn out, get sick, have marital problems, etc. at probably a higher rate than most folks. It would be good if you could get a copy from the National Treasury Employees Union of the mass grievance that was put in by virtually all the Revenue Officers at (one) office a couple of years back. It would make for good reading—for one thing, the management at one point had made it virtually impossible to get an installment agreement on a business account approved regardless of what the Manual said about that being okay. I regret I don't have my copy still—the response of the Chief of the Collection Division for the . . . district was (as he was overheard leaving a group manager's office): "Get the trouble makers out of here!" However, most IRS people feel themselves caught between a bureaucratic union on the one hand and a bureaucratic management on the other—in other words, for most there appears no way things can be appealed, one is all alone.

Fifth, your advice that one can always go to one's Congressman and complain may or may not work. More likely not. If someone gets the ear of a top management person about an irregular procedure and keeps the pressure on, then maybe something will be done. However, for the most part, the IRS just views Congressional inquiries as just so much "control" correspondence and a nuisance. Worse, down at the working level, some Revenue Officers resent high-level interference and will go out of their way to gum up a taxpayer. A complaint to a group manager will seldom get relief either—though there are some group managers who bend under pressure, so it might be worth trying. And sometimes one wonders if anything can be done—I put through an adjustment several times (and it never came back to me as rejected so I have to assume it was done right) and each time service center conveniently lost it, the changes were never made to their account. And each time they would get a fresh bill they would run to their Congressman that (I said I would straighten it out and yet,) here is a fresh bill. It can get frustrating. Besides which, often a taxpayer will send in information to

correct an account while it is still in Office Branch—at least in (one) district they just let such replies pile up. Once or twice a year they will take such correspondence to the terminal to see where the case is—and behold the case has worked its way to the Field Branch where a Revenue Officer has been bugging a taxpayer for information he has already supplied!

Sixth, as for the taxpayer being able to count on the Revenue Officer being unarmed since that is the rule and I followed it. However, if I now met up with a Revenue Officer I wouldn't count on it. One of my co-workers was a gun nut and even showed a revolver openly in the office once. The last I heard this particular Revenue Officer was going to be prosecuted for falsely making statements in cases that were not true, that Federal Tax Liens had been filed when they were not, etc. (and I was one of those who helped the Inspectors on the case) and he was going to try and beat the rap by claiming mental incapacity! What a combination, a mental nut with a gun out there with the taxpayers! Don't bother to ask management, you see management never seems to know that these things go on. The rumor could be all over the place for years, but management never knows. You see? And there is also a code of silence, no one—management or employees—is ever supposed to go to Inspection except for outside types of things (bribes and threats). That's the code.

Am I better? Not really, but a bit disillusioned. As you said, the FBI and CIA excesses are nothing as compared with the way the IRS has run wild. But it has succeeded, in the sense that a large body of the public really fears it. And, as you said, Congress must accept some of the blame for not getting this monster under control.

I just decided enough is enough and I didn't want to be a part of the federal government's terror squad. My reviews over those five years were good. But when I got sick . . . I had time to think and decided to resign, especially as they had decided to rotate Revenue Officers for spells in lower level work. That's an interesting story too, they sent a police officer to my door (they apparently did not believe I was sick) and then sent me a letter saying the police officer said you are okay, so get back to work. How a police officer has medical qualifications I don't know. When I sent them a doctor's certificate, they shut up about that. Then when the doctor said I was okay (to go back to work) I asked for a few days leave without pay and they said okay and then later called it absent without leave because I hadn't applied to the right level of management. You see, even if one is sick and weak you are supposed to go through their red tape.

Again, I enjoyed your book and if I can ever be of any assistance as a former insider in the IRS, please let me know. You are free to employ any of the information in this letter in any way you choose with one stipulation: do not have my name on anything going beyond you and your immediate staff . . . so they can't figure out who talked. I am afraid the IRS would just love to do a job on a former employee writing a Congressman. At the very least I would be put on the violence list!

I'm afraid though even the IRS may get overwhelmed there are so many non-filers. I don't think anyone really knows how many. I remember one guy in the U.S. attorney's office . . . saying that there were so many sending in blank returns with Fifth Amendment written on it that he thought the IRS

should just send such direct to Audit, that is just have Audit (examination) set up an assessment. I'm not sure, but pretty much I think that is what they are doing. If you've been patient enough to read this far, I hope you have learned something.

Sincerely,

THE LATE LOUIS M. LYONS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, Louis M. Lyons, one of the most respected individuals in American journalism, died in Boston. His death brings to a close a career in print and broadcast journalism that has been an inspiration to a generation of reporters and commentators.

For more than 50 years, Mr. Lyons had an association with the Boston Globe and the radio and television stations affiliated with that newspaper. During that time he achieved a reputation for excellence as a journalist that few members of his profession could match. He covered the news in a manner that was acknowledged by his peers and the public to be thorough, accurate, and fair. I cannot think of a finer tribute to a journalist than to have his work characterized in that manner.

In addition to the role model he established as a working journalist, Mr. Lyons took a direct interest in the education of journalism students. For 25 years he headed the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University and through his efforts the Nieman fellowships became one of the most sought after prizes in journalism. The value of those efforts was perhaps best described by Harvard when, in awarding him an honorary degree, it called him the "conscience of his profession."

Mr. Speaker, although Louis Lyons spent most of his working life in Boston, the people of western Massachusetts were well known to him. Educated at the University of Massachusetts and for a time a member of the staff of the Springfield Republican, Mr. Lyons had strong ties to the western part of the State and was regarded with a special fondness in that area. His many contributions to journalism will keep his memory alive for years to come.

I would like to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the fine tribute to Louis Lyons which appeared in the Boston Globe on April 13:

LOUIS LYONS

Louis M. Lyons, who did more than anyone else in these parts for the caliber of broadcast news, died after a losing battle malignant lymphoma.

Louie Lyons was the right person in the right place, at the right time. His back-

ground was uncomplicated—born in Dorchester, moved to a farm in Plymouth, graduated from the University of Massachusetts when it was still a cow college instead of a major university.

He worked for The Globe and eventually headed the Nieman program for journalists at Harvard. In 1951, when television and educational broadcasting were both in their infancy, Louie's low-key style gave little hint of the bite that he wove into his account of local, national and international events.

He had none of the passion for the sensational event that plagued so many broadcasters. His news was level-headed balance of reporting and commentary that illuminated events themselves and the way they were portrayed in the rest of the media, print as well as broadcast.

Louie Lyons had the rare knack of performing two services at once. He gave his listeners a lucid view of the day's events that was based on a strong sense of what was important and what was not. More than that, his standards were a guide for uncountable numbers of print and broadcast journalists. They were all made better by his performance, to the further benefit of the public.

"Well, that's the news," Louie Lyons always said quietly, almost tentatively at the end of each broadcast. It was the perfect coda to his low-key but strong treatment of a difficult world.●

UNICO HONORS MAYOR RODGERS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the dean of New Jersey's mayors, and one of the most respected mayors in America, is being honored this week by the Kearny, N.J., chapter of UNICO National.

Frank Rodgers, mayor of Harrison, N.J., since 1947, is a man whose name is synonymous with good government on the State and local levels. Besides mayor, he wears the hats of State senator and clerk to the Hudson County Board of Freeholders; and in the past he has served with distinction on the Garden State Parkway and Arts Center Commission, on the New Jersey Racing Commission, and as superintendent of roads for Hudson County.

In recognition of his public achievements and his continuing concern for the people of his community, UNICO National's Kearny chapter will bestow its most prestigious award—Man of the Year—on Mayor Rodgers. It is not difficult to explain why there is such an overflow of admiration and affection for my friend of over three decades. Frank Rodgers is a natural leader and man of principle who never stops working to solve community problems. Yet he is warm, compassionate, and humble, a leader who listens and who acts with purpose.

Frank Rodgers has made a difference in the lives of thousands of New Jersey families over the years, and he continues as an inspiring example to all those who aspire to public office.

UNICO's guiding principle is "service above self," and there could be no more fitting person to represent this ideal than my friend Frank Rodgers. He is a great statesman and a man of the people, and in honoring him we do honor to ourselves.●

IT'S NOT CHARITY

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with my colleagues a recent editorial from the *Christain Science Monitor* on the rediscovery of the value of multilateral development banks to the developing countries of the world and to the self-interest of the United States.

As the editorial points out, the recently completed U.S. Department of Treasury assessment of the World Bank, Asian Development Bank and Fund, Inter-American Development Bank and African Development Bank and Fund shows a more sophisticated appreciation of the operations of the banks than did some of the administration's earliest pronouncements. The assessment indicates that MDB lending generally cannot efficiently be replaced by private lending and does not weaken or compete with the private sector in borrowing countries.

I believe that the Members of Congress who have studied and worked with the MDB's share these conclusions and I appreciate the *Monitor's* efforts to highlight the work of the banks.

IT'S NOT CHARITY

From the time he came into office President Reagan has made no bones about how he thinks the poor nations of the world can best be helped. Stress the private sector and shift the balance from multilateral aid to bilateral agreements with countries deemed important to US strategic interests. It is therefore noteworthy that experts in his own administration have found the international development organizations to be far more useful than some might have thought. A study by the Treasury Department released recently gives the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and other multilateral lending institutions high marks for efficiency and effectiveness. So high, in fact, that it should prod the President to alter his perceptions—and foreign aid policies.

Among Treasury's findings:

Bilateral aid and multilateral aid complement each other. Multilateral assistance primarily serves long-term US interests, is cost-effective, and encourages market-oriented

policies in the developing countries. It will remain "highly important" for the 1980s.

The "soft loan" activities of the MDBs (multilateral development banks), which are targeted on the poorest countries, are particularly effective in promoting U.S. humanitarian interests.

The MDBs have served U.S. commercial interests well.

Contrary to critics, the MDBs do not "bail out" the commercial banks by providing debt relief; their lending is tied primarily to the foreign exchange costs of specific projects.

A high proportion of the lending is not competitive with the private sector, and the policy prescriptions recommended for poor countries are along market lines.

Private capital markets by and large cannot substitute for MDB financing. Relying fully on private lenders, moreover, would favor the more advanced developing nations and be a "serious disadvantage" to the poorest and middle-income countries.

World Bank aid emphasizes primarily economic growth through capital investment and not "redistribution" of income.

MDBs have made major efforts to ensure that the poor—not the rich—receive a greater proportion of benefits from aid projects.

Loans for MDB projects in general are well prepared and the projects themselves well supervised.

To be sure, the Treasury probers did find some areas warranting criticism. For one, they recommend more emphasis on loan quality rather than loan quantity, i.e. more selectivity and a closer link between loan programs and effective economic policies in the countries being helped. They also call for improving "maturation/graduation" policies—that is, phasing out hard loans to borrowers no longer in severe need and nudging the "richest" of the poor soft-loan borrowers (India, say) into the hard-loan category. But the overall conclusion is a positive one. The World Bank and others are not, it turns out, socialist organizations.

In light of the Treasury report, one hopes that in the years ahead it will be reflected in the administration's actual policies. It is not at the moment. Present US foreign aid policy is heavily weighted in favor of the Middle East and countries where the US has political and strategic interests. Meantime such an essential aid tool as the World Bank's soft loan agency, the International Development Association, has fallen under the budget ax. The US is way behind in its commitments to IDA, providing less money (\$750 million in fiscal 1982 as against \$1.08 billion pledged under the current replenishment) and stringing out the payments over longer periods (five years instead of three). The pity of it is that the needs of the poorest countries remain immense and that, under the present IDA replenishment agreement, the other donor countries must scale back their own contributions in proportion to the US reductions. The crucial leadership which America has provided in the aid field since World War II thus risks being eroded.

Ironically, the slippage in US support comes at the very time when there is solid evidence of progress in the developing world. The very fact that the administration officials can urge some countries to "graduate" out of the MDB system is heartening evidence of such growth. It bears reminding, too, that multilateral development assistance to poor nations is not a charitable giveaway. It is sound investment for the future. Some 40 percent of all US exports now goes to the third world and trade is growing by

leaps and bounds. Yesterday's impoverished nations are today's healthy competitors. Lifting countries economically, furthermore, can be the best way to fostering political stability and preventing the kind of revolutionary turmoil now rampant in Central America.

Can the United States afford not to be a weighty participant in multilateral aid for the up and coming nations of tomorrow? ●

ROBERT BISHOP, 1982 OUTSTANDING PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, during National Volunteer Week (April 18-24), we are honoring a special breed of Americans—our 85,000 active and returned Peace Corps volunteers. For the past two decades, these volunteers from all walks of life, age groups, and economic and social backgrounds, have selflessly donated years of their lives toward fostering a better way of life throughout the developing world, and promoting world peace and friendship.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend especially Mr. Robert Bishop, a fellow native from Massachusetts, who is serving now as a Peace Corps volunteer in Micronesia. Robert has been named the 1982 outstanding Peace Corps volunteer for the North Africa, Near East, Asia and Pacific (NANEAP) operations of Peace Corps.

For 3 years, Robert has been attached to the Community Action agency in the Republic of Palau, Micronesia. He primarily works with the Palau East Coast Farmers Association.

In his role as a Peace Corps volunteer, Robert has set up proper management procedures, determined the production trends of the farmers, surveyed and analyzed the demand for produce, and made recommendations on crop production. He also has helped with the marketing of native crafts.

More recently, Robert has been involved with the opening of new markets, training personnel in management cooperative principles, and establishing a revolving fund to help farmers with their cash flow.

Robert will be completing his Peace Corps service in October of 1982.

I would like to applaud his efforts, as well as those of the other 5,000 volunteers from Massachusetts who left their homes to help people in distant lands. Because of volunteers like Robert Bishop, we are successfully building bonds with developing countries of understanding, friendship, and peace. ●

BISHOPS PROTEST UNITED STATES IN EL SALVADOR

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, traditionally, American leaders of the Catholic Church have chosen the role of silent spectator when U.S. foreign policy is at issue. For the most part, this position has been a wise one. The separation of church and state is, after all, one of the tenets of our Constitution.

Yet there are those issues that, though born of the political realm, transcend it. In such situations, the cost in human life, suffering, and injustice becomes too great to ignore. Then the boundaries between religion and politics fade and merge. The Vietnam war was such an issue and American Catholic leaders rallied in protest of U.S. involvement in that tragic quagmire. Now, closer to home, the bloody civil war in El Salvador has become another.

Several weeks ago, through a series of official statements and congressional testimony, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops became a forceful opponent of Reagan administration policy on Central America. The 372 bishops oppose all forms of military aid to the Government of El Salvador and favor a negotiated settlement between the country's ruling junta and its left-wing guerrillas.

I am proud of the bishops' stand. I am especially proud because one of the leading voices of that opposition belongs to Auxiliary Bishop John E. McCarthy of Galveston-Houston, a diocese that includes my congressional district.

The position these religious leaders have taken is a brave one. They may face criticism from those who say that they are wading into waters where they should not swim. Also, since the Pope has not raised a voice on American involvement in El Salvador, the bishops could face accusations of insubordination. Finally, there is the real and constant physical danger that American Catholic missionaries and church leaders face in El Salvador. The murders last year of Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero and four American missionaries stand as stark and ugly reminders of that threat.

In an interview with Time magazine, Bishop McCarthy brought the issue home. He said:

Those 22-year-old rebels are not risking their lives for the good of the Soviet Union or Cuba. They are risking their lives because they have seen their sisters raped and their homes burned.

Bishop McCarthy is right. The carnage in El Salvador has exceeded any

possible political boundary. It has become an issue of human rights. I salute these members of the American Catholic clergy for recognizing the harm that U.S. foreign policy could inflict upon its Central American neighbors. I thank them for crossing the line.

I am including the following articles to explain in more detail this bold and significant stand:

[From Time Magazine, Mar. 8, 1982]

THE AMERICAN BISHOPS PROTEST

As debate over the U.S. policy in El Salvador has intensified, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops has emerged as a highly vocal opponent of the Reagan Administration's position. The American bishops are against all forms of military aid to El Salvador and favor a negotiated settlement between that country's ruling junta and its left-wing guerrillas.

Other clergy have also spoken out against the Administration. Last week a group of more than 350 church leaders, most of them Protestant but including Catholics and Jews, called for an end to U.S. military aid to El Salvador. But the crucial role of the Roman Catholic Church in Central America makes the position of Catholic leaders in the U.S. particularly relevant. Some church sources say that the U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador, Deane Hinton, has cited the bishops' position as the most serious obstacle to the Administration's efforts to increase military aid to the Salvadoran government.

The 372 American bishops have understandably been influenced by the tragedies that have befallen a number of clergy and church workers in El Salvador, including the slaying of liber Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero in March 1980 and the murders of four American women missionaries later that year. Right-wingers are suspected of killing the archbishop and five former national guardsmen have been charged with killing the missionaries. The bishops have contended for two years that the U.S. must not become too closely identified with the Salvadoran government. Archbishop James A. Hickey of Washington last year told the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs: "Our position is to oppose military aid and intervention from all outside powers." The bishops favored diplomatic pressure to "stop the flow of arms from Cuba through Nicaragua to El Salvador," he said, "but we earnestly and vigorously oppose the sending of U.S. military assistance to El Salvador." In November, the Conference of Bishops reaffirmed that position, with only a dozen members at the meeting dissenting.

As Archbishop Hickey has argued, the Catholic leaders fear a Communist takeover in El Salvador but nonetheless are against sending in U.S. arms. The bishops' rationale: the weapons will strengthen repressive elements in the security forces and, says Bishop Raymond A. Lucker of New Ulm, Minn., drive more and more people "into the hills and into the hands of the guerrillas." Says Auxiliary Bishop John E. McCarthy of Galveston-Houston: "Those 22-year-old rebels are not risking their lives for the good of the Soviet Union or Cuba. They are risking their lives because they have seen their fathers murdered, their sisters raped and their homes burned." His fear, says McCarthy, is that "the intensity and blindness of American policy will produce the opposite effect of what lovers of freedom want—a situation leading to a Communist

takeover." For these reasons, says Archbishop John R. Roach of St. Paul and Minneapolis, president of the Bishops' Conference, the group has taken its stand and asked Washington to refrain from "massively increasing the destructive capability of the armed forces." The bishops have not addressed themselves to what the U.S. should do if such restraint should lead to a guerrilla victory, as the Administration fears would happen.

Although Pope John Paul II has not commented on their political statements concerning El Salvador, the American bishops believe that he does not oppose their policies. Says Lucker: "Clearly he cannot be saying that we shouldn't be taking stands on moral issues that have political implications. Look at his own statements on Poland." A Vatican official describes the Pope's views on El Salvador to be threefold: to prevent bloodshed, encourage social reform and avoid the emergence of "another Cuba." Neither the bishops nor the Reagan Administration would disagree with those goals; the question is how to attain them.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1982]

U.S. CATHOLIC BISHOPS OPPOSING ADMINISTRATION'S SALVADOR POLICY

(By Kenneth A. Briggs)

Responding to growing debate over United States involvement in El Salvador, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops has become a forceful opponent of Reagan Administration policy, toughening its stand against all forms of military aid to the Central American country and demanding a negotiated settlement there.

Many other religious groups have attacked the Administration's strategy, including an interfaith coalition of 350 people who, in a letter to members of Congress last week coordinated by Clergy and Laity Concerned, demanded an end to military aid. But the special place of the Roman Catholic Church in the lives of 90 percent of Latin America's people makes the voice of the church hierarchy in the United States especially powerful.

MAJOR TURNING POINT SEEN

The State Department has carefully studied the bishops' protests and church sources say the United States Ambassador to El Salvador, Deane R. Hinton, has privately singled out the church's opposition as the main obstacle to the Administration's effort to increase military aid to the Salvadoran Government, which is fighting leftist guerrillas.

The solid position of the hierarchy in the United States, expressed in a series of official statements and in Congressional testimony, stems from a history of close contact with Latin American Catholics and signals a major turning point in the church's readiness to criticize United States foreign policy. A similar climate of objection has developed around the issue of disarmament.

In broader church terms, the move is an outgrowth of an approach to the third world that began in the early 1960's with the Second Vatican Council's appeal for human rights. It continued in Pope Paul VI's 1967 encyclical on social justice, "Progress of the Peoples," and was taken further at the meetings of Latin American bishops in 1968 and in 1978 that called for the church to side boldly with the poor. During the same period, the establishment of regional episcopal conferences encouraged bishops to make more of their own decisions.

We feel an obligation to heed the voice of the South American church," Bishop John E. McCarthy of Houston said in discussing El Salvador. "And we feel it is our duty to challenge the public policy of the American Government, which is arming, training, and guiding military forces which are obviously oppressing its people."

In stepping up the criticism, the bishops say they are gaining confidence in their ability to make distinctions. "The biggest hurdle," said Archbishop Rembert G. Weakland of Milwaukee, "is the idea that if you're not pro-U.S. policy, then you're pro-Communist, that there's only black and white, no middle ground. We're calling for a new, realistic policy. We can side with the poor and not be Communist."

Archbishop James A. Hickey of Washington began visiting El Salvador in 1975 when, as the Bishop of Cleveland, he supervised many church workers from his diocese, including two of the four churchwomen slain more than a year ago. In a letter this month to Representative Michael D. Barnes, Democrat of Maryland and chairman of the House subcommittee on inter-American affairs, Archbishop Hickey expressed a common view among bishops that the United States must press for negotiations between the Salvadoran Government and the guerrillas. He also called for an international peacekeeping force as a prelude to fair elections.

"My attempt is to present a balanced case," Archbishop Hickey said, commenting on the letter. "I don't want a Communist government there, but I don't want arms supplies going there either."

VATICAN STAYS MOSTLY ALOOF

Meanwhile the Vatican itself has caused some uneasiness among American churchmen by remaining largely aloof from the public debate, reportedly because of worries over the possibility of Communist expansion in the region.

Some of the anxiety in the United States has stemmed from the delay in naming a permanent head of the San Salvador Archdiocese to replace Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero, the outspoken foe of military conflict and of Salvadoran Government policies who was shot dead while saying mass two years ago. Archbishop Romero's plea to President Carter to withhold arms to El Salvador had first prompted action by the Catholic hierarchy in this country.

Bishop Arturo Rivera Damas, who is widely believed to hold views similar to those of Archbishop Romero, has been acting Archbishop since the prelate was killed, but the long process of choosing a permanent replacement troubles some churchmen.

TENSIONS REPORTED IN CURIA

Some Catholic leaders attributed the Vatican's silence on the Salvador issue to tensions among high officials of the Curia, the central administration of the church, over how best to address the human rights problems in the region in the face of what some prelates see as a growing threat of Marxist influence in Nicaragua and El Salvador. "Basically," said one leader, "the Vatican doesn't want little Cubas all over the area."

The situation is complicated by the fact that the acting Archbishop is virtually the only progressive in the Salvadoran hierarchy and that the president of the country's Bishops Conference, Bishop Pedro Arnoldo Aparicio y Quintanilla, is a staunch conservative who favors United States military assistance. Some critics of the United States

bishops, including State Department officials, have drawn on Bishop Aparicio's statements, but the bishops insist their primary responsibility is to weigh the actions of their own Government, which, they say, are wrong.

The United States bishops have taken independent initiatives without seeking outright approval from the Vatican. At a closed-door session in November that discussed the position of the bishops' conference regarding El Salvador, some prelates wanted to consult the Vatican, but the suggestion was rejected by a large majority on grounds that the Americans knew better than Rome how to respond to the situation.

"TACIT APPROVAL" SEEN

Archbishop John R. Roach, president of the conference, noted that the Vatican is "fully aware of our position" and said the lack of any explicit objection constituted "tacit approval."

Such decisiveness mirrors a changing role for the bishops as they expand their concern for moral issues and human rights to the realm of international affairs. In so doing, they are taking greater responsibility for assessing the policies of their own country.

Archbishop Roach sharply attacked military assistance to El Salvador in a letter released at the outset of Senate hearings on the matter. He called to "present direction" of Administration policy "a dangerous course, with a result potentially as damaging to us as it is to the Salvadorans."

The Archbishop repeated the call by the full conference last November for an end to all "outside military assistance" and urged Washington to encourage talks among conflicting parties rather than "massively increasing the destructive capability of the armed forces."

CHURCH HAS NEW CONFIDENCE

The adamant support for this stand among most United States bishops indicates a degree of confidence and determination unusual for a church once disposed to approve Washington's foreign policy with few if any reservations. "We were an immigrant church during the last century and most of this one," said Bishop Raymond A. Lucker of New Ulm, Minn., "and we went through a period when we bent over backwards to prove we were American."

By comparison, church opposition to United States actions in Vietnam grew more gradually, beginning as support for American involvement in 1966 and culminating in a call for the total withdrawal of American troops in 1971.

"The Southeast Asian experience is in back of everybody's mind," Bishop McCarthy said.

Among the chief differences between reactions by the church to the two conflicts was that ties between the Catholics in the United States and in Central America go much deeper and are more personal. For more than two decades, since Pope John XXIII called on United States bishops to send personnel to South America, hundreds of priests, nuns and lay people have gone to serve poor parishes in the region, under the direction of bishops who usually traveled to the missions and learned firsthand of the problems there.

BISHOPS BECAME AWARE

"Those bishops who went there became aware on an experiential basis," said Bishop Weakland. "That took the church out of its inner circle to another part of the world. It gave us knowledge and courage to take

stands otherwise we probably wouldn't have taken. We have our own sources of information and people we trust. We can speak forcefully and feel good about speaking out."

Administration officials have been concerned about the strength of the bishops' stand. A year ago, Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr., along with Under Secretary James L. Buckley, met with several top Catholic officials to press the Administration's case. Subsequent meetings have been held between small groups and individuals from both sides, but neither side has appeared to give ground. The bishops seem to have stiffened their resolve.

"I don't think we can stay in the sacristy and talk about holy things," Bishop Lucker said. "These are holy things. People are holy."

THE IRS STRIKES—WITH VIOLENCE

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices, which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act—TPA—is their use of violence in disregarding any lawful procedures, constitutional rights, or basic decency and respect which should be extended to all citizens.

The IRS has been known to hit an entire community with a heavily armed strike force or even to use a force of 40 armed men against 1 non-violent Amish individual.

The following account is one of many where violent measures have been used to inflict IRS demands upon the public.

In 1977, Mona and Stephen Oliver of Fairbanks, Alaska, received notification from the Internal Revenue Service Regional Office in Ogden, Utah, that they owed the IRS \$3,300. No explanation of how this sum was determined accompanied the bill. The Olivers, while examining the IRS bill, discovered an error in arithmetic, so they wrote to the IRS and pointed out the mistake.

IRS bureaucrats made no response at first, but several months later the IRS informed the Olivers that they now owed \$4,700, again failing—or refusing—to state how this figure was selected. The Olivers, who have always filed their income tax returns, continued to write to various IRS officials but received no adequate explanation.

By February 1979, the IRS had grown tired of the "obstinate" Olivers who refused to comply with the manifestly arbitrary assessment of the IRS. During this time the IRS changed its mind again and decided that the correct amount of taxes owed was \$4,200. Then the agency proceeded to place a levy on Stephen Oliver's wages, which reduced the Olivers' income below the poverty level.

On August 1, 1979, the Olivers were informed that they now owed \$9,600 in back

taxes. That same morning, Stephen and Mona Oliver drove to Fairbanks federal building on business relating to the IRS. According to Mona Oliver, she and her husband were on the top floor of the federal building when "someone came up and said, 'They're towing away your car outside!' We were in such a hurry that we didn't even wait for the elevator . . . we ran down the stairs."

The Olivers found their car hitched to a tow truck. It had been towed off of the public street in front of the federal building and into the building's parking lot.

"I was upset, I was shaking. There must have been ten IRS agents around it [the car]. I said, 'Is it all right if we remove our personal belongings?' They said that was all right, so we started to take our things out of the car. I was so close to breaking into tears, but that was the last thing that I wanted to do in front of them," Mrs. Oliver said.

The Olivers claim that they were never notified by the IRS that their property was going to be seized. In any event it is unusual and perhaps foolish to place a levy on a person's wages and then seize his only means of transportation to work.

As she was unloading her belongings, Mrs. Oliver thought to herself, "Where are they taking my car? If they're taking my car somewhere, I want to know where."

She said, "So then I just sat down on the seat, closed the door, and locked it."

Stephen Oliver quickly joined her in their small dilapidated Volkswagen. He sat in the driver's seat and locked his door too.

This defiance of the IRS infuriated the agents, who began yelling threats and warnings at the Olivers. IRS agents quickly summoned the city police to help them against the unarmed Olivers and from the rapidly gathering crowd of onlookers.

The operator of the truck towing the Olivers' Volkswagen was shaken when he learned that the IRS agents did not have a court order allowing them to seize the car. The driver uncoupled his truck from the Olivers' car and left. The IRS agents immediately surrounded the Volkswagen with vehicles of their own. Members of the large group of bystanders sympathetic to the Olivers' plight suggested that they might remove the IRS vehicles and set the Olivers free. Stephen Oliver vetoed the idea. Minutes later his car was chained to an IRS agent's jeep.

For seven hours the determined Olivers held their position inside their car until the IRS secured a search warrant from a magistrate brought in by the IRS specifically for that purpose. (It is difficult to imagine what the IRS was "searching" for in the Olivers' car.)

"With no warning at all, they began smashing the windows with billy clubs," Mona Oliver said. "I saw them start on the driver's side; my husband's arm was right up against the glass. I thought, 'If I put my hand up against the window they'll see it and won't break the glass.' But they smashed the window right into my hand," she said.

After the IRS agents had hurled Stephen from the car, they went after Mona. Several agents dragged her across the broken glass and shoved her onto the pavement, leaving her bruised and bleeding. Even under the authority of a search warrant, what these IRS ruffians did is tantamount to assault and battery. These agents seem to have knowingly committed the crime of assault by using excessive force against non-criminal, nonviolent citizens in a civil matter.

A government-owned tow truck soon whisked the car away. The next day the IRS informed the Olivers that they now owed "only" \$4,010.

On August 23, 1979, the Olivers' Volkswagen was auctioned for \$500. The crowd of protesters who had gathered outside the building where the auction took place was photographed by IRS agents. License-plate numbers of those at the rally were taken down.●

SETON HALL ATHLETIC HALL OF FAME

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Seton Hall University in South Orange, N.J., will hold a very special event this Saturday evening—its 10th annual Athletic Hall of Fame dinner, honoring those Seton Hall alumni who excelled in athletics.

Seton Hall is celebrating its 125th year of quality higher education, and the individuals who will be honored at the Hall of Fame dinner are a tribute to the well-rounded educational experience offered at Seton Hall. This year's Seton Hall alumni elected into the Athletic Hall of Fame are Rick Cerone, the all-star catcher for the New York Yankees; Ben Fields, U.S. Olympic high jumper; Howard Brock, who has possession of six Seton Hall track records; Tom Boutsikaris, All-American fencer; Richard Wiecezszak, All-American third baseman; basketball standouts Al Senavitis and John Suminski; track star Frank Fletcher; and Father Francis Reynolds, now deceased, who was a standout basketball and baseball player for Seton Hall.

New Jersey State Senator John Caulfield and Gerard Dalton, vice president of New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., were elected honorary members of the Athletic Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have followed Seton Hall athletics over the years hold a special appreciation for all these athletes, but the most famous of the Seton Hall alumni is undoubtedly Yankee star Rick Cerone. For those of us who watched Rick grow up playing baseball and football on the sandlots of Newark, and then for Essex Catholic High School in Newark, it came as no great surprise that he blossomed into a major league star. After three record-setting seasons at Seton Hall in which he became a baseball All-American and academic All-American, Rick became the No. 1 draft pick of the Cleveland Indians in 1975. He honed his skills for 2 years with Cleveland and 3 with the Toronto Blue Jays until the Yankees called him, and Rick came home to become the American League's all-star catcher in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I join all the citizens in New Jersey in proclaiming how proud we are of all the Seton Hall Athletic Hall of Famers for their courage and determination. They brought us many moments of excitement, and in the process carried on the rich tradition of Seton Hall University.●

THE CITY OF CYPRESS PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION HONORS

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 16, 1982, the city of Cypress Public Safety Employees Association, in cooperation with the Cypress Chamber of Commerce, presented the 14th Annual Police Officer of the Year Awards Banquet.

The city of Cypress always seems to be associated with success and persistence. Cypress does things in a big way. For instance, growing in population by 1,670 percent in the 1960's and gaining notoriety as Orange County's fastest growing city.

The honoree for the 1981 police officer of the year was Officer James Weuve, a 9-year veteran of the force. In addition, Kathleen Mary Tautkas had been selected as the Cypress employee of the year for 1981 by her fellow employees and Phoebe Mason was honored as city of Cypress citizen of the year. These three individuals typify the quality of the city of Cypress.

For example, Officer Weuve has been the recipient of citations from the chief's office for his caring concern and compassion for his fellow human being, while, at the same time, he has been honored by the district attorney's office for outstanding work.

Kathleen Mary Tautkas is known to be a city employee who easily adapts to various assignments, thrives on challenging assignments and works hard for Cypress citizens.

Phoebe Mason, a long-time crossing guard for Cypress schoolchildren, can always be found at her post without regard to the weather or traffic conditions. She always serves with a smile on her face, and with a concern for the safety of our children.

Mr. Speaker, please join with me and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives in cheering the city of Cypress and its honorees: Officer James Weuve, police officer of the year; Kathleen Mary Tautkas, employee of the year; Phoebe Mason, citizen of the year.●

RESPONSIBILITY TO THE DEAF AND HEARING IMPAIRED

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1982

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my colleagues today on the principal of responsibility. Specifically, Government responsibility, corporate responsibility, and personal responsibility to guarantee the civil rights of this country's deaf and hearing impaired population.

In 1973, the U.S. Congress passed into law the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. It is commonly known as the Handicapped Civil Rights Act. With the passage of that act, the Federal Government assumed responsibility for guaranteeing handicapped citizens open access to public facilities and a public life. But the Government cannot create and maintain open access for handicapped people without the steadfast cooperation of American business.

This Nation's airwaves are owned by the public and are licensed by the most public of all institutions, the Federal Government. The 16 million deaf and hearing impaired citizens who make up a large portion of the public have every right to expect open access to television programming. It is the corporate responsibility of the television industry to make their product available to the deaf and hearing impaired. There is a lot of talk these days about increased corporate responsibility and deceased Government control. I am sorry to say, that while two networks are making efforts, the television industry as a whole has not taken seriously its corporate responsibility to provide open access to its programming.

PBS leads the pack of networks in providing access to television programming for the deaf and hearing impaired by closed captioning about 27 of its shows. Close behind is ABC which captions about 16 of its shows. Far behind the leaders is NBC which captions only two of its programs and has plans to discontinue the closed captioning service altogether at the end of this season. Rating a complete zero for its efforts, CBS has not one captioned program available to the deaf and hearing impaired. CBS claims to be working on a captioning system of its own but it will probably not be available for another 4 to 5 years. The National Captioning Institute has tried to work with CBS to make sure their system would be compatible with television adaptors already being purchased by the deaf and hearing impaired. So far, the institute reports

that CBS cooperation has been minimal.

I recognize that there have been problems associated with the distribution of the television adaptors needed to bring closed captioned programming to the deaf and hearing impaired. However, the captioning service began only 2 years ago and the National Captioning Institute is currently making great efforts to overcome past problems.

The Institute is mounting a massive awareness campaign to make more deaf and hearing impaired viewers aware of the adaptors and how to obtain them. There have already been over 50,000 machines sold and the Institute feels it can significantly expand the number of machines in use through its awareness campaign.

The Institute is also making it easier for people to obtain the adaptors. Today, an adaptor costs about \$300. While they cannot be purchased any cheaper because they are already being sold at cost, the Institute is becoming very successful at getting service clubs, churches, and other organizations to help defray the cost. The Institute has also begun to distribute the machines themselves. In the past, Sears was the only distributor and because the machines were sold at cost, the marketing efforts were inadequate. In addition, the IRS will now consider the cost of an adaptor a deductible medical expense. The Institute has informed the networks of these activities, but network closed captioning continues to decrease.

While there are so few television shows available to the deaf and hearing impaired, it is interesting that the world of advertising is rapidly opening up to them. The Institute reports that they do closed captioning for 150 advertisers. They include Sears, IBM, Xerox, Kellogg, Nabisco, Bristol-Myers, Colgate Palmolive, Johnson & Johnson, Proctor & Gamble, General Foods, General Motors, Mobile Oil, and Kraft to name just a few. If all these other industries recognize the importance of the deaf and hearing impaired in their markets, why do the networks continue to virtually ignore them? Is it the cost of closed captioning that deters them? I don't think so.

I called NBC to find out what they charge for 1 minute of advertising on "Little House On the Prairie," one of their two closed captioned programs. Depending on the time of year, the time sells for between \$160,000 and \$200,000 per minute. The National Captioning Institute charges \$2,200 to caption the entire 1 hour episode. There are 6 minutes of advertisements during the program. The network takes in between \$960,000 and \$1,200,000 per episode. Do you think \$2,200 is too much to pay to bring entertainment and enjoyment to millions

of people? In this case, corporate responsibility would come cheap.

The Federal Government has the responsibility to guarantee the deaf and hearing impaired open access to as much as possible. The television industry has a corporate responsibility to provide expanded closed captioned programming for deaf and hearing impaired viewers and I have a personal responsibility to the deaf and hearing impaired community to help the National Captioning Institute in its awareness campaign. I will be sponsoring along with the Deaf Advocacy Council of Metro Detroit, a meeting with a person from the Institute who will provide much needed information on their campaign. The meeting will be held on May 21, 1982, at 7:30 p.m. The UAW region 1 has kindly offered their facility at 12000 Twelve Mile Road for the meeting. I invite anyone interested to attend.

Closed captioning is coming into its own and now is the time to be expanding not eliminating the service. I applaud the efforts of PBS and ABC and encourage them to expand their closed captioned service. It provides tremendous pleasure and important information to a large group of people who otherwise could not enjoy television. The deaf and handicapped need the cooperation of the networks and they are a population the networks cannot continue to ignore. ●

MOST REVEREND CHRISTOPHER J. WELDON

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1982 the people of western Massachusetts lost one of their best friends and most local supporters. The death of the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, retired bishop of the Springfield Roman Catholic Diocese brought to a close of lifetime of dedicated service to God and to his fellow man.

Bishop Weldon was a man of deep religious faith and tremendous compassion. During the more than 27 years in which he headed the Springfield Diocese, Bishop Weldon also proved himself to be a skillful administrator. Monuments to his ability, in the form of schools, hospitals, and homes for the young and the old who had no other place to go, abound in the diocese. His vigorous efforts to improve the diocese's social welfare programs were a good example of his belief that his church and the people who compose it, have a duty to act on behalf of those in need. In countless ways, both tangible and intangible, he

touched the lives of people of all faiths and people in all walks of life.

The love which Bishop Weldon engendered was evidenced by the crowds which came to pay their last respects to him. Their presence was an indication of their conviction that our lives and the life of our community, had been made better by Bishop Weldon's having been with us. He was truly a good shepherd who led his flock in an appreciation of God and humanity.

Mr. Speaker, Bishop Joseph F. Maguire, the current bishop of the Springfield diocese, delivered a moving eulogy to his predecessor at the funeral services. I ask that Bishop Maguire's tribute be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Daily News, Mar. 24, 1982]
MAGUIRE TRIBUTE TO CAREER OF BISHOP WELDON

(Following is the text of the eulogy delivered by Bishop Joseph F. Maguire at funeral services today for retired Bishop Christopher J. Weldon.)

"Ut Christum Ferum", "That I May Bear Christ", sums up an urgency and a history. Christopher Joseph Weldon took these words as his motto when he became Springfield's fourth bishop. He lived these words. He challenged us with these words. He leaves them with us as a reminder of his love for the Lord—and his fidelity to the end.

It is more than coincidence that we come to bury Bishop Weldon on the exact date he was consecrated 32 years ago.

It is a symbol and a summary of the man. His episcopacy and his death are one totality.

His sisters, Alice and Margaret, and his brother, Edward, remember March 20, 1950, as a bright, brisk and sparkling day. It was just about this time that church bells on Fifth Avenue began to peal as the long line of priests and prelates entered Saint Patrick's Cathedral in New York.

GREAT CHURCHMEN

From that Cathedral, the destiny of the American church was carved by great churchmen like Archbishops Hughes and Corrigan, Cardinals McCloskey, Farley, Hayes and Spellman.

Among those in procession on that chilly morning were heroes of our time. Monsignor Fulton Sheen, Archbishop Cushing of Boston, Bishop John Wright of the new Diocese of Worcester—and scores of bishops and priests, some of whom are with us this morning. In a setting of pageantry and splendor, Christopher Weldon was ordained to be a servant, a shepherd, an overseer, a bishop.

There are many in this church who recall his arrival at Union Station in Springfield—a smiling, friendly, dynamic prelate, with a prophecy on his lips: "Don't rush," he said, "I intend to be here a long time."

Many of you remember him 27 years later, after the years had taken their toll, standing in the sacristy before a ceremony, stiffened with pain, ashen and tired from a sleepless night but, as he said so often, rising to "full stature," meticulously vested, staff in hand, the imposing Michael mitre on his head, the red of his zucchetto accentuating the silver of his hair, a trace of wistfulness in his smile, eyes flashing and a flush

of excitement lighting every feature as he rallied all his energies to be bishop.

NO WEARY SIGH

There was no stiffness in his gait, no weary sigh as he preached to the last ounce of strength and then moved on to the next task—not drained but rejuvenated.

The compelling, unrelenting urgency of his life was to be what he was consecrated to be—a bishop.

In our Catholic tradition, it is in the manner as well as in the words of Jesus that we understand the ministry of bishop. He called the Twelve to a close and intimate friendship.

He required that they be men of prayer; that they tend the flock; that they be healers; that they seek the lost and abandoned and that they preach unceasingly his Good News.

Early Christian communities, blessed with overflowing gifts of the spirit, quickly began to develop various ministries. But the prime concern of those struggling churches was to hand on intact the Gospel—"the pledge entrusted."

Thus, in the rite of the laying on of hands, the gift of the Holy Spirit is given to help the bishop preserve and proclaim the Apostolic tradition. In the pastoral letters, Paul emphasizes the bishop's responsibility to preach "in season and out, whether convenient or inconvenient" and to remain faithful to the pledge entrusted, especially when sound doctrine is in jeopardy.

True to this tradition, Christopher Weldon wanted to be, as Saint Paul says, "a man approved."

But he did not seek this or desire it for himself. He wanted it for what he was. He knew that within the church, the bishop has unique responsibilities. "He exercises the office of teaching, of sanctifying and of governing." He is the sign of our communion with our brothers and sisters called from every land and nation into the one, holy people of God.

He is the Good Shepherd joined by sacred tradition to the historic past—anointed with the spirit as prophet, leading the church to promises ever to be fulfilled. "Behold, I make all things new."

KINGLY MINISTRY

The bishop gathers all the people of God "called in baptism and confirmation to share in the priestly, prophetic and kingly ministry of Christ."

It is his happy burden to call forth the gifts of God's people and to make use of these gifts in the building up of the kingdom. Without his presence or his office, we have no visible sign of unity or community.

Bishop Weldon knew that we have no other agenda. Buildings and institutions, drives and programs exist not for their own sake but, as he would say, "for the cause."

Brightside, Cathedral High School, the Newman Center, homes for elderly men and women, the modernization of Catholic hospitals—all these have diocesan character and identity because they are signs of our common commitment to bring to perfection the Gospel message "in this area of the Lord's vineyard."

Bishop Weldon was involved in brick and mortar, in color schemes and blueprints. He knew about health care and building codes. He chided, insisted, corrected, argued, reproved and persisted because, like it or not, this was what he had to do.

He was not afraid to sacrifice personality or risk losing friends to live more fully his idea of what it meant to be a bishop.

He truly loved his family. Yet he returned to Springfield immediately after his mother's funeral to attend a fund-raising meeting for Brightside.

It would be a grave injustice to think of him simply as an overseer of buildings and institutions.

He was an overseer in the exact sense that the term was used in the early church. He was a builder of community.

RISE TO FULL STATURE

He called upon every individual "to rise to full stature," to accept responsibility in and for the community.

Proof of that, I believe, is in the compassion that people of Western Massachusetts have for "their less fortunate brothers and sisters."

Long ago he directed that collecting monies for agencies and institutions would be "exercises in charity" rather than fund-raising campaigns. He established a network of lay involvement through the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Parish Councils and Boards of Trustees.

To the end, he maintained that support for the education of our children in a religious environment is the obligation of every Catholic.

Constantly, he emphasized the importance and necessity of sound teaching. The spirit he engendered has taken root and flourishes among us.

APOSTOLIC TRADITION

Contained in the apostolic tradition is the indisputable truth that the Twelve were different—especially Peter—and that tensions and clashes have prevailed in the church and will always be part of our journey.

Many of you could tell by the set of his chin and his resolute eyes whether or not Bishop Weldon had made up his mind. And all of you knew that once he had decided, it was difficult, indeed, to sway him.

There was much of Saint Peter in Bishop Weldon—so much strength, so much discipline, so much love. Today's Gospel strips away Peter's defenses and shows us what he really was.

According to John, Jesus meets Peter for the first time after the Resurrection in the early morning by the Lake of Genesareth. He does not question Peter about his denial or his guilt.

DO YOU LOVE ME?

He simply asks: "Simon, son of John, do you love me?" Certainly Peter had guilt feelings and was troubled about his denial.

But when Jesus asks, "Do you love me?"—he makes Peter aware of the depth of his love. That knowledge healed Peter.

He knew that whatever else he felt, his love for the Lord was the strongest force in his life. "Yes, Lord, you know I love you." Then Jesus said: "Feed my sheep."

There are some people we know almost instantly. What they are becomes apparent at our first meeting.

As friendship grows, we appreciate more deeply their gifts and qualities. With others, there is a more gradual revelation. We discover than in bits and pieces.

LEGEND AND HISTORY

During the past six years, I learned the legend and heard the history of Bishop Weldon.

I sat with him often in visits that were mutually enjoyable. Monday, March 15, 1982, at Mercy Hospital, will long be part of my memory.

I saw this great priest and prelate, this once physically powerful man, now frail and

thin, his body arched and wracked with pain.

It was then that I knew the measure and the mystery of this man—then that I knew him as I had never known him before. In his last spoken words to a friend, he said: "I am offering my suffering for the priests and the people of the diocese."

"Do you love me?" "Yes, Lord, you know I love you."

HEART HAD WORN OUT

After his death, Bishop Weldon's doctor said that his heart had worn itself out and was beyond repair.

In his lifetime, with amazing resiliency, he had given all his energies for his people and his God. For him, "To Bear Christ," was an urgency—a call he accepted, as he accepted his death for his flock.

And so, on this day, March 24, 1982, ends a story that began on March 24, 1950.

We have come full cycle in the life of Christopher Joseph Weldon. An idealist, a perfectionist, a bishop—what he asked and expected of others, were never more than he demanded and gave of himself.

"Do you love me?" "Yes, Lord, you know that I do." "Feed my sheep." ●

THE IRS STRIKES—MUSCLING THE MIDDLE CLASS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices, which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA) is the following letter I received from a disgruntled accountant in the Northeast:

DEAR SIR: I would like to commend you for the initiative you are taking by introducing the Taxpayer Protection Act (H.R. 4931). Of all the problems which face legislators today, few if any, represent such a direct contradiction to the nature of our country and the intent of our Constitution than the illegal powers granted to and/or established by the Internal Revenue Service. This power, together with the overwhelming complexity of our laws, gives the IRS virtually total unencumbered ability to interpret a taxpayer's liability and enforce collection in any way it (the IRS) chooses. My major, in college, was accounting and I worked in public accounting for about six years. I have prepared hundreds of tax returns and have had encounters with the IRS at various levels and for various reasons during those years. I could relate to you stories known to me, because of my professional interests, during that time. However, I am certain that you know these same stories as well as I, if not better. There have been newspaper and magazine articles, books and television documentaries on the subject. So the question is: Why have "we the people" allowed this to go on for so long? It should suffice to say that my empathy for the taxpayer and disdain for the system of tax collection precluded me, ethically, philosophically, morally, and emotionally, from taking part in this process. I no longer work in the

field of public accounting. However, sometimes I feel guilty for abandoning the taxpayer and leaving him one less advocate. Therefore, I will throw caution to the wind (for our sake) and allow you to use this letter, in anyway, if you feel that it could be of some benefit.

The middle class, of which I am a member, the W-2 wage earner bears the brunt of this burden and exploitation. We support the country with our taxes and are the target of the greatest number of audits made by the IRS. Strangely enough, we are the least likely to cheat on our taxes because the vehicles for cheating are not available to us. However, the middle class provides the most efficient means for the IRS to enforce collection through its use of intimidation. Because the middle class comprises the largest block of taxpayers, we provide tremendous "word-of-mouth advertising" for the IRS. This is not conjecture or theory. While I was in public accounting, attending tax seminars, I listened to IRS Directors explain this principle of effective, low cost, high benefit, efficient tax collection. The IRS was, and probably still is, proud of this technique. However, my clients, at that time, were frustrated and almost paranoid. I learned, first hand, that if this country ever has another major revolution it will be the middle class in a tax revolt. God help us! It isn't necessary. It's our country, our laws, our taxes. Isn't it?

In conclusion, Congressman Hansen, I support you and urge you to continue towards your goals of tax collection reform and tax reform in general. I am confident that you can only receive tremendous public support. This issue transcends all partisan affiliations for any person who calls himself a citizen of the United States. It is the duty of all elected representatives to tackle these difficult issues. Please, make our system work! ●

NATIONAL BOYS CLUB WEEK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation celebrated National Boys Club Week earlier this month, and my home city of Newark marked the occasion in grand style. The Boys and Girls Clubs of Newark are very important to the Newark community. They provide a place to learn, to work at a craft, to compete in athletics, to relax, and to socialize for over 5,000 young people. Their participation in National Boys Club Week was an excellent example of their involvement in the community.

The David L. Warner division of the Boys and Girls Club held a junior boxing show and a series of basketball tournaments. The central ward unit held a brunch and a talk by Gladys Hillman, deputy executive superintendent of schools. It also gave awards to Essex County Warden Albert T. Collier, the Men of Essex, and the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity.

The commitment of the Newark Boys and Girls Clubs to the youths of

our city does not stop at the end of National Boys Club Week, however. The dedication to helping our young people become confident contributors to their community is an ongoing purpose of the Boys and Girls Club; and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all those involved with the clubs who have worked so hard to make them a success in Newark. ●

UNFAIR TRADE BARRIERS

HON. LYNN MARTIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, job stability is a justifiable concern to all workers. That stability, however, is threatened not only by a sluggish economy, but also by international trade imbalances.

In 1981 alone, the United States had an imbalance of trade with Japan of almost \$16 billion, of which \$12.8 billion reflected automotive vehicles, parts, and engines. In other words, we buy more Japanese automobiles than they buy U.S. automobiles. While a portion of this trade imbalance may, in fact, be due to the competitive price and gas mileage of Japanese automobiles, a good portion of this imbalance is indicative of unfair trade barriers against United States autos sold in Japan. Although Japan has no import duties or content laws, their nontariff barriers inflate the purchase price of a United States auto sold in Japan. Obviously, a Buick Century that sells in the United States for \$9,000 is unattractive at a price tag of \$23,000 in Japan. Likewise, a Ford Mustang and Chevrolet Chevette price tag in Japan of over \$13,000 is certainly not a "good buy."

But this scenario is not peculiar to Japan, or the auto industry. That is why we must look at our international trade policies and see if the United States is indeed becoming the "underdog" in trade, a situation costing thousands of Americans their jobs.

One suggestion to save U.S. auto jobs is domestic content requirements. Although this type of legislation is indeed an interesting approach to auto job stability, I think many people would agree that protectionism is not the best policy in the long run for the U.S. auto industry. Competition, whether it be domestic or foreign, provides the impetus to produce better and more attractive automobiles for the cost-conscious car-buying consumer.

It is easy to understand, of course, why U.S. autos are unattractive in foreign countries; they carry inflated price tags which reflect informal trade barriers. In light of this, I am a co-sponsor of legislation which gives the

President authority to terminate trade agreements concerning tariff reductions or other import restrictions, if it is determined that our trading partners have failed to provide equivalent competitive opportunities for U.S. commerce in their home markets. This piece of legislation is an important first step in restoring overall reciprocity with our trading partners who raise informal barriers against U.S. goods while subsidizing what they send us. Another proposal I support requires a review of the major nontariff barriers that deny the United States commercial opportunities relatively equivalent to those offered by the United States.

I believe the special and close relationship we have had with our international trading partners should continue, but perhaps in a slightly different framework. I am uncomfortable with the fact that some of our trading friends can export cars with little difficulty to the United States, but U.S. manufacturers face unacceptable informal barriers when they attempt to export cars. Steps must be taken to remedy this imbalance and to save U.S. jobs. They should not be, however, hasty and politically expedient ones that will isolate or protect our manufacturers from necessary and productive competition. ●

NO PRESS FREEDOM IN SANDINIST NICARAGUA

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, the state of press freedom in Sandinist Nicaragua is, in a word, nonexistent. While human rights activists are crowding into El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, the Marxist totalitarian regime of self-professed people's liberators have either closed down or threatened to a point of submission all media outlets.

Buried somewhere beneath the pile of press reports coming out of Central America in the American press is the short, but telling, statement bearing on the status of the press and free expression in Nicaragua issued by the Committee To Protect Journalists, chaired by Walter Cronkite. This statement calls the situation of journalists "profoundly threatening." It says that Sandinista-sponsored mobs and government officials have attacked and harassed the few remaining active journalists who are opposed to the Government.

For the attention of my colleagues, I am including an article which recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal, "The State of Press Freedom in Sandinist Nicaragua." Allen Weinstein, of

the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown, wrote the following article:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1982]

THE STATE OF PRESS FREEDOM IN SANDINIST NICARAGUA

(By Allen Weinstein)

Six American journalists and a lawyer returned recently from a tour of Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala arranged by a group known as "The Committee to Protect Journalists," whose honorary chairman is Walter Cronkite.

None of us could be considered a specialist in Central American affairs. Our group included Jonathan Larsen of Life magazine; George Watson of ABC News; Randolph Ryan, an editorial writer for the Boston Globe; Gloria Emerson, formerly a reporter for the New York Times; and Michael Massing, executive editor of the Columbia Journalism Review. I was accompanied by my wife, a Washington attorney who is fluent in Spanish.

The group returned with a report that condemned the jailing, assault and murder of press figures in El Salvador and in Guatemala. The report criticized the guerrilla left as well as rightists for the periodic acts of violence directed against journalists. And the report denounced both the total repression of the free press in Nicaragua under Sandinista rule and the many threats to the physical safety of journalists in that country. No sterner indictment of that regime's abuse of press freedom has appeared in this country.

The status of the press in Nicaragua, alas, failed to interest most of the reporters who attended a New York City press conference called by the committee. The journalists present virtually ignored the Nicaraguan section of the report to concentrate on El Salvador, an understandable interest given the recent election and the international attention on the four Dutch journalists whose deaths remain a matter of great controversy.

At the same time, two members of our delegation were so uncomfortable with our group's statement on Nicaraguan press abuses that at the press conference they expressed their rejection of this part of the statement, which is printed below. All of us had agreed previously on this section after extensive discussion during the drafting process in Central America.

The inner history of our group's arguments over the virtues and failings of Sandinista leadership need not concern us here. What matters is the report itself. A three-day round of meetings in Nicaragua was arranged for the committee by a member of the U.S. Maryknoll religious order, a woman clearly sympathetic to government perspectives. As the report indicates, a majority of the delegation found unpersuasive the efforts there of "official" journalists, radical priests and pro-government "human-rights" advocates to discredit their current adversaries in Nicaragua's democratic opposition, including genuine human-rights activists and the dwindling band of independent journalists.

Indeed, correspondents in Nicaragua informed me yesterday that a La Prensa editorial writer-reporter, Roger Alonzo Ocampo, was arrested in Managua under the emergency laws on April 2 and has not been seen since then. In Mr. Alonzo's possession at the time of his arrest was a statement prepared by La Prensa's employees' union protesting the recent Sandinista

decree that required all Nicaraguan workers to remain on the job during traditional Holy Week observances.

Sandinista chic remains infectious in Western countries, nowhere more obviously perhaps than in the Orwellian praise heaped upon the new tyrants of Nicaragua by the Socialist International for the Sandinistas' alleged commitment to "pluralism" and "democracy," both of which the regime is apparently eliminating as quickly as world opinion allows.

The Nicaraguan tragedy deserves at least as much attention from the press—and the U.S. Congress—as the question of American involvement in El Salvador. Independent journalists in Nicaragua practice their craft at peril to their continued existence as professionals. Should the Sandinistas maintain their "state of emergency" indefinitely, there will be no independent journalists left practicing there, only pro-government flacks whose numbers grow steadily.

At that point, perhaps, the Committee to Protect Journalists could send a second expeditionary force not only to Nicaragua but also to Cuba and Grenada, both omitted from its recent itinerary. Of course, once free expression has disappeared from a country and the independent press has been crushed, there exist no journalists worthy of the name in need of protection except those in jail or in exile.

The following is the portion of the committee's statement bearing on the status of the press and free expression in Nicaragua:

In Nicaragua, we found the situation of journalists profoundly threatening. The 1979 Nicaraguan revolution, which generated the most sweeping national liberation movement in modern Central American history, has been degenerating into an uneven struggle between the Sandinista government and its opponents. Despite Sandinista commitments and promises prior to taking power that the revolutionary government would foster pluralistic and democratic institutional development, the government of Nicaragua and its military forces now rule by decree under a recently declared state of emergency.

They are challenged by a wide range of private-sector opponents—including the independent daily newspaper, La Prensa, church officials, independent radio stations and business and professional leaders (most of these persons had participated in the revolution). They have united openly, if loosely, in a democratic opposition coalition. Several of their leaders have been prevented from leaving the country, attacked by Sandinista-sponsored mobs (called "Turbas") and subjected to arbitrary imprisonment.

Even before the state of emergency, La Prensa had been closed down six times for printing articles which violated vague and sweeping government regulations prohibiting publication of information on economic and national security matters. A restrictive press code enforced on La Prensa a wide measure of self-censorship and resulted in the periodic closing of several independent news programs and radio stations. Archbishop Obando y Bravo has been prevented from broadcasting his weekly sermon, which had been aired regularly for the past 10 years, on the sole state-run television channel. The radio station of the Catholic Church, Radio Catolica, has been closed down indefinitely, and all attempts to create an independent TV channel have been buffed.

Today, as a result of the recent state of emergency imposed in March, all independ-

ent radio news programs have been shut down and newspapers—La Prensa and its two government-aligned competitors—must submit all copy for pre-censorship; those journalists opposed to the government have been harassed and even assaulted by the "Turbas." Several journalists have served jail sentences under a broadly worded "Law to Maintain Order and Public Security," passed shortly after the Sandinistas took power, which subjects violators to military jurisdiction.

Such intimidation has taken a heavy toll on news gathering and dissemination even by La Prensa, which under the leadership of Pedro Chamorro, is struggling to maintain its role as a beacon of free expression throughout Central America. Virtually all independent journalists to whom we spoke believe that the government has begun a drive either to emasculate through censorship or to close the few radio stations and single newspaper which today uphold the tradition of independent journalism in Nicaragua. ●

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WHITMAN COUNCIL, INC.

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize the Whitman Council, Inc., on its 25th anniversary.

Philadelphia is a city of neighborhoods. The special character of these neighborhoods and the strong bond between neighbors, are the essential ingredients in making Philadelphia a liveable city, which combines the comforts of a small town with the opportunities of a major urban center. Nowhere is this commitment to neighborhood more evident than in Whitman.

The special spirit of Whitman begins with the people who live there. The tradition of generations marrying and settling in the community in which they were raised, close to parents and childhood playmates, has made Whitman like an extended family, in which neighbors are almost as close as kin.

The Whitman Council is also an important factor in maintaining this spirit. The council has drawn its strength from the commitment of the people. It has also reinforced this commitment by serving as a cohesive force, expressing the aspirations of the community, and producing tangible improvements which have greatly enhanced the neighborhood.

The boundaries of Whitman, Snyder Avenue to Bigler Street, between 6th and Lee Streets, were originally designated as the Whitman Urban Renewal Area on December 3, 1957. Within this designated area a small group of concerned neighbors formed the Whitman Area Improvement Council to provide community input in federally funded renewal plans for the area.

Among the pioneers and founders of the Whitman Council, Inc. (as it was renamed in 1977) were Fred Goldstein, Morris Jacobs, the late J. Otis Ford, the late Father Edward Burke, Emily Davis, the late Bernard Tonkin, the late Joe Skale, the late Morris Levitt, and Angelo Manaco. Its first president, Morris Levitt, was succeeded by John Daly, followed by Morris Jacobs, Alice Moore, and its present leader Fred Druding.

Over the years, the council conscientiously labored on behalf of the neighborhood to establish a full service community. Its accomplishments, all of which are too numerous to mention, are highlighted by a new public library, a \$10 million shopping center (Whitman Shopping Plaza), a new playground (Burke Playground) a new park (Weinberg Park), offstreet public parking at Front and Snyder and Forth and Porter, construction of new homes and the rehabilitation of existing properties, and a nursing home (Whitman Convalescent Center) now in progress.

All of these accomplishments represent a lasting tribute to the Whitman Council, its leadership, and the countless dedicated volunteers who have devoted their energies and talents to bring these dreams to fruition. On the occasion of the council's 25th anniversary, I am making this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to afford the council the national recognition which it deserves, and to express my personal appreciation and best wishes for the future. ●

THE REAGAN REVOLUTION

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. P. R. Garner, recently wrote a letter to the editor of *Newsline*, a local San Diego newspaper. Mr. Garner's comments demonstrate remarkable insight into our current budget dilemma. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I could not have said it better myself. Therefore, I would like to commend Mr. Garner's remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

THE REAGAN REVOLUTION

DEAR NEWSLINE: Hans Jovishoff complained about the Reagan administration's "... exceedingly wasteful spending for 'defense' or, rather, overkill. . . while eliminating practically all social programs. . ." Let's have a look at budget comparisons cited from Congressman Bill Lowery's most recent newsletter: "Shift in Budget Priorities":

PERCENT COMPOSITION OF OUTLAYS

	1962	1981	1984
Department of Defense.....	44	24	32
Safety net programs.....	25	37	41
Net interest.....	6	10	9
All other.....	25	29	18

During former President Johnson's first full year in office, 1964, \$34 billion or 28.8 percent of the federal budget went for "human services" (entitlement programs: health, education, veterans, welfare, nutrition, civil service and railroad pensions, Social Security, etc., most of which are "indexed" for inflation). By 1981, with successive increases in these entitlement programs, spending for human services increased to \$349 billion or 53.3 percent. Reagan's fiscal year 1982 budget (and projections) for human services (or resources) is about \$344 billion or 51.8 percent of the federal budget; a reduction of 1.5 percent, assuming he gets all his planned cuts in the next few years. (Source: Patrick J. Buchanan, *The Union*, 1/13/82).

Buchanan points out also that, "In short, not only all the FDR, but almost all the LBJ social programs endure and grow; taken together, they will continue to consume a near record share of an ever-expanding federal budget." But the current budget for Health and Human Services (HHS) is \$250 billion or 35 percent of the federal budget (funding, by the way, 284 programs) (Source: *Senior World*, San Diego, Feb. 1982). This is what the liberals (to borrow several cliches) call "shredding the social safety net," "salvaging the social budget," "balancing the budget on the backs of the poor," and "writing off the minorities."

As regards defense, DoD has been underfunded for several years in respect to the mammoth growth of Soviet military power. Funding has necessarily had to be increased (witness, e.g., Cuba and Central America). However, "the Reagan administration in the past year actually presided over a significant reduction in strategic nuclear weapons on alert as well as in the development of new weapons for the future." Moreover, at "the conclusion of the Reagan program, the U.S. share of gross national product going to defense will be half the Soviets; it will consume a smaller percentage of GNP (6 percent) and budget (33 percent) than in any of the Eisenhower or Kennedy peacetime years." If Reagan were a Democrat, Republicans would be accusing him of "unilateral disarmament." (Buchanan, *The Union*, 1/13/82; 11/18/81).

In sum, President Reagan's fiscal 1982 budget reduced the increase in federal spending by about \$40 billion. There were, however, increases in 13 of the 18 budget categories, but increases smaller than former President Carter called for. Hardly "severe and deep" cuts as some would have us believe, and certainly not "resurrecting the Robber Barons of days past" or "welfare for the greedy" as Reagan's tax cuts have been labeled.

As for the automobile industry that Mr. Jovishoff believes "to be in greater trouble than ever," it has been in deep trouble for many years. Excessive wage and benefit demands by union leaders has drastically reduced productivity, forcing up costs. The average hourly wage of U.S. auto workers is about \$19.00. In Japan the average is about \$11 per hour. How can we compete under these conditions?

Certainly inflation is a factor. Price inflation is caused by monetary expansion, and

monetary expansion has been used for most of the past 45 years (certainly excessively in the past 20 years) to finance much of federal deficit spending. Revenues were not adequate and still are not. We must blame past Congresses and administrations for that—and much of Reagan's deficit problems today. More than 78 percent of the federal budget is accounted for by automatic cost-of-living adjustments, entitlement programs, subsidies and other built-in spending increases, according to Sen. William B. Armstrong (R-Colorado).

The "Reagan Revolution" is regrettably causing some temporary hardship, but it could hardly be otherwise under the circumstances. And "revolutions" are never pleasant. America has been on a spending binge for many decades and restoring the free-enterprise economy to health will be difficult but the goal is worthy. It can be done with the cooperation and understanding of the people and Congress. This may well be our last chance. Let's work at it!

P. R. GARNER. ●

CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. DOUGLAS APPEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. APPEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the White House and Members of Congress in their deliberations on the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act that a cautious and pragmatic approach be used and not allow overzealous environmentalists to continue to retard the economic growth of this Nation through extreme and rigid requirements.

I know of no one who is not anxious to achieve an absolute purification of our Nation's air so that future generations will have a cleaner environment, but we can't do it today. Time and enforcement is needed but during this time period it is imperative that the economic health of this Nation as well as the physical and biological health be a criteria.

Sure, we always hear "if it will save one life it is worth it." Well, I have never heard of a single death caused directly by acid rain or sulphur dioxide emissions in the air. I'm not saying it does not have an adverse effect on health, it does; but not to the degree that has been stated in irresponsible statements. But using this premise, and if we are really interested in saving lives, using the health and safety criteria only, then I say to you we should outlaw automobiles in which 55,000 lives are lost each year as well as cigarettes and liquor which add hundreds of thousands more lives to the list. There are other examples, but the point is that the economic health of the country has been taken into consideration in these industries even when the safety and health of the American people are effected more severely.

These are billion dollar industries employing hundreds of thousands of people and no legislation is going to affect them adversely because of the economic benefits to the Nation as well as the Federal coffers through high unemployment.

There are other industries, such as steel and coal, that are declining in their ability to compete in the world and American markets because of the cost of retrofitting or facilitating plants for pollution equipment.

Much has been accomplished with the implementation of the Clean Air Act by the U.S. EPA and the respective State environmental agencies that is good, however, it comes at the heavy expense of the American worker and consumer and this was not the intention of Congress.

Again, commonsense must prevail if we are to see this Nation rise up out of the depths of economic despair. People are hurting and they want action by the Congress and the administration to revitalize the economy but such recovery can only be fully accomplished if everyone cooperates.

A healthy economy is as important in the overall equation of this Nation's and its people's future as is a healthy physical environment.

Ask the autoworker, the coal miner, the steelworker, the pottery maker, and other industrial and factory workers and those dependent upon them working and contribution to their business and livelihood. ●

STATE DEPARTMENT SELLING
OUT ON LAW OF THE SEA
TREATY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a familiar saying that what is needed most at the U.S. State Department is an American desk. The wisdom of that statement is evidencing itself anew with the heavyhanded and deceptive manner in which the leadership of the U.S. LOS delegation is undermining the six major objectives of President Reagan in New York. Not only have they attempted to do an end-run around the White House and interested Members of Congress, but they are presently pressing in a direction that will lead to an immense embarrassment for the President.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. delegation is totally out of order and out of control. I urge the President to act swiftly to insure that the U.S. delegation head is brought back into line before it does serious and irreparable damage to the United States.

Two articles upon the subject follow. It should be noted that some press re-

ports may be misleading on particular points. For example, the Safire article indicates that U.S. industry concerns are in agreement with the positions now being taken by the head of the U.S. delegation. In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, as reported in the authoritative Platt's Oilgram News, U.S. industry is violently opposed to the delegation's position; and contends that it could not proceed into deep seabed mining under the regime being promoted by the U.S. delegation head.

[From the Oilgram News, Apr. 16, 1982]
U.S. "BENDING OVER BACKWARDS" TO REACH
SEA-TREATY ACCORD

United Nations 4/15—Leigh Ratiner, deputy chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Law of the Sea Conference told a plenary meeting today that "the U.S. at its highest level is ready, willing, able and anxious to be part of the consensus in adopting the (UN Law of the Sea) convention April 30."

"We've done all that is possible consistent with our vital interests to revise our negotiating demands and bring ourselves into a format for negotiations which might enable us to reach that goal," he said, adding that the U.S. government "is bending over backwards" to get a settlement (see story elsewhere in this issue).

After several days of discussions in plenary, the president of the conference Tony Koh will call for last-minute private negotiations on all of outstanding issues in order to reach an agreement enabling every country, including the U.S., to sign the treaty April 30.

SPECIAL REPORT: OCEAN INDUSTRY CRIES
"SELLOUT" BY UNITED STATES; OUTCOME OF
SEA TREATY TALKS STILL CLOUDY

New York 4/15—Although U.S. Law of the Sea negotiators are claiming victory, the ocean industry is charging a "sell-out." That situation makes any final outcome of the negotiations impossible to predict at this time and at least for the moment is capping a round of negotiations that started troubled and hasn't improved since (ON 4/15, 4/1).

The new ruckus between the negotiators and industry stems from a set of proposed amendments the U.S. submitted to the conference on April 13. In an eleventh hour maneuver, the U.S. won the support of six other industrialized nations—UK, W. Germany, Japan, France, Belgium and Italy—as co-sponsors.

The industry charges that the U.S. delegation has so softened its stand on basic issues that there is real doubt whether any company would attempt to mine the oceans under those conditions.

Conrad G. Welling, senior vice president of Ocean Minerals, the consortium that includes affiliates of Amoco and Royal Dutch/Shell, said the industry is "very upset. I don't see how anybody could proceed" under the latest U.S. amendments to the proposed treaty text.

Welling said the U.S. negotiating team pushed through the amendments, with industry given only two days' notice. He added that industry representatives met with chief U.S. negotiator James L. Malone only a few hours before the amendments were formally presented to the conference at 6 p.m. on April 13.

FAST FOODWORK

The industry group, including representatives from Sedco, argued with Malone for

changes before the amendments were submitted, then filed a four-page report documenting industry objections on April 14.

In addition to charges that "grandfather" protection of companies is severely eroded and that companies will be subjected to production controls while losing control of the "council" that will set the rules, the industry complains that the U.S. negotiating team headed by Malone and his deputy Leigh S. Ratiner have used fast footwork to keep the negotiations going. When the hard line dictated in January by President Reagan produced no results at the conference, Malone met with secretary of State Haig and convinced him that the U.S. had to soften its position.

INTERIOR PROTESTS

A hurried meeting was called with the senior interagency task group comprised of top officials of the departments of Interior, Defense, Commerce and Treasury and White House officials to get approval to weaken the U.S. demands.

Malone won approval on some issues, and—industry charges—went beyond what the interagency group authorized. Some departments, notably interior, memoed strong protests against the softened position.

The change also brought a blast from Rep. Breaux (D-LA) who came here last week to berate the U.S. delegation for operating in secrecy and not keeping Congress informed on shifts in negotiating tactics.

Delegation officials justify the shift on grounds that they are now taking a broad interpretation of Reagan's January instructions instead of the narrow one originally presented to the UN conference. Industry counters that such reasoning is merely a way for the negotiators to bend and in the process are "giving away the store," says one official who wouldn't be named.

Even in its softened position, there is no certainty that the conference will adopt the proposed U.S. amendments. The test will be when the matter comes up for a vote possibly late next week (see story elsewhere in this issue).

[From the New York Times, Apr. 9, 1982]

REAGAN'S SEA-LAW SELLOUT

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON, Apr. 8—The Law of the Sea Conference is an attempt by third-world nations to set up a "new order" in the world's production of minerals. Their idea is to subject all exploration and mining of the ocean bottom to international control. Their vehicle would be modeled on OPEC: a cartel capable of price-fixing by enforcing control of mineral production—run by an "authority" certain to provide permanent employment for thousands of third-world diplomats.

For centuries, the treasures that lay beyond anyone's territory belonged to nobody, and therefore were available for the taking for any explorer or miner with the wit, courage and capital to go get it.

In the last decade, however, a collectivist notion took hold that all such treasures were "the common heritage of mankind," which meant that an international bureaucracy, not the explorer, would decide who could develop what resource. A combination of third-world greed and liberal-world guilt brought us to the brink of signing a treaty that would sound the death knell of free enterprise in the 21st century.

The Reagan Administration put a stop to that—or so we thought. Many of us cheered when the United States finally told the rest

of the world that we had awakened to the danger of negotiating away our freedoms in the Law of the Sea conference. We hailed the stand that rejected price-fixing by an unaccountable "authority."

That Reagan's defense of free enterprise collapsed last Monday night in the office of Under Secretary of State James Buckley. As Bernard Nossiter of The New York Times reported, a new American position was secretly decided upon that accepts the principle that a global cartel—and not free-market forces—would have the power to limit America's or any other country's production of minerals mined from the sea.

The abandonment of the basic principle on which our economy is founded—and which has yielded far more prosperity than any Socialist scheme—was made possible by buying off the American companies who had been objecting loudly. "Preliminary investment protection"—some pip of an idea—is to be given to private mining companies that lead the way for the exploration of the seabed; their technology and know-how will later be taken over by the competing third-world bureaucracy. As usual, some businessmen can be found who will sell their birthright for short-term profit.

Everyone watching these negotiations knows full well what the thirdworld game is: First, establish the cartel principle by getting industrial nations to sign a treaty submitting to an international body's production limits. Second, improve on the United Nations by making it impossible for the industrial countries to veto thirdworld majorities. Third, make it possible to amend the by-laws of the cartel—thereby eliminating private competition—without having to go back to such stumbling blocks as the U.S. Senate for approval.

When the Senior Interagency group met to cave in under Mr. Buckley's aegis, it was agreed that (1) production limits would be accepted, provided there was "no bite" in them in the beginning; (2) we would not have a veto, but perhaps we could talk bravely about a "blocking capability" if industrial nations stuck together; but (3) it might be awfully hard to get the Senate to hand over a power to amend without future Senate agreement.

That supine position is typical of foreign affairs in the Second Reagan Administration, which began when pragmatists James Baker and William Clark fell in step with Al Haig in February and process triumphed over policy. The same middle-level crew (Secretary Buckley, Assistant Treasury Secretary Marc Leland) that brought us no-default in Poland and winking at the European-Siberian pipeline is in charge of the planned cave-in on Law of the Sea. (Incredibly, they have even approved export licenses for six C-130's to be sent to Iraq.) Because businessmen applaud—weak policy is good for business—Mr. Reagan is persuaded he is doing the conservative thing.

He is not. The betrayal of capitalism, not to mention freedom of the seas, is a radical lurch to the left. And for what? We are warned that the rest of the world will sign a treaty without us, which might mean that our banks would ask for Government guarantees to finance exploration. That's scare talk; we can get other industrial nations to sign a separate free-market treaty if need be.

In return for their hard work inhibiting competition and driving up world inflation, third-world diplomats envision a bonanza from their supranational authority: lifetime jobs, highrise offices, limousines, elite

schools for their children, studies farmed out to friendly academics, everything a potato-shaped manganese nodule can bestow. Best of all, no control of their budget from individual nations, because the cartel bureaucracy would fix world prices to its profit.

No wonder the diplomatic community is putting such pressure on our hapless negotiators. The Law of the Sea Treaty bids fair to become the biggest boondoggle in the history of the earth, setting the example for Socialism in outer space.●

CARIBBEAN CRUSADE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the following article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, appeared in the February 28, 1982, issue of the Hearst newspapers. The article pertains to President Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative. Since the issue is currently being reviewed in the Congress, I urge my colleagues to read the article carefully. The text is as follows:

CARIBBEAN CRUSADE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—President Reagan has launched a crusade aimed at saving the nations of the Caribbean Basin from oppression and poverty. Although the word "crusade" can have a ring of militarism to it, the president's program clearly emphasizes a desire to seek political and economic solutions rather than a military one.

The president fired the first volleys of his campaign in a speech at the Washington headquarters of the Organization of American States, OAS. He did so amid a heating up of the civil war in El Salvador, and continuing threats of communist expansion originating in Moscow and Havana.

His package did include a promise of \$60 million more in military aid, but such aid would be limited to small arms, patrol boats, helicopters and communications equipment. The question naturally rose, as it has for weeks, about the possibility of involvement of America combat troops. An administration spokesman gave an unequivocal answer to that one it was:

"Absolutely not."

Mr. Reagan knew that one of the first criticisms of his pledge of economic aid to Central America would be that it is unprecedented, so he responded to that in advance, and headon:

"This economic proposal is an unprecedented as today's crisis in the Caribbean. This commitment makes unmistakably clear our determination to help our neighbors grow strong."

In my opinion he got to the heart of the crisis when he said: "A new kind of colonialism stalks the world today and threatens our independence. It is brutal and totalitarian. It is not of our hemisphere but it threatens our hemisphere and has established footholds on American soil for the expansion of its colonialist ambitions."

In other words, extraordinary trouble demands extraordinary, but peaceful efforts to keep it from our shores.

The Reagan initiative in the Caribbean has been compared to the Marshall Plan, an American crusade started in 1948, whose aim was to use economic weapons to save Western Europe from the threat of communist expansion. It is my hope, and surely that of all Americans, that this latter day Marshall Plan will have a similar measure of success.

Although the nature of the initiative was set forth by the president in somewhat general terms, here are some details that suggest the shape it will take:

All told, President Reagan has programmed a Caribbean Basin initiative for \$350 million with an additional \$75 million earmarked for assorted military assistance. In these inflationary days these sums don't sound staggering but they show U.S. good will in preparing to aid have-not little countries start helping themselves.

His sweeping proposal, aimed against further communist expansion as practiced by the U.S.S.R. and its Cuban surrogates with arms transfers into Nicaragua, is unprecedented in the history of the U.S. which decades ago encouraged "The Good Neighbor Policy" as articulated by FDR.

To suit action to his words, the president intends to obtain congressional authorization for free trade from the inflamed regions except for textiles and some apparel. Any U.S. industry that could conceivably be hurt by the imports he intends to protect with a careful congressional safety net.

Importantly, this isn't another "foreign aid" package in which taxpayer's money is handed to governments with practically no questions asked.

The unique phase to the plan is that the money will be in interest-bearing accounts deposited in U.S. banks. It's intended to build up the middle classes and entrepreneur systems. If a Central American has a project that merits creditworthiness for an idea but no money, his project will get serious consideration at the banks with money on deposit here.

That is a sound idea, I believe, and should eliminate skimming by individual and greedy government officials in the Caribbean Basin. I don't agree with those skeptics who say President Reagan's deposit scheme shows him to distrust our neighbors. Not at all. It is a plain and simple exercise in free enterprise.

As a matter of fact, if you study the president's program, you see that the concept of his "new federalism" is being applied to Central America. This is imaginative as it is bold and I hope it will be appreciated and welcomed by all our friendly neighbors fighting for survival against alien ideologies based on totalitarian terror.

In his presentation, the president sent the Russians and Castro Cubans a message. It essentially stems from our own Revolutionary times and rings vibrantly true today as it did over 200 years ago: "Don't tread on me."

I'm glad the president is making this bold move. The Hearst Newspapers under my father and in later years through this column have continually warned that we would some day have to protect the Western Hemisphere from communism.

Russia already controls part of Asia, half of Europe and a large chunk of Africa. The only way to keep the insatiable Bear out of this hemisphere is to react powerfully and often.●

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate has reached an alarming level and the recession is our Nation's most pressing concern. The economic situation is being aggravated by unfair and illegal trade practices of foreign countries, which include: The proliferation of nontariff barriers such as inscrutable and unreasonable health and safety standards and testing procedures; discriminatory Government procurement policies; and, export subsidies, which many times enable a foreign company to sell goods in the United States below the cost of production.

Our Government has been trying for years to negotiate fair trade principles to provide consumers with more reliable and cheaper products, and to provide more jobs with choice. Unfortunately, the result has been making our country safe for Japan.

Many businesses in my district are failing and hundreds of workers are unemployed because other countries have erected barriers against our goods while subsidizing what they send us. Trade must be a two-way street and other countries must be willing to abide by the accepted international norms, principles, and laws of free trade.

American industry is not without its problems; but a full faith effort is being made to correct the existing difficulties. I firmly believe that, for the most part, American products are well made, and can compete with foreign products which do not have the advantages of protection and subsidization.

With a trade deficit of \$40 billion, \$18 billion with Japan, it is time for our Government to take corrective measures. Under section 126 of the Trade Act of 1974, Congress adopted the principle of reciprocal nondiscriminatory treatment whereby the President was required to determine if major industrial countries had failed to provide competitive opportunities for the United States equivalent to the opportunities provided to our trading partners in this country. If such determination were made the President could take certain steps to restore "reciprocity." This authority expired in 1979.

I have cosponsored legislation to restore the President's authority in a strengthened form and I urge my colleagues in the Congress to do likewise. This legislation would require the President to take steps to terminate the benefits of trade agreements entered into under the trade laws of the United States with respect to tariff re-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ductions or other import restrictions if it is determined that our trading partners have failed to provide equivalent competitive opportunities for the commerce of the United States in their home markets.

Rather than being inimical to free trade, this initiative helps to restore a mutual trade relationship. I am confident that American industry will prosper, and American goods will succeed in such an environment.●

CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL
SPEAKS ON NORTH KOREAN
POLITICAL PRISONERS

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, with considerable fanfare and propaganda, North Korea last week observed the 70th birthday of its only ruler since 1948, Kim Il Sung. The event was marked in the manner one would expect from the society termed "one of the most highly regimented and controlled in the world today" by the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices.

The forced festivities clearly were in keeping with the rigid personality cult established by Kim Il Sung. As the Country Reports notes, "... individual rights are subordinated in practice to the overriding aim of imposing a social revolution and marshalling a show of unanimous popular support for the country's governing system and its leaders."

For at least 105,000 North Koreans, however, the birthday of Kim Il Sung was not a cause for celebration. The reason was that they are being held in camps for ideological offenders.

According to reports by defectors from Communist North Korea and from South Korean intelligence, North Korea is holding over 105,000 political prisoners, most of them without trial, in eight isolation camps in various parts of the country.

This latest information serves to confirm that the Kim Il Sung government is one of the most cruel totalitarian regimes on the earth today. We must not forget the suffering and misery of the people living in North Korea, which the Kim Il Sung government tries to hide from the outside world.

I commend to my colleagues' attention the following article from The New York Times of April 11, 1982, concerning the tens of thousands of imprisoned dissidents in North Korea:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1982]

NORTH KOREA IS SAID TO HOLD 105,000 AS
DISSIDENTS

(By Henry Scott Stokes)

Seoul, South Korea, April 10—South Korean intelligence officials say that at least 105,000 North Koreans are being held in camps for ideological offenders.

The existence of the camps, long suspected by intelligence officials, was disclosed in recent interviews here with three North Korean defectors and with high-ranking officials of the South Korean Agency for National Security Planning, formerly the Korean Central Intelligence Agency.

Until recently, the intelligence officials said, it was difficult to check the existence of the camps. But now, with the aid of the defectors from North Korea, and with information that is believed to derive from American aerial reconnaissance, eight major camps for political offenders have been located, according to experts in Seoul, in addition to 25 separate conventional prisons for ordinary criminals.

South Korea also has forced labor camps, which Seoul officials said held more than 3,200 people late last year. However, according to political dissidents, only a minority of the internees are political prisoners.

APRIL CELEBRATION SET

The disclosures about the camps come as North Korea prepares huge celebrations to mark the 70th birthday of its leader, Kim Il Sung, next Thursday. Intelligence officials here insisted that they were not trying to overshadow that event. The disclosures, they said, followed years of efforts to confirm the presence of the camps.

In an interview at the national security agency's headquarters in Seoul, a high official said: "Our hope is that by showing the truth about North Korea, including the camps, we will broaden international knowledge about society there, paving a way for reunification in the long run."

American officials here declined to confirm the camps' existence, saying they had "no knowledge" of aerial photos of the facilities. But diplomats here believe that such places exist and are used to bolster President Kim's authority. He has ruled North Korea since it was founded in 1948.

The three defectors are Kim Yong Joon, who fled to the South in January; Kang Hyung Soon, who left North Korea in 1979, and Shin Young Man, a former North Korean agent in Japan who defected there in 1977. They told of their experiences at a joint interview at a Seoul hotel.

Mr. Kim, 30 years old, said that he had repaired farm implements in Onsung County, in North Hamgyong Province, near the Chinese border. He said that several times in 1978 he entered a large camp there for political offenders to repair equipment during a government campaign to "reclaim" lost land. Intelligence officials said that the camp was the largest of the eight and probably held about 27,000 people.

Mr. Kim said that he had first become aware of the camp in 1962, when as a teenager he explored the vicinity to search for tree bark to make string. "There were high fences, notices saying 'keep out' and 'danger,'" he said. "Everyone in the locality knew about the place. It was no secret that it held 'ideological criminals.'"

Intelligence officials said at a separate briefing that a second camp, holding about 20,000 prisoners, was in nearby Hoeryon County. They said other camps were in

kyongson County, which is also in North Hamgyong Province, with 15,000 prisoners; at Yodongmyon in South Hamgyong Province, with 13,000 captives, and in Chongpyong County in the same province, with 10,000 prisoners. Two camps in North Pyongyang Province hold 5,000 and 15,000 prisoners and a third in Chagang Province holds an undetermined number, according to the officials.

105,000 PRISONERS MINIMUM

"About 105,000 is the minimum figure we came with up for the total in the camps," said a high official in charge of North Korean affairs at the security agency, "but there may be more and there may be other camps. We can't be sure yet."

None of the three defectors interviewed had been held in a camp. But Mr. Shin, 57, said that he was taken to Chuulli in North Hamgyong Province on a tour in the spring of 1972 to see a camp, shortly before he was smuggled into Japan as an agent. He said the visit was apparently a warning of what could happen if he failed in his mission.

Mr. Shin said that he got a close look at prisoners and buildings at the Chuulli camp.

FORMER AGENT IN NORTH KOREA

"They were not normal homes but wretched huts, half cave and half home," he said. "It was early spring, a bit cold. The people's clothes were really ragged, with flesh showing through the holes. They were very pallid, scrawny and miserable."

He said he had left his wife and six children in North Korea and presumed that they were now interned in a camp. "When I think about them I want to cry," he said, breaking into tears.

Mr. Kang, 26, said he had been trained as an agent of the North Korean State Political Security Department and had been responsible for tracking down people suspected of holding views contrary to the principles of the North Korean Workers Party. He said he had studied at the political security department of Kim Il Sung University in Pyongyang, the North Korean capital. ●

THE IRS STRIKES—WITH GUNS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices, which would be stopped by the passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA), is their overzealous enforcement using weapons.

The IRS should go to great lengths to prevent armed confrontation with the taxpaying public. However, it appears that many times they go overboard with their militia to publicly make their presence known, to instill fear, and to remind the public not to question their awesome authority.

The following story is a good example of these unbelievable practices.

Hallie Snyder was alone in her home in Oakland, Md., with her 5-year-old daughter on the morning of February 20, 1980.

She had just sent her 9-year-old son off to school. Her husband, Dwight, was working in his small cabinet shop located next to their home.

At 9 a.m., someone knocked on the door of the Snyder residence. As Hallie Snyder walked across the living room toward the door, it was flung open by a man carrying a high-powered automatic rifle. Eight men, all heavily armed, burst into the room with weapons pointed and ready to fire.

Next door, James Dwight Snyder was busy at his saw cutting out a set of custom-made cabinets. He heard the door to his shop swing open and turned his head instinctively. "Freeze!" someone shouted. Snyder looked down at the floor in front of the entry to his shop. Several men carrying M16's and submachine guns lay in the prone position with their weapons aimed at Snyder.

Outside, in front of Snyder's shop, State policemen had blocked off the road. Federal marshals and IRS special agents armed with M16's had surrounded the Snyder property. More than 30 men had just captured the unarmed Snyder family.

James Dwight Snyder is no criminal. He has no criminal record and has never been accused of a crime, and neither has his wife.

In fact, the IRS agents who attacked Snyder and his family knew this. The Internal Revenue Service had not come to arrest Snyder, but to seize his property for his alleged failure to pay income taxes in 1971 and 1972. Whether or not Snyder actually owes the money claimed by the IRS has not yet been decided. At the time of this writing, Snyder has two cases pending in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Snyders had no idea that the IRS was going to grab their property.

About 10 of the IRS agents immediately began tagging various household goods, equipment in Snyder's workshop, vehicles, a tractor, and numerous other items belonging to Snyder. (They even tagged Snyder's mother's pickup truck.) The 20 remaining storm troopers camped around the edge of the Snyder property keeping an eye on Snyder, his wife, and their daughter "preventing them from interfering in the seizure of Federal property." Late that afternoon the IRS brought in a moving van and three wreckers and proceeded to haul their loot away.

All of this done without a search warrant. Because Snyder had committed no crime—indeed, the IRS would not accuse him of a crime because this would have given Snyder the opportunity to a trial by jury—a search warrant could not be issued. The IRS, however, got around this obstacle by a technicality called a writ of entry. This order of entry, along with section 6331 of the IRS Code, allows the IRS to seize, by force, a citizen's property

without due process of the law. The IRS seized thousands of dollars' worth of property from the Snyders and sold some of it at public auction.

The Snyder case dramatically demonstrates the police-state power and mentality of the IRS. An Internal Revenue Service official in Baltimore who was asked to explain why the IRS sent in more than 30 armed men stated, "When resistance is anticipated, steps are taken to assure the safety of the IRS officials * * * involved."

Yet Snyder, a father of three who has never had as much as a traffic ticket, a member of the Dunkard Brethren Church, a fundamentalist group that, like his Amish neighbors, hews to ideals of pacifism, hard work, family values and plain living and frowns on television, movies and similar worldly diversions, was considered such a threat to require more than 30 armed men, without a search warrant, to illegally seize his humble possessions. ●

GET MOVING ON TRADE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues the Chicago Sun-Times editorial of April 13, which strongly supports Export Trading Company legislation.

We have an opportunity to enact legislation that will create jobs, reduce the deficit and increase the GNP—but only if the bill is scheduled for subcommittee consideration.

I urge my colleagues to join me in calling upon Chairman PETER RODINO to schedule this important legislation at the earliest opportunity. As the Sun-Times has said, "the bill deserves bipartisan support," and it deserves it now.

The Sun-Times editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 13, 1982]

GET MOVING ON TRADE

Like a spring thaw, Congress may soon break the ice jam blocking the most vital trade bill in years. The bill, if OK'd, could remedy major economic woes at home and ease diplomatic strains with a key ally, Japan.

The measure would help expand U.S. trade by creating exporting trading companies, like the world-famous sogo shosha trading giants that have fueled Japan's economic miracle.

The results could be dramatic here, too. As Rep. Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.) notes, this is valuable legislation. It could:

Create 300,000 jobs nationwide as early as 1985—more than 14,000 of them in Illinois.

Reduce the swollen federal deficit by as much as \$11 billion.

Increase this country's gross national product about \$30 billion.

The ideas behind the Export Trading Companies Act work. Such companies handle two-thirds of all Japanese exports. Look, too, at success in West Germany, France and Hong Kong with similar trade expedients. Yet our cumulative trade deficit for the last five years has reached \$100 billion.

Trading companies help export products by providing knowledge and financial resources that small- and medium-sized companies lack. Thousands of small businesses know little of foreign customs, laws or the risks in trade ventures. Thus they hold back—losing both markets abroad and jobs for workers at home.

Former Sen. Adlai E. Stevenson (D-Ill.) first pushed a similar export bill to passage in the Senate. It died in the House. Last year, the Senate voted 93-0 to ease anti-trust obstacles to trading companies. A House version, with more than 100 co-sponsors, was approved March 31 by a Foreign Affairs subcommittee.

Unfortunately, the bill is hung up in the House Judiciary subcommittee. Chairman Peter W. Rodino (D-N.Y.) should look at our 9 percent unemployment rate and other aspects of the sagging economy and then show the kind of dash he became known for during the Watergate hearings. Push the trade bill out.

In dealing with global competitors in the 1980s, anti-trust adjustments are required. Once-valid objections to banks entering commerce should be revised, too. Foreign banks are key sources of capital funds for our competitors. To ease our disadvantage in that area, Stevenson's wise plan permitted banks to own part of a trading company.

The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion increase in exports will create 31,000 U.S. jobs. Unlike foolish protectionists bills aimed at Japan, this bill is a positive way to compete with allies. As Hyde urges, the bill deserves bipartisan support. ●

TAX INCENTIVES FOR DAY CARE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1982, I introduced H.R. 5965, to amend the Internal Revenue Code and to provide for additional incentives for individuals to use, and for firms to provide facilities for, day care.

Present law provides a number of such incentives, including the fact that a credit of between 20 and 30 percent of the first \$2,400—\$4,800 in the case of more than one dependent—of day care expenses may be applied against one's tax bill. However, many low income families do not earn enough for the tax credit to be of use to them, since they have tax bills of less than the applicable credit. For this reason, I feel it is important that the tax credit be made refundable, so that it can be as useful to the lower-income as the upper-income taxpayer.

But where are these children going to be cared for? Many of them are placed in existing profitmaking or not-

for-profit centers. Even though there is Federal funding for day care—although its has been reduced in many States because of the priorities set by States under the social services block grant—and even though there have been some tax benefits available in the past for the construction or operation of day care centers—which were increased by last year's Economic Recovery Tax Act—there are still many more children in need of day care than there are slots available to them.

In order to stimulate the supply side of this equation, my bill also makes provision for tax credits to go to firms which construct of equip day care centers. A 10-percent credit, over and above existing investment tax credits, would be granted to a taxpayer for the expenses incurred in equipping a day care center. A 5-percent credit would be available for the costs of the actual construction of such a center.

Mr. Speaker, last year the other body passed a measure making the day care tax credit refundable. It also proposed even more liberal tax credits for business. Thus, this proposed legislation is not a radical measure, but a reasoned proposal directed at further gentle stimulation of the day care industry so that children who need quality day care can get it and parents who need day care services in order to work can obtain them at a reasonable price.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to become cosponsors of H.R. 5965, and ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

H.R. 5965

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make the credit for dependent care expenses a refundable credit and to allow an additional investment tax credit for dependent care center property.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CREDIT FOR DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES MADE REFUNDABLE.

(a) In general.—Subsection (b) of section 6401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to excessive credits treated as overpayments) is amended—

(1) by inserting "44A (relating to expenses for household and dependent care services necessary for gainful employment)," after "lubricating oil"; and

(2) by inserting ", 44A," after "31, 39".

(b) Technical Amendments.—

(1) Section 44A of such Code (relating to expenses for household and dependent care services necessary for gainful employment) is amended by striking out subsection (b).

(2) Sections 44C(b)(5), 44D(b)(5), 44E(e)(1), 44F(g)(1), 44G(b)(1)(B) of such Code are each amended by inserting "44A," after "31, 39".

(3) Subsection (a) of section 53 of such Code (relating to limitation based on amount of tax) is amended by inserting "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out ", and" at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out paragraph (7).

(4)(A) Paragraph (2) of section 55(b) of such Code (defining regular tax) is amended by inserting ", 44A," after "31, 39".

(B) Paragraph (2) of section 55(c) of such Code (relating to credits) is amended by inserting "44A," after "31, 39," each place it appears.

(C) Clause (i) of section 55(c)(4)(A) of such Code (relating to carryover and carryback of certain credits) is amended by inserting "44A," after "33, 39".

(5)(A) Subsection (c) of section 56 of such Code (defining regular tax deduction), as in effect for taxable years ending before January 1, 1983, is amended by inserting "44A," after "31, 39".

(B) Subsection (c) of section 56 of such Code (defining regular tax deduction), as in effect for taxable years ending after December 31, 1982, is amended by inserting "44A," after "39, 43".

(6) Subsection (b) of section 6096 of such Code (relating to designation of income tax payments to Presidential Election Campaign Fund) is amended by striking out "44A".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT FOR DEPENDENT CARE CENTER PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 46(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amount of investment tax credit) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (iii), by striking out the period at the end of clause (iv) and inserting in lieu thereof ", and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(v) in the case of dependent care center property, the dependent care percentage."

(b) DEPENDENT CARE PERCENTAGE.—Paragraph (2) of section 46(a) of such Code (relating to amount of credit) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(G) DEPENDENT CARE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of this paragraph—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The dependent care percentage is—

"(I) 10 percent in the case of dependent care center property not described in subclause (II), and

"(II) 5 percent in the case of dependent care center property which (but for section 48(q)(1)) would not be section 38 property.

"(ii) REGULAR PERCENTAGE NOT TO APPLY TO PROPERTY NOT OTHERWISE SECTION 38 PROPERTY.—The regular percentage shall not apply to any dependent care center property to which subclause (II) of clause (i) applies."

(c) DEPENDENT CARE CENTER PROPERTY DEFINED.—Section 48 of such Code (relating to definitions; special rules) is amended by redesignating subsection (q) as subsection (r) and by inserting after subsection (p) the following new subsection:

"(q) DEPENDENT CARE CENTER PROPERTY.—For purposes of this subpart—

"(1) TREATMENT AS SECTION 38 PROPERTY.—For the period beginning after December 31, 1981, dependent care center property shall be treated as meeting the requirements of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) (other than the penultimate sentence of such paragraph).

"(2) DEPENDENT CARE CENTER PROPERTY DEFINED.—The term 'dependent care center property' means property for use by a dependent care center property means property for use by a dependent care center if—

"(A) such center meets the requirements of subparagraphs (C) and (D) of section 44A(c)(2), and

"(B) more than 90 percent of the gross revenue of such center is from one or more of the following sources:

"(i) payments which are employment-related expenses (within the meaning of section 44A(c)(2)) for the care of a qualifying individual (within the meaning of section 44A(c)(1)) outside the taxpayer's household,

(ii) amounts paid or incurred by an employer which are excludable from the gross income of an employee under section 129 (relating to dependent care assistance programs), and

"(iii) grants received from a State or political subdivision thereof, the District of Columbia, or an organization described in section 501(c) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a)."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) FOR SECTION 1.—The amendments made by section 1 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1981.

(b) FOR SECTION 2.—The amendments made by section 2 shall apply to the period after December 31, 1981 (under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) in taxable years ending after such date.●

TRIBUTE TO UNION FIRE COMPANY NO. 1

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of Union Fire Company No. 1, of Hamburg, Pa., who will be celebrating their 150th anniversary beginning with a banquet on April 24, 1982.

The Union Fire Company No. 1, enjoys the enthusiastic support of the community it serves and not only works to protect the lives of the citizens and property of the Hamburg area, but has tirelessly contributed time and effort on many projects to benefit their neighbors and friends.

The members of this company demonstrate every day, the community spirit of helping one another, which is the very foundation of our Nation. I think that it is indeed fitting that their accomplishments should be recognized in the U.S. Congress. I know my colleagues will join me in paying tribute to the Union Fire Company No. 1, of Hamburg and will wish them many more years of continued success. It is my hope that their excellent example of what can be accomplished continues to underline the importance of aiding those in need.●

NUCLEAR WASTE—LET US DISPOSE OF THE PROBLEM

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, the past few years have been

extraordinarily difficult for electric utilities using nuclear power. The accident at Three Mile Island was the most serious in the history of the U.S. nuclear industry. However, despite these difficulties, nuclear energy continues to provide the lowest cost, most reliable, and environmentally reasonable source of electric energy.

In 1979, 70 licensed nuclear powerplants, representing 9.6 percent of the Nation's total installed generating capacity, supplied approximately 12 percent of our total national output of electricity. This represented the energy equivalent of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day, which was the total Alaskan region oil production in that year. The present installed electric capacity of approximately 50,000 megawatts from nuclear plants alone is more than the entire U.S. electric generating capacity from all available sources at the end of World War II. In addition to the nuclear plants currently operating, there are on order, and in various stages of construction, 96,000 megawatts of nuclear generation which, when completed and in operation, will serve to increase nuclear electrical generation to the equivalent of 4.5 million barrels of oil per day—the maximum oil importation level set by President Carter after 1980.

Nuclear energy unquestionably helps to reduce our foreign oil imports. No one needs to be reminded of the severe economic effects that the recent rise in foreign oil has had on the U.S. economy. In 1979 alone, official OPEC prices about doubled. By 1980 the cost of imported oil had risen to \$35 per barrel—a far cry from the \$2 to \$4 per barrel that foreign oil cost prior to 1973-74 Yom Kippur war, which precipitated the Arab oil embargo.

The cost of this fuel is the basic reason electric rates have increased dramatically in recent years. In southern California there is no coal, no hydroelectric power, and only a limited supply of natural gas. The primary fuel San Diego Gas & Electric is required to use by State regulation is expensive, low sulfur oil which has risen in cost from \$2 a barrel in 1970 to around \$45 recently. Consequently, San Diego Gas & Electric is spending 63 cents out of every utility bill dollar for its fuel and purchased energy. Their customers would be paying significantly less had the utility been permitted to quickly build and operate the Sundesert nuclear power plant. However, the permit for this plant was denied after years of expensive regulatory overkill.

As serious as the rapid escalation in the price of oil may be, even more serious is the distinct possibility of a serious curtailment in the supply of foreign oil, not only to the United States, but to the entire Western World. Nearly 50 percent of the oil imported

by the Western World originates in the Persian Gulf. As demonstrated in the 1973-74 oil embargo and the more recent loss of the Iranian oil supply, any sudden cutoff or loss of oil from the Persian Gulf will have a major economic impact on not only the United States, but the entire world.

If we are to reduce our dependence on imported oil, we must develop our capability to substitute alternative fuels for that oil. One method is to increase the uses of electricity. Mass transportation and the development of electric automobiles will require significant increases in our electric energy supply. And, in many areas, particularly in the northern sections of the country, the only practical substitute for oil-fired heating units will be electric heating using heat pumps. However, the only practical methods of supplying the necessary increases in future electrical energy usage will be from coal and nuclear-powered utility plants. And, of the two, the nuclear alternative is clearly the better choice from an environmental perspective.

That the nuclear option is a sound environmental choice is supported by Ansel Adams, world-famous photographer and a member of the Sierra Club board of directors for 35 years. He demonstrates his support for nuclear energy in the following quote:

The fight against nuclear power has turned into a holy war without rhyme or reason. I get annoyed with people who are opposed to things because it's fashionable. And the southwestern United States is suffering because of it. Stripping the land for the production of coal and utilizing coal-burning plants are, I think, far more dangerous than utilizing clean, controlled nuclear plants. Now, that doesn't mean that plants shouldn't be run under disciplined management with safety and security guidelines. But, after all, Three Mile Island has set off what you'd think is the next Civil War. And yet nothing really happened. Certainly nothing that compares to the stuff I've seen in the Southwest at the Four Corners coal plant. The sky is no longer blue, the country's being raped by strip mining, precious water is being used to sluice out the coal. And someday that coal will give out. Nuclear power is very clean, and, if well managed, I think it is the only logical source of energy we have. I don't go along with the holy war at all.

Therefore, as even Ansel Adams agrees, from an environmentalist standpoint, nuclear is the best near-term option for increasing our energy capacity. Therefore, environmentalists will be much better served by working to make nuclear energy as safe as possible. That is what we are trying to do in H.R. 5016, the Nuclear Waste Management Policy Act, which I have co-sponsored, which establishes a comprehensive national policy for the disposal of nuclear waste.

One of the most significant obstacles blocking the nuclear option is the public concern over the disposal of nuclear wastes—often referred to as the

Achilles heel of the nuclear industry. However, when viewed objectively, the waste problem is manageable.

Assuming a rapidly expanding nuclear program, the total volume of waste generated in the entire United States annually in the year 2000 could be stored in a cube less than 40 feet on a side. In contrast, a year's worth of ash from just one modern coal plant piled 40 feet high would cover 4 acres of land.

Furthermore, the technology required to dispose of nuclear waste has already been developed. Key steps in the process are currently in operation on a commercial scale both in this country and abroad. We are entirely capable, from a technological standpoint, of moving to institute a safe and environmentally acceptable waste management program.

What we do not seem to be able to do is resolve the issue from a political standpoint. Every year we go round and around. And while we debate the issue, unprocessed nuclear wastes continue to build up in temporary storage facilities nationwide. This poses more of a threat to the environment and to the public health and safety than any permanent repository could possibly be.

The issue is not so much whether we can solve the problem. We can. The question is how and when. The "how" will hopefully be resolved by the various committees of jurisdiction in the House and Senate. And the "when" will hopefully be during the 97th Congress. We simply cannot afford to prolong the issue any longer.●

HELP FOR THE SMALL FARMER

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, today no one can deny that our small farmers rest on the brink of financial disaster. Faced with low revenues, a tight credit market, and high production costs, their future looks bleak and disheartening. But there also exists an underlying snag in current taxation law, of which many are unaware, that could cause enough financial hardship to break the small farmer. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 6082, to correct this snag by amending the present unemployment compensation taxation ruling which applies to agricultural labor. Under law created in 1976, a farmer becomes locked into unemployment compensation taxes if the farmer: First, during any calendar quarter in a calendar year paid wages of \$20,000 or more for agriculture labor, or second, employs at least 10 individuals on each of some 20 weeks during the calendar year. I am sure

this statute served its purpose in 1976, but with an inflation rate of 69.5 percent occurring within a 6-year period, the figures set under previous law become quickly outdated. Statistics show that the \$20,000 wage limitation would be equal to \$33,900 today. Needless to say, our small farmers are finding it extremely difficult to stay under such a limitation and still pay decent wages to their workers.

My bill proposes to raise this paid wages figure to a more realistic one of \$35,000. This figure is then to become indexed annually with the rate of inflation so that these gaps previously created by inflation will no longer strangle our small farmers.

I propose to further amend the statute by increasing the number of employees permitted to work to the number of 15, before compensation taxation can occur. Many farmers would gladly hire additional help when needed, but again, constraints through present law forbid this without the additional financial repercussions.

Yes, we all hope the interest rates will soon fall, the credit markets ease, and inflation continues its decline so our farmers can again prosper. But until then, they need our help and they need it now. This small but significant change in current law may be enough to save them from financial hardship today. I hope my colleagues will join with me in supporting H.R. 6082.●

CALIFORNIA'S BOTTLE INITIATIVE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an interesting article by Peter Steinhart in the Los Angeles Times of March 27, 1982.

California has long been the leading State in the use of the initiative process enabling our citizens to directly pass those laws they wish to initiate themselves. In our general elections this November we will have a number of these propositions to consider and pass judgment upon.

One such measure placed on the ballot by Californians Against Waste will require a 5-cent refundable deposit on all beer and soft drinks sold in cans and bottles, and will require stores to redeem empty containers of those brands they sell. Mr. Steinhart's article is well worth thoughtful reading.

The article follows:

CALIFORNIA'S BOTTLE INITIATIVE, IF PASSED, MAY SAVE MORE THAN BOTTLES

(By Peter Steinhart)

For more than a decade, Fred Martin, a founder of Citizens Against Waste, has been trying to get people to think about garbage. It isn't an easy task. "It's an unglamorous problem," Martin acknowledges. "For most people, it ends at the curbside when they put out their garbage cans. And out of sight is out of mind."

But it isn't out of Martin's mind. And it isn't really out of sight. You see it everywhere. Garbage bags slopped down the sides of a gully. Junked cars in the bushes. Bottles along the roadside. The leavings of a society swelled on production but not too interested in decomposition. For some, the sight of it is heartless. It speaks of a people who feel no responsibilities to things or to men. A bottle tossed out the window of a car says, "I don't care where it came from or where it's going. And I'm not too fond of you, either."

Beverage containers are a large part of litter. Californians throw away 7 billion of them a year, about 15,000 of them a minute. With cans and bottles in mind, Martin helped to form Citizens Against Waste, an organization that has pressed the state Legislature to pass a deposit law. For more than 10 years, the Legislature has considered and rejected the law. But now it looks as if Martin's efforts will bear fruit. Californians Against Waste has qualified a bottle bill as an initiative on the November ballot. If approved by the voters of California, the bottle bill will require a 5-cent refundable deposit on all beer and soft drinks sold in cans and bottles, and will require stores to redeem empty containers of those brands they sell.

It wasn't the heartlessness of litter that got Martin interested in deposit laws. Ten years ago, he began to realize that we were running out of places to put garbage. Around the edges of San Francisco Bay, for example, mountains of trash were rising, and already pressing ominously against limits imposed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The city of San Francisco has filled its own dumpsite and now trucks waste 40 miles south to Mountain View, which uses it to fill baylands for a future shoreline park. But next year, Mountain View's parksite will be filled, and San Francisco must look farther afield, to the hills east of San Jose or to the San Joaquin Valley. Cities all over the country are facing similar problems. As existing dumps fill, garbage must be trucked greater distances.

Garbage also brings political problems. Cities often move their dumps far beyond the city limits, imposing their refuse upon country folk who, in all likelihood, moved out of the city to get away from just such indignities. Disputes over the location of dumpsites have been fought recently in a half dozen California counties. At Los Angeles' Mission Canyon, residents have fought for years over the siting of a landfill dump.

Martin understood the waste of waste early. When others were talking of composting and live Christmas trees, he was trying to work out ways to reuse solid waste as an energy source or a building material. Those were disappointing times. Garbage does not convert to energy cheaply. And people persist in thinking of garbage as something to be abandoned, rather than reused. Californians still toss out 46 million tons of garbage a year. It piles high in trash mounds, leaches an increasing amount of toxic chem-

ical residues, and requires us to use enormous amounts of energy to replace the used-up artifacts.

What Martin has come to understand is that there is no overall solution to garbage. It will arrive, like the problem, in pieces. And Martin has what he hopes will be a piece of the solution in the bottle bill—6% of our municipal wastes are made up of beverage containers.

The bottle bill has regularly been buried in the Legislature by steel and aluminum companies, brewers and soft-drink bottlers, retailers who don't want to clear merchandise off shelves to make room for empty bottles, and labor leaders who fear the loss of jobs in bottling plants. But polls show that more than 80% of Californians want such a law. The bottle bill is endorsed by a wide range of interest groups including the California Farm Bureau Assn., the Sierra Club, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the California Federation of Co-ops and the California College Republican Lobby.

At first sight, the bottle bill is an anti-litter law. Federal studies show that in the seven states that have passed such laws, roadside litter declined by 80% or more. Supporters of the bill say the state of Michigan saved \$15 million a year in roadside cleanup costs after passing a bottle bill. The beverage industry's advertising organization, Keep America Beautiful, hopes to counter the argument with television ads which proclaim "only people pollute," a slogan that echoes the opponents of handgun control, as if to say, "when throwaways are outlawed, only outlaws will have throwaways." It is ironic that in the 1930s, when throwaway containers were introduced, the bottlers advertised them with pictures of fishermen gaily tossing them into lakes.

But for Martin, the bottle bill is much more than a question of litter. "Litter is certainly a big component and one of the things we are going to stress. But the important reasons for this bill are materials use and energy savings." A variety of studies show that deposit laws save energy. An Illinois study concluded that refillable bottles use less than half the energy that one-way bottles use. A Federal Energy Administration study contends that nationwide use of refillable bottles, as recommended by a National Commission on Supplies and Shortages under President Gerald R. Ford, could save 29 million barrels of oil a year. Citizens Against Waste estimates that an all-returnable system in California could save 104 million gallons of oil a year.

Reusable containers also save materials. A national returnable container system would reduce the demand for imported bauxite, now used most heavily in the manufacture of aluminum cans, by 80%. Returnable cans also save water. A refillable bottle that makes 10 trips back to the bottler uses less than half the water required to manufacture and process a new bottle.

But bottlers claim that because recycled bottles are bulkier, they require more trucks and fuel to transport and therefore use up more energy than throwaways. Other criticisms of the bill center upon its effect upon employment. Some jobs will be lost in the manufacture of bottles and cans. But it is clear that more jobs will open up to truckers, retail clerks and bottling company employees. A California Public Interest Research Group study estimates that there would be a net gain of 4,781 jobs in California if the bill passes. In Michigan, a similar law created 3,500 more jobs than it eliminat-

ed. Most of the jobs gained are at the lower skills level, and would benefit groups like teenagers that have high unemployment rates.

And there may also be savings to the consumer. Proponents of the deposit bill point out that returnables are 30% to 65% cheaper than throwaways. The president of Coca-Cola, U.S.A., told a Senate subcommittee that "Coke sold in food stores in non-returnable packages is priced, on the average, 30% to 40% higher than Coca-Cola in returnable bottles." The contents of a soft-drink can cost only a few pennies; most of the cost is in the packaging. The Federal Energy Administration estimated that under a national returnable system, consumers could save more than \$1 billion a year.

If deposit legislation is so commendable, why didn't the Legislature pass a bottle bill? Largely because the bottlers have long experience arguing against deposit legislation. Deposit laws were first proposed in the 1940s, not as anti-litter laws, but as attempts by local bottlers to impede the growth of national beverage distributors. The laws were not passed, and national bottlers and brewers, using lightweight containers and the public subsidy of municipal dumps, enjoyed competitive advantages over local bottlers, who relied upon returnables.

Bottlers and metal companies oppose the recycling law for a variety of reasons. Bottlers fear that the public, having put up a deposit, may conclude the product is more expensive and buy less of it. Steel companies oppose the bill because it reduces the market for their product. Aluminum companies would have an increased market for aluminum under a returnable system. But the older aluminum foundries, which have paid off their construction costs and which operate under energy contracts signed in the days of cheap electricity, use bauxite rather than recycled aluminum. The book-keeping favors the old plants over newer plants which are still paying off construction costs and higher electricity rates.

Because of these costs, bottlers, metal companies and retailers have ponied up a fair amount of money for political campaigns. Brewer William Coors once estimated that bottlers spent \$20 million a year to defeat deposit laws. In most of the states that have deposit laws, the beverage industry defeated the laws in the legislatures, but succumbed to popular initiative campaigns.

But the California bottle bill currently looks promising. And in qualifying it for the ballot, Martin has gotten people to think about the problem of garbage. The bottle bill could go a long way toward convincing people that garbage is not something that simply vanishes at the curb. And that, in a materialistic age, could be a revolutionary idea. ●

"NEVER AGAIN"—DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF THE HOLOCAUST

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, under an act passed by Congress with my support, our Nation officially observes the "Day of Remembrance of Victims of the Nazi Holocaust"—

known as Yom Ha Shoah to those of the Jewish faith.

On this day we are reminded of perhaps the most abhorrent of all eras in modern world history—the era of the Nazis where, in the period before and during World War II, some 6 million innocent Jewish men, women, and children were murdered.

It is not enough that we dwell on the horrors of the Holocaust on the Day of Remembrance. We should use this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the principle that such a travesty should never again be allowed to happen. Never again should the mass murder of innocent people be conducted by a government or regime and ignored by the rest of the civilized world. Never again must tyranny be allowed to completely overrun freedom. Never again should man's inhumanity to man be manifested in such a fashion as the Holocaust.

Two years ago Congress also created the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council as a permanent part of our Government. Its purpose is to make our citizens of all faiths aware of the unspeakable crimes committed by the Nazis.

Last year, a dramatic meeting was conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Holocaust Council. It was the first International Liberators Conference in Washington. At this meeting those who were liberated from the concentration camps met those who helped to liberate them. The stories that were exchanged gave us perhaps the most compelling of all reasons why we as a nation should lead the effort to avert any future Holocaust.

On the Day of Remembrance, let us pledge to rid our own Nation of the various forms of religious intolerance which shows disturbing signs of increase. Acts of anti-Semitism have increased dramatically in the past 2 years, evoking new levels of anxiety among those of the Jewish faith. We must set the example as the greatest democracy in the world that we consider freedom of religion to be of the highest importance in fulfilling our purpose as a nation.

Finally on this day, let us not forget the oppression which Jews face in nations such as the Soviet Union, Ethiopia, Poland, and Syria. Let us raise our voice in protest and let us use whatever leverage we have over those offending nations who persecute persons because of their religious beliefs. Let the world 40 years after the Holocaust show itself to be more enlightened and tolerant of all people. ●

**MENACHEM Z. ROSENSAFT
SPEAKS OUT FOR ETHIOPIAN
JEWRY**

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 11, Menachem Z. Rosensaft spoke at a rally to condemn persecution of the Falasha Jews in Ethiopia. The rally was held by the International Network of Children of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, of which Mr. Rosensaft is president. I attended this rally and was very pleased to have the opportunity to lend my support to the International Network's efforts to free the Falashas from the persecution of the Ethiopian Government.

The Falasha, many believe, are more threatened by genocide than any other group of Jews in the world. The International Network has taken up their cause, because, explains Mr. Rosensaft, "As the heirs of the 6 million Jews who perished during the Holocaust, we constitute a moral force whose voice can have an impact on mankind. We must—and we shall—raise this voice on behalf of all, Jews and non-Jews alike, who are subjected to persecution and oppression anywhere in the world."

Not only children of the Holocaust, but all of us, share the responsibility to speak out against persecution wherever it occurs. I am hopeful that greater public awareness of the plight of the Falasha will bring about increased efforts to bring them to Israel and to improve the lot of those who remain in Ethiopia.

I ask that Mr. Rosensaft's remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

STATEMENT BY MENACHEM Z. ROSENSAFT,
CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERNATIONAL NETWORK
OF CHILDREN OF JEWISH HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS

For more than six months—almost since its formal establishment on September 13, 1981—the International Network of Children of Jewish Holocaust Survivors has been deeply involved in the struggle to save the persecuted and largely abandoned Jewish community of Ethiopia from annihilation. We swore to ourselves that we would bring their desperate plight to public consciousness, and that we would do everything in our power to enable them to live in freedom, safety and dignity in the State of Israel.

Why? What prompted us to take up the cause of Jews whom we have never seen, with whom we have nothing in common except our Jewishness? The reason is simple and fundamental to our collective being. If our parents survived the greatest cataclysm in history and had the courage and strength, despite all their suffering, to give us life, it was for a purpose. We have a solemn responsibility to them, to the past and to ourselves. While the commemoration of the Holocaust and its victims lies at the heart of all our activities, that alone is not

sufficient to justify our existence as human beings and Jews.

We do not have the right to be exclusively retrospective and introspective, to concentrate only on the past and on ourselves. As the heirs of the Six Million Jews who perished during the Holocaust, we constitute a moral force whose voice can have an impact on mankind. We must—and we shall—raise this voice on behalf of all, Jews and non-Jews alike, who are subjected to persecution and oppression anywhere in the world, or who are threatened by annihilation.

We have learned from our parents' tragic experiences that the greatest crime is indifference to the suffering of others. Because of who we are, we may never be passive, or allow others to be passive, in the face of anti-Semitism or any other form of racial, ethnic or religious hatred, for we know only too well that the ultimate consequence of apathy and silence was embodied forever in the flames of Auschwitz and the mass-graves of Bergen-Belsen.

Forty years ago, the world—including most of the Jewish world—closed its eyes and ears to the slaughter of European Jewry. Today, some 25,000 Ethiopian Jews face destruction, and once again there is almost universal silence. With a few notable exceptions, Jewish organizations and Jewish leaders have placed the cause of Ethiopian Jewry near the bottom of their list of priorities, and have remained silent. The Government of the United States pleads helplessness, and is silent. The United Nations is busy defaming and harassing Israel to concern itself with the fate of persecuted Jews, and reaffirms its utter venality by its silence.

Only the State of Israel exists as a refuge for the Jews of Ethiopia. These victims of brutality and evil desperately want to go to Israel, and Israel stands ready to receive them just as it stands ready to receive all Jews. We want to assure Consul General Lavie and the Government of Israel that we wholeheartedly support each and every endeavor to bring the Jews of Ethiopia to Israel, and that we stand ready to do whatever we can to help.

Today, we proclaim to the Jewish community and the world: So long as Jews will be persecuted, whether in Ethiopia or the Soviet Union, whether in Arab countries or elsewhere, so long as the enemies of our people persist in their efforts to destroy us, so long as human beings anywhere will be oppressed, our united voice will be heard and our presence will be felt. We, whose roots are embedded in ashes, will never forget that above all else, we are our brothers' keepers. ●

SOVIET JEWISH EMIGRATION

HON. LYNN MARTIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there exists widespread documentation of the drop in Soviet Jewish emigration and of gross human rights violations on the part of Soviet officials. I rise today to voice my objection to that state of affairs.

Emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union has dropped drastically in

recent years, from 21,471 exits in 1980 to 9,447 in 1981, and is now at a rate that is the lowest of the past decade. Reduced emigration reflects not only a denial of basic and accepted human rights, but a direct violation of provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Soviet Union, a signatory to the act, has consistently violated that portion of the act which establishes the right of all persons to emigrate.

Various explanations for the reduced emigration level exist. The Soviet Union allows Jews to leave only in two cases—in order to return to their homeland of Israel and in order to be reunited with direct family. In most cases, application to emigrate is contingent on having an invitation to join family members in Israel. Having won release from the Soviet Union, some emigrants drop out of the migration to Israel and choose to settle in some other country instead. This contradicts the emigrant's stated interest in returning to his homeland or family, and points to discontent with life in the Soviet Union as the real reason for emigration. Obviously, these cases embarrass Soviet officials and challenge their claim that human rights in the Soviet Union are fully protected.

Probably a more powerful reason for the reduced level of emigration, however, is the decline in détente between the United States and the Soviet Union. Increasing hostility in relations among the superpowers leaves the Soviet Union little incentive to behave in accordance with declared American interests.

Simultaneous with the decrease in emigration has been an increase in Soviet anti-Semitism. Personal harassment of known Jews by the KGB and the MVD is manifest, and, increasingly, reports revealing official Soviet efforts to suppress and eradicate expression of Jewish culture are heard. Disruption of Jewish religious meetings and celebrations, confiscation of religious property, and incarceration of prominent Jewish leaders and worshippers, are not unusual. Like its emigration policy, the Soviet Union's official anti-Semitism contradicts its declaration to honor international agreements on human rights—agreements which in this case call for an end to racial discrimination and a prohibition on efforts to promote racial superiority.

Congressional attempts to secure the release of several well-known refuseniks—Jews who have been refused permission to emigrate—reflect admirable concern for the plight of Soviet Jews. The effort to broaden Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union must not be relaxed, but should be expanded to show concern for all Russians who

desire, for any reason, to leave the Soviet Union. The contradictions and injustice inherent in Soviet emigration policy are obvious, and I am hopeful that my colleagues of both political parties will urge the Soviets to adopt a fair and open emigration policy. ●

UNITED CAMPUSES TO PREVENT NUCLEAR WAR

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a new organization that is working on our Nation's colleges and universities to bring about a more rational and acceptable national policy on nuclear weapons.

The United Campuses To Prevent Nuclear War (UCAM), chaired by Dr. Peter Stein, vice provost at Cornell University, is currently organizing lectures, seminars, and other events focused on the threat of nuclear war on more than 335 campuses, including at least one college or university in each of the 50 States. Most of these events will be held this Thursday, April 22. Some events have already been held and others have been scheduled for later in the week.

These activities are being conducted in conjunction with Ground Zero, which, as our colleagues know, is a nonpartisan, educational group that has organized community-based events dealing with the threat of nuclear war for this entire week.

I strongly support the work that UCAM is doing, and I hope that it will continue to educate the American people about the dangers posed by nuclear war and what can be done to prevent such a terrible catastrophe from occurring.

It is of the utmost importance that the people of this country raise their voices to let their Government know where they stand on these most critical issues. As elected representatives, we have the responsibility of exploring every possible option for reducing the threat of a nuclear conflict. Thus, I commend UCAM for the work it is doing in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our colleagues will be interested in knowing at which schools UCAM has been active. Thus, I am inserting a list of these schools in the RECORD at this point. Additional information about the work of UCAM can be obtained from its national office, which is located at 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1101, in Washington, D.C. (telephone: 202-296-5600).

LIST OF SCHOOLS

(NOTE.—Asterisks indicate representatives on Steering Committee.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ALABAMA

University of Alabama, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Auburn University, Birmingham-Southern College, University of South Alabama, Spring Hill College, Tuskegee Institute.

ALASKA

University of Alaska, Northwest Comm College, Sheldon Jackson College.

ARIZONA

Arizona State University, University of Arizona, Scottsdale Comm College.

ARKANSAS

University of Arkansas, Arkansas State University, Arkansas Tech, Hendrix College, Ouachita Baptist University.

CALIFORNIA

UC Davis, UC Davis Medical Center, UC Los Angeles, UC San Diego, UC Santa Barbara, UC Santa Cruz, Canada Comm College, Jesuit School of Theology, Mt. San Jacinto College, Pepperdine University, St. Patrick's College, Salano Comm College, San Diego State University, University of San Francisco, Stanford University.*

COLORADO

Adams State College, Colorado State University.

CONNECTICUT

Central Connecticut State College, Connecticut College, Fairfield University, Middlesex Comm College, Wesleyan University, Yale University.*

DELAWARE

University of Delaware.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American University, Catholic University, Georgetown University.

FLORIDA

Eckerd College, University of Florida, Florida Atlantic University, Florida State University,* North Florida Junior College, Palm Beach Comm College, University of South Florida, St. Vincent de Paul Seminary, U Western Florida.

GEORGIA

Emory University, Floyd Junior College, Georgia Southern College, Georgia Tech, Mercer University.

HAWAII

University of Hawaii.

IDAHO

Boise State University and University of Idaho.

ILLINOIS

Argonne National Labs, Barat College, Bethany Seminary, Brandley University, University of Chicago, Columbia College, DePaul University, Highland College, Illinois College, University of Illinois, Illinois State University, Morton College, Northwestern University, Southern Illinois University.

INDIANA

Anderson College, Ball State University, Indiana State University, Notre Dame University, St. Joseph's College, Wabash College.

IOWA

Clarke College, Clinton Comm. College, Grinnell College, University of Iowa, Luther College, Marshalltown Comm. College, Mt. Mercy College, Mt. St. Claire College, University of Northern Iowa.

KANSAS

University of Kansas, Marymount College, Ottawa University.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky, Midway College, Morehead State University.

LOUISIANA

L.S.U. and McNeese State University.

MAINE

University of Maine and University of Southern Maine.

MARYLAND

Frostburg State College, Goucher College, Hood College, Johns Hopkins University, University of Maryland, Montgomery Comm. College.

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst College, Berkshire Comm. College, Boston College, Boston University, Bradford College, Brandeis University,* Clark University, Fitchburg State College, Hampshire College, Harvard University, Harvard Medical Area.

College of Holy Cross, Lesley College, University of Lowell, U Massachusetts-Amherst, M.I.T.,* Mt. Holyoke College, Northeastern University, Regis College, Salem State College, Smith College, Tufts University, William College.

MICHIGAN

Ferris State College, Kendall School of Design, Macomb Comm College, U of Michigan—Ann Arbor, U of Michigan—Dearborn, Michigan State University, Oakland University, Washtenaw County College, Wayne State University,* Western Michigan University.

MINNESOTA

Bemidje State University, Carleton College, Mankato State University, McAlister College, U Minnesota—Duluth, U Minnesota—Minneapolis, St. Mary's College, Winona State College.

MISSISSIPPI

Meridian Jr. College, University of Mississippi, Mississippi State Univ., U Southern Mississippi, Tougaloo College.

MISSOURI

U Missouri—Kansas City, Washington University, Webster College.

MONTANA

University of Montana and Montana State University.

NEBRASKA

Creighton University and University of Nebraska.

NEVADA

University of Nevada—Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Colby-Sawyer College, Dartmouth College, Keene State College, University of New Hampshire, White Pines College.

NEW JERSEY

Caldwell College, County College of Morris, Drew University, Princeton University, Rutgers—New Brunswick, Stockton State College, Trenton State College.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State University and Western New Mexico University.

NEW YORK

Adelphi College, Albany Medical College, Albert Einstein College of Medicine*, Bard College, Barnard College, CUNY, CUNY Graduate School, Colgate University, Columbia University*, Cooper Union.

Cornell University*, Cortland College, Eisenhower College, Elmira College, Empire State College, Hamilton College, Hartwick

College, Hobart College, Hofstra University, Hunter College.

Ithaca College, Jefferson Comm College, John Jay College, Keuka College, Lehman College, Manhattan College, Manhattan Comm College, Manhattanville College, Nassau Comm College, New School for Social Research.

NY Medical College, NYC Technical College, NYU—Washington Square, Public Health Research Inst, R.P.I.,* University of Rochester, Saint Lawrence University, Skidmore College, Sloan-Kettering Institute, SUNY—Albany.

SUNY—Binghamton, SUNY—Buffalo,* SUNY—Fredonia, SUNY—New Paltz, SUNY—Stony Brook, Syracuse University,* Utica College, Vassar College, Wagner College, William Smith College.

NORTH CAROLINA

Duke University, East Carolina University, Guilford College, North Carolina Central,* North Carolina State, UNC—Chapel Hill, UNC—Charlotte, UNC—Greensboro, UNC—Wilmington, Shaw University, Wake Forest University, Western Carolina University.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary College.

OHIO

Antioch College, Bowling Green University, Case-Western Reserve, Cleveland State University, Dyke College, Hiedelberg College, John Carroll University, Miami University, College of Mt. St. Joseph, Mt. Union College, Oberlin College, Ohio State—Lima, Ohio University, Ursuline College, Youngstown State University.

OKLAHOMA

Cameron University, Oklahoma Baptist University, Oklahoma State University.

OREGON

Lewis & Clark College, University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Pacific NW College of Art, Warner Pacific College.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bryn Mawr College, Carnegie-Mellon University, Clarion State College, Dickinson College, Elizabethtown College, Gettysburg College, Haverford College, Juniata College, Lehigh County Comm College.

Mansfield State College, Muhlenberg College, Penn State University, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia College of Textiles and Sciences, Slippery Rock State College, Swarthmore College, Theil College, Villanova University.

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Rhode Island College, Rhode Island School of Design, University of Rhode Island.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coker College, Furman University, Lander College, Presbyterian College, University of South Carolina.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota School of Mines and South Dakota State University.

TENNESSEE

Belmont College, Maryville College, Middle Tennessee State U, Southwestern at Memphis, University of the South, University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt University.*

TEXAS

Baylor University University of Houston, Incarnate Word College, Our Lady of the Lake Univ St. Edward's University St. Mary's University, University of St. Thomas, San Antonio College, Southern

Methodist University, Texas Christian University.

Texas Lutheran College, Texas Tech University, Texas Wesleyan College, U Texas—Austin, U Texas—Dallas, U Texas—El Paso, U Texas—Health Science Center U Texas—San Antonio, Trinity University, West Texas State University.

UTAH

Utah State University.

VERMONT

Middlebury College, School for International Training, Vermont Technical College, University of Vermont.

VIRGINIA

Eastern Mennonite College, Emory and Henry College, Hollins College, University of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, College of William and Mary.

WASHINGTON

Central Washington University, Gonzaga University, University of Washington, Washington State University, Whitworth College.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Concord College, Davis & Elkins College, West Virginia Inst. of Technology, West Virginia University, Wheeling College.

WISCONSIN

Carroll College, Marquette University, Mt. Senario College, Northland College, Viterbo College, U Wisconsin—LaCrosse, U Wisconsin—Madison, U Wisconsin—Platteville, U Wisconsin—Stevens Point.

WYOMING

University of Wyoming.

CANADA

University of Toronto.*

THE IRS STRIKES—AND THE RULES KEEP CHANGING

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, another example of the heavy-handed and abusive tactics of the Internal Revenue Service in their tax collection practices which would be stopped by passage of H.R. 4931, the Taxpayer Protection Act (TPA), is the following letter I received from a citizen in Pennsylvania.

Dear Sir: Why should we taxpayers have to combat the IRS as though they were an enemy? They are not. They must obey the rules the same as anyone else. Rules that Congressmen, like you, lay down in the House.

I am a Kings Pointer, class of 1942, and I am thoroughly familiar with "Rules and Regulations." When the rules are laid down, they go for "all hands" which includes the admirals.

The IRS has just tried their "hassle" act on my 1979 tax return. I promptly wrote back, quoting their rules and regulations, and told them "You are in error!" Scare me? No way! I've already faced death many times in torpedoings, bombings, strafings, and worse through the eye of two hurricanes.

I am, however, fed up with the way they change the rules month by month. You Congressmen are going to have to lay down rules for them to abide by and set up definite prison terms if they fail to obey the rules. No wrist slaps. No dismissals. Prison terms like everyone else gets when they disobey.

Good luck in your fight. I am with you all the way.●

DICK OTTINGER PROTESTS REAGAN'S HAITIAN REFUGEE POLICY

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am including in today's RECORD an excellent speech which was presented by my good friend from New York, Representative DICK OTTINGER, at a symposium on Haitian refugees held at the Grace Episcopal Church, White Plains, N.Y., on April 18, 1982.

As the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I commend Representative OTTINGER for his steady voice of outrage over the Reagan administration's ideologically biased refugee and human rights policies. DICK OTTINGER has helped to lead the fight against President Reagan's callous disregard for the rights of blacks in the United States as well as those abroad.

I thank DICK OTTINGER for his leadership in these grave matters, and commend to the attention of my colleagues his recent speech on the plight of Haitian refugees:

I have been asked to discuss the tragic plight of Haitian refugees, and the political dimensions to this important issue.

The Reagan Administration's alarming tilt to the racist government of South Africa, its support for tax exemptions for racist institutions in the United States, and its decision to eliminate the "extended voluntary departure program" for Ethiopian refugees are all indicative of this Administration's total disregard for the human rights of blacks in the United States as well as those abroad.

The Administration's policies toward Haitian refugees constitutes a shocking discrimination inconsistent with the treatment of other refugees. These policies violate rights that have traditionally been afforded to those seeking political asylum in the United States.

Indeed, it's the President's Haitian refugee policy which is the most flagrant example of a racially biased refugee and human rights policy.

In the past 20 years, about 800,000 Haitians left their country, according to the State Department. During January through September, 1981, over 1,000 Haitians per month entered the United States.

On July 31, 1981, the Reagan Administration announced that its policy would be one of indefinite imprisonment of Haitians until they receive exclusion hearings. This policy was an abrupt change from that which allowed for the release of detained Haitians to

voluntary agencies and sponsors while the refugees awaited hearings.

Today, there are well over 2,000 Haitians at 17 detention centers throughout the United States. In a recent article in *Newsweek*, these detention centers were described as resembling "concentration camps."

Detention in remote facilities clearly impedes fair hearings of asylum claims. First, it is extremely difficult for fair consideration of an asylum claim in a prison setting. Second, it is virtually impossible for the detainee to seek witnesses which may be crucial to the claim. Finally, the policy of detention in remote facilities thwarts the Haitians rights to effective counsel as provided for in immigration regulations.

This policy also has a chilling effect on our historical commitment to those who have valid claims to political asylum. The Administration is simply reversing America's humanitarian tradition of aiding individuals fleeing repressive regimes that engage in brutal violations of human rights.

The United States, of course, is bound by treaty and by law to grant political asylum to undocumented non-citizens who have a well-founded fear of persecution should they be returned to their homelands.

However, as is consistent with Reagan's ideologically and racially biased refugee and human rights policy, the Administration has argued that Haitians are fleeing Haiti for strictly economic reasons and that there is no well-founded fear of persecution should they be returned. This is a transparently discriminatory program designed to deport Haitian nationals.

By the Department of State's very own admission, the human rights climate in Haiti is exceedingly repressive. In its Report to Congress on international human rights practices in 1981, the State Department reported that "Haiti has had a long and troubled history of autocratic rule characterized by many periods of political instability and human rights abuses."

Many of the refugees currently in American detention centers insist that economic conditions in Haiti simply cannot be separated from the political conditions. For example, Haitian officials expropriate peasant farmland with the passive consent of the government. The Haitian Government exploits its people economically, in conjunction with massive arbitrary arrests and imprisonment, total disregard for the right to fair trial, and absolutely no toleration whatsoever for political dissent.

Indeed, in a ruling that indicated that a large number of Haitian refugees have valid claims to political asylum that are being ignored by our Immigration and Naturalization Service, Judge James L. King of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida ruled that the mere act of seeking asylum elsewhere was viewed by the Haitian regime as an act of opposition to its leader, Jean Claude (Baby Doc) Duvalier. Judge King went on to note that an applicant for political asylum could expect to be "imprisoned and executed" in Haiti.

Judge King's ruling clearly shows that the Reagan Administration is engaged in racist policies to deny refugees the freedoms that have been extended to so many other refugees. In his ruling, the Judge wrote: "These Haitians who came to the United States seeking freedom and justice did not find it. Instead, they were confronted with an Immigration and Naturalization Service determined to deport them."

For these reasons, I have been opposing the Reagan Administration's racist refugee

and human rights policies. I have written to Attorney General William French Smith, urging the Administration to renew the policies which allow for detainees to be temporarily released to voluntary agencies. Some of you may have seen my letter to the Editor which recently appeared in *Newsweek*, pointing out the devastating plight of Haitian refugees. I have also been in touch with the Haitian Refugee Center, which is currently involved in a federal lawsuit challenging the legality of I.N.S. procedures and the policy of indefinite imprisonment of Haitian refugees. Finally, I initiated a letter to President Reagan, which nearly 70 of my colleagues in the House co-signed, protesting his immigration policies.

I would urge you to join me in this fight by expressing your sentiment to Attorney General William French Smith. We simply cannot let this racist Administration reverse America's humanitarian tradition of aiding those who flee from the worst human rights offenders in the world.●

STUDENTS AT CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY COMPLETE A REPORT ON FIRE SAFETY

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce the publication of a study undertaken by students from the School of Urban and Public Affairs, the Department of Engineering and Public Policy and the Department of Social Sciences at Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa. This report, "Fire Safety: A Comparative Risk Assessment," identifies key issues in fire safety with a view to formulating effective policies in these areas. The report demonstrates how important the careful analysis of outside study groups can be in providing objective guidelines and benchmarks for people in public policy positions.

The report makes two key recommendations to reduce fire loss in our Nation:

One. Improved data collection can be cost effective in meeting the goal of national fire loss reduction by helping to target efficient investment in intervention and prevention strategies; and

Two. A greater effort by government agencies is needed to introduce the public to fire safety detection and suppression devices as well as to educate people to react appropriately to fires.

The report also suggests other important areas for exploration such as tax incentives, government assistance, reduction in insurance premiums, litigation for failure to install fire safety devices and government surveillance and stimulation of private sector solutions.

This report highlights several of the major fire safety problems to focus on the development of a more coordinat-

ed national fire prevention policy. In addition, this report suggests important roles for the Federal Government in helping to reduce fire loss. However, the future of having a coordinated national fire prevention program seems bleak because the Reagan fiscal year 1983 proposed budget does not include funding for the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA), the lead agency for coordinating the Federal fire prevention and control effort.

The possible dismantling of the USFA has become a matter of great concern to firefighters, State and local government officials, and community leaders around the country. The Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, which I chair, will hold hearings this spring on this Nation's fire problem and the USFA.

Inquiries regarding "Fire Safety: A Comparative Risk Assessment" should be addressed to Mrs. Sandra Rocco, Department of Engineering and Public Policy, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213.●

PEACE * * * AND LET IT BEGIN WITH ME

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, recently former Secretary of State Mike Howlett, of Illinois, addressed the Cardinal Stritch Assembly of the Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus. This group is made up of more than 30 councils from throughout the southern suburbs of Cook County.

As his theme, Mike chose, "Peace * * * And Let It Begin With Me." It was a fine message he delivered, one geared to our troubled times, and today I want to share it with my colleagues.

[From the Chicago Catholic, Jan. 15, 1982]

PEACE * * * AND LET IT BEGIN WITH ME

The following speech was presented to the Samuel Cardinal Stritch Assembly of the Knights of Columbus Fourth Degree at its annual "Patriotic Night."

(By Michael J. Howlett)

In 1955, a Jewish song writer in Beverly Hills, Calif., and his wife—Sy Miller and Jill Jackson—wrote a song everybody here has heard.

Many of the people in this room must know it from memory. It is in the monthly missals printed by J. S. Paluch Co. and distributed throughout the archdiocese.

It has been sung at the Vatican in Italian. It has been sung by an Illinois high school choir at the Pioneer Palace in Kiev, Russia. Mahalia Jackson sang it in Thailand. Billy Graham sang it in Portuguese with a chorus of 2,500 voices in Brazil.

Each of you, I'm sure, has either sung it or listened to it at the Offertory of the Mass in your own parish church. Don't be frightened; I'm not going to sing it here myself.

I'm only going to speak the lines. But the melody will spring immediately to your mind.

Let there be peace on earth, and let it begin with me!

Let there be peace on earth, the peace that was meant to be.

With God as our Father, brothers all are we.

Let me walk with my brother in perfect harmony.

Even spoken, without music, the words have a poetic rhythm. The melody is equally simple, up and down the scale in the key of C with only one accidental F-sharp, they emphasize the words "peace" and "walk" and "step."

The range is short. You don't have to be Pavarotti to be able to sing it. The simplicity of it sticks in your mind, like "Silent Night" or the Londonderry Air or Stephen Foster's tunes. You leave the church humming.

But it wasn't just the melody of "Peace on Earth" that won the George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedom Foundation, or the Brotherhood award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, or the hearts of millions around the world.

It was the thought expressed in the lines. It appeals to a world that has had it with strife, and violence, and hatred.

There's not much we can do about the conflicts in northern Ireland, or Afghanistan, or the Middle East. Or the assassination of Sadat. Or the attempted assassination of our President . . . or our Pope. Or the race to find who can build the deadliest weapons the quickest to blow up the human race.

But we can do something for peace on earth. We can let it begin with each of us. It is a do-it-ourselves project. We can recognize God as our Father and every man as our brother. We can live in peace, moment by moment, starting with ourselves.

Tonight is "Patriotic Night" in the Cardinal Stritch Assembly. But the Fourth Degree of our order is the patriotism degree, and every day is really a day to be patriotic.

Every fourth degree member must swear to support the Constitution. This implies support of social justice and brotherhood as much as bearing arms for national defense.

Patriotism is love of country—in peace as in war. We are obliged to fight when our country needs us, but millions of patriots never fired a gun in their lives.

Here in the Chicago archdiocese, largest in the United States, we have special reasons to love our country and be thankful for the encouragement it has given our faith.

The first white men around here were Catholic Frenchmen who came specifically to bring our faith to the Indians. Father Jacques Marquette said Mass in 1673 in what is now Chicago.

The first settler in Chicago was a black Catholic, Jean Baptiste Point du Sable. We had a Catholic parish in Chicago, St. Mary's, before we had a city government.

Today, more than 40% of the total population in the two counties of Lake and Cook are members of our faith, 2,386,000 souls in 444 parishes. Our parochial school system also is the largest in the country, with 190,000 students.

The freedom of worship we enjoy is guaranteed by our government, the oldest constitutional democracy in the world—and the best. The love of country which motivated our first president, George Washington, should be a beacon to all of us.

In 1790, President Washington said: "The government of the United States, which

gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Under the protection of our Bill of Rights, the Catholic faith has had a phenomenal growth. In 1776, the year of Independence, we had one Catholic for every 120 citizens. By 1800, it was one for 53; by 1850, one for 11. Since 1950, it has been better than one for five.

The acceptance of the Church among our fellow countrymen was made obvious with the election of a Catholic president, John F. Kennedy, in 1960. In the city of Chicago, every mayor since 1933 has been a Catholic.

Between 125,000 and 150,000 adults convert to our faith in the United States every year. We hear only of the famous ones, such as Knute Rockne, Clare Booth Luce, Heyward Brown, Sen. Stephen Douglas or Sen. Robert Wagner, author of the Wagner labor relations act. Some became religious leaders, such as Mother Seton and Frances Allen, daughter of the Revolutionary patriot, Ethan Allen.

We can be proud of the contributions of Catholics to the growth and strength of our country. The list would fill a library with books. But it serves no purpose to brag. There is work to be done.

We can express our love of our country by our work with men and women of other faiths for social justice, and by an example of sacrifice for the common good.

There is no problem we cannot solve by work and sacrifice, be it inflation, high interest rates, energy shortages, unemployment, crime, a decline in moral standards, or international tensions.

For a place to start, we can find inspiration in the peace song of the Beverly Hills Married couple. Sy Miller has been dead for more than 10 years, but Jill Jackson Miller, a grandmother now, is still going strong from coast to coast, carrying her message to peace committees of the United Nations and anybody else willing to listen.

To find peace, we start with ourselves. As the song concludes:

Let peace begin with me; let this be the moment now.

With every step I take, let this be my solemn vow:

To take each moment and live each moment in peace eternally.

Let there be peace on earth. And let it begin with me. ●

ROY N. WINKLER

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as commander of the Congressional Squadron of the Civil Air Patrol, I have had the opportunity to meet many fine individuals. One of them is Roy Winkler.

Lt. Col. Roy N. Winkler will be retiring from active duty in the U.S. Air Force after 26 years and 16 days of service. He began his military career in May 1956 after getting his commission from the ROTC program at Rutgers University in New Jersey. He entered pilot training at Kinston Air Base in

North Carolina and got his wings at Vance AFB in Enid, Okla. From pilot training he was assigned to the 962d Airborne Early Warning and Control Squadron of the 551st AEW Wing (ADC) at Otis AFB, Mass.

As a pilot and aircraft commander he flew over 4,500 hours in the RC-121 Super Constellation radar patrol aircraft. For career broadening, he volunteered for the air traffic control field in 1962. After graduating from the ATC officers school at Keesler AFB, Miss., he was assigned to Okinawa. He served as a crew chief and later as a watch supervisor in the highly complex Kadena approach control facility.

Upon his return from overseas in 1965, he was assigned as the Flight Facilities Officer in the 1908th Communications Squadron at England AFB, La. A year had not yet gone by when he was alerted for a Vietnam assignment in "Project Phylis Ann." He assisted in establishing the flying training portion of this project while at England AFB. The venerable C-47 "Gooney Bird" was the aircraft flown in this program. It has received a \$2.5 million retrofit of classified equipment and was designated as an EC-47. An interesting sidelight of this assignment was that he was designated as a pilot on a ferry crew. These ferry crews flew the aircraft from a base on the east coast of the United States to Saigon via Alaska, Midway, Wake Island, Guam, and the Philippines.

After flying 947 hours in combat—160 missions—he returned to Westover AFB, Mass., in February 1968. Here, then Major Winkler served as a squadron commander for the 1917th Communications Squadron.

In 1970 Major Winkler was assigned to the Pentagon, where he served as a staff officer in the air traffic control branch of the Flight and Airspace Management Division. In 1972 an opportunity arose to move across the Potomac River to downtown Washington, D.C., to serve in the Federal Aviation Administration headquarters. Now a lieutenant colonel, Winkler worked as an air traffic controller specialist in the terminal procedures branch of the Air Traffic Services. His valuable input in this area provided an update, an improvement in the entire air traffic system.

In 1977, Lieutenant Colonel Winkler was assigned as the liaison officer for the National Capital Wing, Civil Air Patrol, at Bolling AFB, District of Columbia. In early 1979 he was additionally assigned as the liaison officer to the Congressional Squadron, Civil Air Patrol.

During his 26-year career, Lieutenant Colonel Winkler has amassed over 8,000 flying hours. His decorations include the Distinguished Flying Cross, Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal with 8 oak leaf clusters, Air Force

Commendation Medal, and the Vietnam Service Medal.

After such a distinguished career, I would just like to take this opportunity to thank and commend Roy Winkler on the contribution he has made to this country, and its people. ●

STUDENT AID: NATIONAL INVESTMENT

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is time to refocus the debate on college student aid.

The Reagan administration argues that student aid is a luxury that we cannot afford. Others bemoan the cuts merely because they have become accustomed to such aid.

SPENDING OR INVESTING?

I wonder if both may be missing the point. The debate concentrates too much on budget questions and not enough on what investments make sense for the country. I believe that cutting our investment in higher education will only worsen our current economic troubles and degrade our long-term productivity.

Sure, we can cut waste in student aid programs by targeting aid to students with the greatest needs and by speeding up the collection of delinquent loans. As a matter of fact, I wholly support efforts to target aid to those students with proven needs.

But a needs test is one thing. Making wholesale cuts and changes in the student aid program is another. Those cuts would shut out millions of students from our colleges and universities.

That could foster an intellectual recession.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM

The administration's fiscal year 1983 proposals would cut student aid by about 50 percent from fiscal year 1981. The combined proposals would eliminate about 2.4 million student aid awards nationwide and prevent some 600,000 graduate students from participating in the guaranteed student loan program.

In North Dakota, these administration proposals would also cut aid in half, dropping it from \$15 million to \$7.5 million. As a result, our State's colleges and universities would distribute 10,000 fewer awards to students with real needs. Some 2,000 graduate and professional students would become ineligible for guaranteed student loans, on which so many depend.

Reagan administration officials say that these cuts will help to balance the budget, and that college education is the responsibility of students and

parents, not the responsibility of the Federal Government. Hard work will solve the problems, they say.

In my view, things are not that simple.

NORTH DAKOTA'S FLIGHT

Self-support is no answer for low- and moderate-income students in North Dakota. With the farm economy at a 50-year low and jobs in sharp decline, many students simply cannot earn enough to cover all college costs. Nor is the State of North Dakota able to fill this gap itself.

Cutting aid to most college students would put them in the same Catch 22 as our farmers: How do you make it when your income is falling and your costs are rising?

Hundreds of North Dakota college and graduate students—and their parents—have written to me to say they might have to quit college if Congress approves the administration's plan. This deeply concerns me.

Higher education for the wealthy alone is no education; it is an affront to a democratic society.

A FRESH LOOK AT STUDENT AID

We should remember that a well-targeted program of student aid—aid to students with proven need—is not a drain on the Federal Treasury. It is an essential investment in our economic well-being.

Nor should we regard a solid student aid program as a competitor with our national defense. Instead, we should see that "Education is the cheap defense of the Nation," as Edmund Burke once said.

The point is, we cannot even build a competitive economy or a strong defense without the requisite brain power.

Our economic and political rivals understand this. Japan, for example, trains more engineers that we do with half of the population. The Soviet Union, our major political rival, produces five times as many engineers. In both these countries, the national government plays a major role in educating professionals in agriculture, business, and education as well.

We can not afford to fall behind.

HOPEFUL SIGNS

It looks like Congress will oppose most of the administration's student aid proposals. House committees have rejected plans to change the guaranteed student loan program, recommended that we retain campus-based aid, and urged that we increase funding for Pell grants and work-study programs.

I have joined with over 100 of my colleagues in cosponsoring House Resolution 422 to urge that Pell grants and other student aid programs should be fully funded and that there should be no legislative changes in the guaranteed student loan program which would deny eligibility to graduate and professional students.

Twenty-five years ago, President Eisenhower said that the bedrock of our democracy is a highly educated population. He pledged that "no student of ability will be denied an opportunity to attend college because of financial need." He recognized that student aid is a wise investment.

In my view, Ike is still right.

I would like to insert here in the RECORD a contemporary view which shows that sensible student aid is a sound national investment—not a frivolous luxury. The article is by Carl T. Rowan and is entitled "The Old Rob the Young of Education."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1982]

THE OLD ROB THE YOUNG OF EDUCATION

(By Carl T. Rowan)

There was a time when, to get my children from underfoot and out to the baseball field or skating rink, all I had to do was start to tell anew the hard-times stories of my youth.

"I left McMinnville with 77 cents in my pocket, my clothes in a cardboard box, hitching a ride on a truck when I went to Nashville to go to college . . ." I would begin.

They had vanished to a pickup football game, or something, before I got around to talking about how I worked for \$1 a day scrubbing floors and sloshing up food at a TB hospital to get my \$20-a-quarter tuition money.

I grew up on Booker T. Washington, and "Up From Slavery," the way Ronald Reagan grew up on Horatio Alger. Boy works hard; boy conquers all; boy becomes president—or even gets rich, preferably both.

That "All-American-boy-conquers-all" pabulum sticks high in the craw these days as we watch the old Booker T. Horatio Alger hogwash mashed into the faces of millions of American youngsters who won't go to college next fall because their government is snatching away the grants and subsidized loans that really made it possible for kids from "ordinary" families to believe that their horizons were as far-reaching and bright as those of the children of the super-rich.

I told my "Up from Slavery" stories to my children in half-jest and half-hope that I might produce a little inspiration. But now I see President Reagan, Treasury Secretary Donald Regan, budget director David Stockman trying to make their Horatio Alger Braggadocio a sort of national religion. Stockman told a congressional committee that the federal government has no obligation to help anybody get a higher education because "If people want to go to college bad enough, then there is opportunity and responsibility on their part to finance their way through the best way they can."

Regan told me shortly after he took office that poor parents have to remember that "state universities and community colleges do not cost the same as my alma mater, Harvard."

It is a matter of theology for the Reagan-ists to say, "No more crutches, young Americans. No Pell grants, no Guaranteed Student Loan Program. You work your way through college the way we real Americans did."

So young Americans who cannot now find work at the minimum wage of \$3.35 an hour are supposed to grub for \$25,950 for first-year tuition in the Georgetown University

Medical School, plus \$2,040 for books and instruments and \$6,650 for living expenses. Or those wanting to be lawyers are supposed to mow lawns and wash cars and come up with at least \$8,000 to meet first-year bills at George Washington University.

The Reaganauts have got the village idiot laughing, because everybody knows that in this pitiful economy, even the most motivated youngster can hardly work his or her way through a state institution that may set tuition at \$1,000 or so a year.

Well, I'm ready to confess to my children: Daddy would never have gone to Oberlin College, or to postgraduate study in journalism at the University of Minnesota, but for a costly, giveaway, federal welfare program called "The GI Bill." I could never have washed enough floors at TB hospitals, or mowed enough lawns, or hoed enough bulb grass, to get a degree in math at Oberlin and journalism at Minnesota. Only the wise largesse of Uncle Sam made it all possible.

In terms of relative dollars spent, that GI Bill has done more to give America a pre-eminent place in the world than the Marshall Plan, the Korean War, the Vietnam conflict or anything else I can think of. When educated, finely trained people are sure to be the key to national security in the years ahead, it strikes me as lunacy for the federal government to make it difficult if not impossible for millions of Americans to get the best educations that their God-given talents will absorb.

The problem is that old men like to glorify the achievements of their youth, even to the detriment of the current generation. This is a government of old men—older in mentality than chronology—who turn blind eyes to the reality that without help, even upper-middle-class youngsters cannot become doctors, lawyers, scientists.

They are so elitist that they could hardly give a damn that in economically troubled Washington state, the number of students in community colleges dropped from 101,000 to 89,000 when tuition was raised from \$306 to \$519.

The Reaganauts are doing more than produce a system where the Donald Regans go to Harvard and tell other Americans that they must be happy with a state or community college. They are saying that the appetite for college and the professions should not be developed among those "lower-class" Americans, other than the few Horatio Algerists who can work enough to make their own way.

This is combining old-man's ego and right-wing theology to forge policies that will cripple America for many generations.

EAST-WEST APPROACHES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, a recent commentary by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., puts into proper perspective the Soviet proposal for a nuclear arms freeze in Europe and the NATO response. I urge my colleagues to give serious attention to what a nuclear arms freeze would actually mean.

[From the Hearst Newspapers, Mar. 28, 1982]

EAST-WEST APPROACHES

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—At the foothills of the majestic Rocky Mountains where Colorado Springs nestles against a backdrop of spectacular scenic splendor, NATO defense ministers grappled with a thorny issue. They pondered the problem of nuclear arms to defend the West against sweet-talking but ever-threatening Soviet missile superiority. A decision was taken to install 572 new U.S. medium-range missiles on Western allied European territory but the story hardly ends with the NATO consensus, which I believe is fully justified in the face of an aggressive Russian buildup and encroachment.

Nearly all our allies, excluding the British government of tough-minded Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, are presently under heavy protest pressure by electorates to go for what has popularly become known as "The Freeze." That option briefly accepts the Soviet peace salvo shot out by President Leonid Brezhnev in offering to dismantle his SS-20s pointed at Western Europe in front of the Ural Mountains, if NATO abandoned our missiles.

President Reagan tellingly rebuffed the Brezhnev offer, I thought, pointing out that the U.S.S.R. was really so far ahead of NATO already that the sly Soviet suggestion was meaningless. He bluntly detailed that the U.S.S.R. had stockpiled 300 new, devilishly advanced SS-20s, with a new one being produced every 72 hours without letup. President Reagan then repeated his November appeal to Brezhnev, the thrust of which was "Let Us Both Dismantle All Stockpiles And Make Them Verifiable." The Russians had a quick, No, to the initial Reagan recommendation and haven't even had the grace to respond to the president's most recent repeat offer.

Soviet reasoning for pursuing the Brezhnev gambit isn't hard to figure. The Russians see that Washington's ties with major allies in Western Europe and Japan are being strained. While demonstrations against emplacing our missiles gather momentum on the continent, the "freeze" complex also has taken hold among congressional critics and municipalities in this country. As readers of this column recall, I wrote recently that Soviet propaganda and "disinformation" machinery never takes a holiday but emphasizes peace which in Orwellian terms really means war—or surrender on their terms.

In taking precautions against Soviet aggression, it seems to me that many folks have lost sight of multiple brutalities committed by the Brezhnev regime against their own people and regions unfortunate enough to be under Soviet might or its communist surrogates. Think for a moment about Poland and its 36 million people held in the grip of martial law. Or Afghanistan, invaded by the Red Army where a puppet regime is unable to govern most areas by night. Only 100,000 Russian troops, backed by the latest equipment in armor and air power, keeps that country from determining its own future.

Those are only two of the most recent examples of Soviet "peace-making" achievements. Look at the U.S.S.R. at home: The regime denies its 235 million people the average consumer necessities that Western societies cannot live without. Even daily bread can come into question frequently because the greatest slice of Russia's gross national product goes into armaments. Who's there

to question this bizarre imbalance? There's none to speak of, because critics and dissidents are hustled off to labor camps. When Brezhnev needs additional wheat, he buys it on world markets.

Western communities are, of course, rightly concerned about the prospects of a nuclear holocaust. But in the last analysis, the West must protect itself against Russian encroachment, or it will be gobbled up piece-meal.

We need deeds to prove what the West really means. So, when the West declares that it must take adequate precautions in the face of a massive Soviet superiority in nuclear weapons, we should go ahead and do so. This is always complicated in parliamentary democracies. West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, to his deep chagrin, just learned how rough the road can be. In key regional elections, Schmidt lost what is regarded as a national test in the Federal Republic. He previously was pledged to accept new medium range missiles and may now, after eight years in office, resign. It would be a major blow to NATO should he do so. In West Germany the real winners will be leftists of his Social Democratic Party and antinuclear groups demonstrating against new weapons.

In Colorado Springs, NATO's defense ministers unanimously rejected Brezhnev's proposal. They pointed out that the Russians were replacing shorter range missiles with new SS-22s, which have the range to zero in on all Western European capitals. In addition, the U.S.S.R. is working feverishly to develop an SS-23 with fiercer capabilities. The Western defense ministers, working from the latest intelligence data, reaffirmed their decision to deploy 572 new medium range missiles next year.

As is proper, it is now up to all their elected parliaments to accept or deny what the defense ministers decided. I believe that after lots of soul-searching—and more protest pressure—Western parliaments will take the same step of backing their defense representatives. We should take the lead and do it first to show the Soviets and the world that the alliance is alive and well. ●

ILLITERACY IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, during Easter adjournment an article appeared in the New York Times unveiling the depressing results of a New York City task force on literacy. Nearly 8 percent of New York City youths between 14 and 21 are functionally illiterate. Experts have speculated that this figure is accurate for urban areas across the Nation.

Reading and writing are skills essential to our Nation. An illiterate population is virtually unemployable, and unable to participate effectively in our political process. As the report notes, "Illiteracy is highly correlated with criminal behavior, with unemployment, and with the receipt of public assistance." In other words, pinching pennies in education will result in tre-

mendous funding outlays in social service programs. The smartest investment that this country can make, in terms of building a strong economy, expanding the tax base, and strengthening national defense, is in the education of our Nation's youth.

Yet education programs are being drastically cut by the Reagan administration. In doing so, the President is crippling the future of the United States and eroding the Nation's long-term intellectual capital, all in the name of short-term budgetary concerns. We in Congress cannot stand by and allow this to happen. We must be generous with funds for education, because, in the long run, investment in education will pay back this country a thousandfold.

I have included the text of the Times article for the information of all of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1982]

TASK FORCE REPORTS 8 PERCENT OF CITY YOUTHS ARE ILLITERATE
(By Gene I. Maeroff)

Nearly 8 percent of the 788,100 youths in New York City between the ages of 14 and 21, both in and out of school, cannot read above a fifth-grade level, according to a report recently issued by the Youth Literacy Task Force.

The 60,000 young people, according to the report, are functionally illiterate and "constitute a form of social dynamite whose costs—both in quality of life and in municipal dollars—can mortgage the city's future."

"Illiteracy is highly correlated with criminal behavior, with unemployment, and with the receipt of public assistance," it continues.

The task force, formed last year by the Board of Education and the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Policy, Robert F. Wagner Jr., recommends the creation of a series of projects, some modeled on smaller existing efforts, to teach reading in schools and in connection with job training out of school.

"Eighty percent of the youthful illiterate population can learn to read within 18 months," the report asserts. It maintains that the existing literacy programs provide a framework that could be expanded within practical fiscal and institutional limits.

SIXTH GRADE LEVEL IN 18 MONTHS

Furthermore, the report says it is feasible to expect most of the young people to reach at least a sixth-grade reading level in 18 months because this timetable has been fulfilled in smaller programs.

"A major factor in the failure of many literacy programs, both in and out of school, was the failure of most program operators to realize that such rates of achievement are possible and can be set as a performance standard," the report concludes.

An estimated 19,000 of the illiterate young people are still in school, the report says, and the rest are dropouts. The number in need of reading instruction was determined by school test scores, figures from the State Education Department and surveys of the reading levels of out-of-school youths entering literacy programs.

Officials at the National Center for Education Statistics and the Literacy Volunteers of America said comparable figures were unavailable for other cities. But the proportion of illiterate youths is probably

similar elsewhere since dropout rates and reading achievement levels in many urban school systems resemble those in New York.

The report also describes how the illiteracy of the young people makes it difficult to help them, which is why City Hall became involved in the study.

BARRIER TO TRAINING PROGRAMS

"The city's private and public youth employment, child care and juvenile justice agencies cited the illiteracy of their clients as a major barrier to the effectiveness of their training and rehabilitation programs," the report says.

The three-pronged attack on illiteracy proposed by the task force involves the development of 10 in-school reading academies, the creation of six pilot employment training centers combining instruction in literacy and job skills and the expansion of part-time evening adult education centers.

In addition, the task force recommends setting up a technical assistance center to support the three programs, especially by attracting private money, training literacy teachers and coordinating cooperation among city agencies.

"Virtually the entire program can be carried out without new money if staff members are redeployed," said Marian L. Schwarz, an education aide to Mr. Wagner and a cochairman of the task force.

The task force found that successful programs involved at least 12 to 30 hours of instruction a week, set goals for the participants, monitored progress, had classes of 10 to 20 students and were linked to job training. ●

THE UNITED STATES CANNOT BE DEFEATED BY A SOVIET NUCLEAR STRIKE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the main fallacies of the Reagan administration's nuclear policies is the premise that the United States is vulnerable to a Soviet nuclear attack. Frankly, I doubt that those who espouse this view truly believe it. Rather, it appears this is a rationalization to justify efforts to develop a first strike capability in the United States, or at the very least nuclear superiority for the United States.

One of the more candid and insightful statements on the nuclear arms race was recently made by the noted nuclear scientist, Dr. Hans Bethe. His basic point is that the United States is not vulnerable to the Soviet Union, nor is it likely to be. Rather, the actions of the United States in nuclear weapons development are a major cause of the arms race.

I highly commend the following interview with Dr. Hans Bethe to my colleagues:

The interview follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 11, 1982]

AMERICA'S DEAN OF ATOMIC PHYSICISTS SAYS UNITED STATES NOT VULNERABLE

(By Robert Scheer)

Nobel Prize-winning theoretical physicist Hans A. Bethe has been continuously involved with the U.S. nuclear weapons program since his participation in the Manhattan Project, which developed the first atomic bomb. Bethe, a refugee from Nazi Germany, was the chief of the theoretical physics division of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico during the war years and later returned to the laboratory to work on the development of the hydrogen bomb.

From 1959 to 1969, Bethe served as a member of the strategic military panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee which, among other things, dealt with the development of the anti-ballistic missile. He continued as a consultant to the U.S. government on nuclear weapons matters through the Carter years.

A professor at Cornell University, Bethe was recently interviewed while he was a visiting professor at the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena. Caltech President Marvin L. Goldberger, himself a leading physicist and the chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee on which Bethe served, has called Bethe "one of the great physicists of the 20th Century."

SCHAEER. Do you agree with the Reagan Administration that we need more nuclear weapons to counter the Soviet threat?

BETHE. I would like to state that there is no deficiency in armaments in the United States, that we don't need to catch up to the Russians, that, if anything, the Russians have to catch up to us. The Russians have their forces mostly in ICBMs (intercontinental ballistic missiles), a type of weapon that is becoming more and more vulnerable. I think our military people know this, but they always talk about the vulnerability of our nuclear ICBMs, and never talk about those of the Soviets. The Russians are much more exposed to a possible first strike from us than we are to one from them.

Q. Do we have the means of deterring a Soviet first strike?

A. I don't think that either country is going to make a first strike because it is absolutely crazy to do so. But suppose there were a first strike from the Russians, and suppose they could destroy all our Minuteman missiles. It wouldn't make the slightest difference. Would we be defenseless? Not at all. We have the submarine force with an enormous striking power.

Q. But the submarine-launched missiles are said to lack the necessary accuracy to retaliate effectively.

A. The submarine-launched missiles, the new generation, are going to be extremely accurate. President Reagan himself has said the Trident II missile will be accurate enough to hit any hard target. This is one point where I would endorse the Administration's program: we should have the most accurate missile for our submarines. Also, we have a good bomber force.

Q. Yet the President refers to the bomber force of B-52s as ancient and incapable of penetrating into the Soviet Union.

A. They themselves cannot penetrate Russia, either today or tomorrow, but they are getting equipped with cruise missiles. Cruise missiles are probably the most accurate weapon that has yet been invented. The Russians don't have them, and I consider them most important, just as a penetra-

tion aid for our bomber force. Our bombers don't need to penetrate the Soviet Union. It would be an unnecessary exposure. Once they have cruise missiles on board, they launch them from outside the Soviet Union and to get, say, within 200 miles of the Soviet Union, they don't need to penetrate a screen of Russian air defenses. The cruise missiles, as you know, have devices to follow the terrain, and find their way by comparing with a map. And they are going on our bombers this year, perhaps even this month.

Q. What about the general argument that the Carter Administration's policies left this country vulnerable to a Soviet attack?

A. On the contrary, the most important progress in weapons in the last decade, I would say, was the cruise missile, which was developed under Carter. Now, in case of an all-out Soviet attack, of course, some of our bombers would probably be destroyed on airfields. However, a long time ago we dispersed our bombers over many many smaller airfields so that, on warning, a lot of them will take off. And, of course, you take off those which are armed with cruise missiles before any others. I don't see that there is any cause for us to be alarmed by the possibility of a major Soviet attack.

Q. So what is this emphasis on U.S. weakness all about?

A. I believe we are repeating the mistake of 1960 when people talked about the missile gap. The missile gap did, in fact, exist, but it was the other way around. We had lots of missiles and the Russians didn't. It took the Russians a decade before they caught up with us, and even then their missiles were not as good as ours because they largely used liquid missile propellant, whereas we went to solid propellant in the 1960s. I believe we have repeated the missile gap story once more, and it is just as wrong today as it was in 1960.

Q. But what about these statements that President Reagan and others make that the Soviets have just undertaken the "most unrelenting military buildup in the history of the world"?

A. That is true, they have kept building missiles, constantly, and in tremendous number, and in much larger numbers than makes any sense. Why? Chiefly, they wanted to catch up with us. Now they have more missiles than we, but in general the numbers are very comparable in the Soviet arsenal and in ours. Both are close to the ceiling permitted by SALT II (Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty). The only way to ensure that they don't surpass us more is to have an arms control agreement.

Actually, ours is a much better arsenal because our forces are better distributed. Less than half our missiles are ICBMs, a weapon, as I said before, which is getting vulnerable; we have 1,050, they have 1,400. In submarines, while the numbers are about the same, we have more serviceable ones. Then we have the bombers which, together with the cruise missiles, are a formidable force, while they have not paid any attention to their bombers at all. Most of their bombers are propeller driven, totally obsolete, and without penetration aids; you can write them off. Yes, the Russians have built, unrelentingly, more and more missiles. There is no question—but it is irrelevant.

One more point on that. The SALT agreements are very much to our advantage because they limit the number, on which the Russians are very good, and they don't limit the technology, on which we are very good. So we can put the most sophisticated technology into the given number of missiles,

which is what we have done in the case of the cruise missile, for instance.

Q. One justification of the arms race is that the Soviets are aiming at gaining the capability to win a nuclear war.

A. I quite believe that we could win an arms race. But it is, of course, absolutely crazy to think of winning a nuclear war. You cannot win a nuclear war, neither they nor we, even if some fraction of the population might survive. The Russians are very cautious, so they will not risk starting a nuclear war. They have publicly stated that they want arms control, and probably we could get arms control more easily from them now than ever before. I don't think we were doing badly before. I think SALT I was excellent, and SALT II was good, though not excellent. In my opinion, we could get a lot of agreements from them, but our negotiators have to be willing to negotiate, which means to make concessions. There was the Russian proposal of a two-thirds cutback (in Europe); instead of rejecting it out of hand. I think what we should have done is to say, "This is a possible negotiating position, now let's talk. Just how do we specify that cutback? What do we do about missiles, what do we do about your SS-20, what do we do about planes carrying nuclear weapons? Could we agree, perhaps, that this be a first step, and that further steps are to follow which would make us free of missiles in Europe?" But instead of accepting it as a basis for negotiations, we said, "No, that's impossible." I think that way you don't get an agreement.

Q. What do you make of the decision to build the MX missile?

A. The MX is a first-strike weapon. It makes no sense in any other way. The MX has extremely good accuracy. I want to give President Reagan credit for abolishing that completely crazy shell game with Carter and (former Secretary of Defense Harold) Brown had proposed. I think that was out of this world. Instead, Reagan proposes, "Let's develop the MX and, in the meantime, let the Pentagon think where to deploy it. They will probably find some way to do it." It would have been politically impossible to say immediately, "Let's not develop the MX at all." Maybe in three years the Pentagon will not have come up with any good method of deployment, and then they can say, "All right, we give it up."

One other point concerning arms control. I think it is just paradoxical to build up your weapons and then have arms control. Any weapons buildup on our part is only an incentive to the Russians to do the same. So if we want reduction in armaments, let's reduce from our present position. But negotiations are always a lengthy affair. Perhaps a challenge would be a quicker way to get results. Professor (Robert F.) Bacher of Caltech and George Kennan of Princeton have, therefore, proposed a series of small steps: We reduce the number of our weapons by, let us say, 5%, and challenge the Russians to do likewise. If they don't, we go no further. If they do, we continue and perhaps a new spirit grows.

Q. We talked before about how you cannot win or survive a nuclear war. What do you make of the view of, say, Edward Teller, who believes that you can? Do you meet with Teller?

A. I meet Teller from time to time. I agree with Teller on the matter of nuclear electric power generation, which is a totally different subject from nuclear weapons. One of the things I wish you would emphasize from time to time in your writings is that the two

things have very little to do with each other. They have less to do with each other than dynamite for mining purposes and explosives in conventional bombs. So Teller and I agree on the need for energy, including nuclear energy, but we don't talk about military matters. I did, at one time—it must have been two years ago; I listened to him about some of the specific military equipment that he advocated, just in order to learn not to argue and when it comes to matters like surviving a nuclear war, we agree not to discuss it.

Q. How is it that there is a disagreement about the presumably objective scientific question of whether or not we can survive a nuclear war?

A. I think there are many different ways you can understand the word "survival." Surely, if the attack were limited to ICBM's, even though fallout spread across the country without an attack on cities the country would survive, there is no question about that. There would be lots of casualties, but recovery would be entirely possible, and might even be fairly quick. But if you talk about an all-out nuclear war, with attacks on industry and attacks on cities and so on, then I would think that, while there will be survivors, the United States as a functioning society would not survive. Such an attack, it has been estimated by the Defense Department, could mean 100 million casualties, but that doesn't fully describe it. The important thing is the aftereffect.

For instance, there would almost certainly be a total breakdown of transportation. Everything in this country depends on transportation. Once many highways and railroad beds are made into rubble and the remaining highways are so radioactive that no truck driver will go on them, you cannot bring food to the cities. Nor can you bring fertilizer to the farms, nor energy to either place. I simply cannot understand how anybody can believe that we can recover from that in any short order.

One of the great mistakes that most people make when they talk against nuclear war is that they put the emphasis on radioactivity. That isn't the worst part. It may be the most widely spread effect, but it is not the worst part. The worst part is the death of people by third-degree burns, and that there is no possible medical help for them. We must expect that many of the explosions would be set off in the air, not on the ground. Heat radiation from the fireball, that is infrared rays and even visible light, is enormous. It increases faster than the area of destruction by blast, so most of the death would come from this source. Many people would be burned directly. Many people would get third-degree burns, and you cannot save a person like that if you don't bring medical help immediately. There will be no medical help because hospitals will be destroyed along with other buildings.

However, that is not the end of it. The thermal radiation sets newspapers on fire, even stacked newspaper. It sets wooden buildings on fire. So even if people are inside the normal kind of houses that we have in this country, which are mainly built of wood, they will burn up inside the house. If they go outside the house, they will burn up directly. The next thing, of course, is buildings collapsing by blast and burying people. If you talk about a large city with office buildings, people can go into shelters in the cellar but, in the meantime, the building above them will collapse or, at least, there will be yard-deep layers of shat-

tered glass. How will they ever get out? Even if they get out, the heat radiation will cause fires all over the place, and many secondary fires, because blast will destroy gas lines and the gas will begin to burn. It is not certain but there is a high possibility that these fires will cause a so-called firestorm, which means the fire consumes all oxygen, and the people down in the shelter will not get any oxygen. So I think that protection of the city population by shelters is totally futile if you have a direct attack on the city. Let me add here that I do not think that even an all-out nuclear war would destroy all life on earth.

Q. How do you feel, I mean you've been with this issue, with this bomb, for such a long time, and then one day you pick up the newspaper and some person says we can recover from general nuclear war in two to four years. What are your thoughts?

A. He is crazy.

Q. What about the clock on the cover of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists showing how close we are to midnight? Are we now in a more dangerous moment? What has happened to our thinking?

A. The main increase of danger, in my opinion, is psychological. People are scared when the Reagan government says we are in mortal danger and need to increase our armaments. But I am scared when he claims that more arms, especially nuclear ones, can protect us. It creates a war psychology. Human beings who are very scared don't act rationally. My greatest fear is that it will make the American people less rational, and then anything can happen. Many of the wars in history have happened because of fear. If there comes an all-out nuclear war, I think it will come because of fear. I believe that in this respect Franklin Roosevelt is right again: we have nothing to fear but fear itself. In my opinion, we have nothing to fear from the Russians, nor the Russians from us, but fear itself, namely the fear that each country creates about the other.

Q. Did you think at the time of the atomic bomb's discovery that we would be here now?

A. No. I was very much afraid in 1946. My wife and I discussed this matter and concluded that probably within 10 years there would be a nuclear war. That has not happened and it is a ray of hope. It has not happened because the statesmen, both in this country and in the Soviet Union, have clearly recognized that nuclear war is unthinkable. It is impossible, it would make such destruction that we have to use every means to avoid it. This realization seems to have escaped the present government. I think the real danger lies in this loss of understanding. Until the end of the Carter Administration, whether the President was Republican or Democrat, it was a generally recognized principle: Nuclear war must be avoided by all means. We are now told that this is not so. So here is a psychological difference. I think it is traditional, and therefore perfectly legitimate, if you want to win an election to play up the relative armaments of the United States and the Soviet Union; that is good election propaganda. But once you are the government, you must not make this primitive approach the basis of your military and foreign policy. That is very dangerous.

Q. We've all read about (Dr. J. Robert) Oppenheimer and his feelings of guilt. What can you add to that? You've been intimately connected with this for much of your life.

A. Having worked on the weapon does not give me a monopoly on deciding. All I can do

is to try to tell people what I think about nuclear weapons, and I will continue to do so as long as they let me. The decision has to be made by the government.

A single missile will destroy a city without having any soldier putting his life on the line. We have some 9,000 strategic weapons. Every one of them is bigger than the Hiroshima bomb. The Russians have a similar force. After hitting military targets, if you direct the remaining weapons against cities, you can destroy at least 5,000 cities of over 100,000—there are maybe 200 of those in each country. Why would you need more than 200 weapons?

Warfare has become totally different because the destructive power is greater than the totality of the things you can destroy. That has never happened before. The destruction can happen in an hour or two, instead of in five years. If it happens over five years, you can recover in part, again and again, you can adjust to it, you can bring help to the city which has been hit. If in two hours all our cities are destroyed, no help can be brought. That is not a difference in size, but a difference in kind. Against missiles there is no defense. This is a subject on which I worked quite carefully and industriously for many years before '68, looking at many ways how to tell decoys from missiles, and so on. Whatever you did, the offense could always fool the defense and could do it better. So anti-ballistic missiles for city defense are technically nonsense.

Let me come back to the question of survival once more. If there is an all-out attack on the Soviet Union and the United States, there will afterwards be no United States nor a Soviet Union.●

ACID RAIN: A CLOSE LOOK AT AN UNRESOLVED ISSUE

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 22, the Congressional Coal Group will sponsor a symposium on acid rain. The purpose of this meeting is to provide further information to Members and their staffs on the causes and effects of acid rain from the perspective of the scientific community along with the impacts any new control program would have on employment and consumers of electricity.

During the meeting presentations will be made by Kathleen Bennett, Assistant Administrator for Air, Noise and Radiation, EPA; Dr. Volker Mohnen, director of the Atmospheric Sciences Research Center, State University of New York; Sam Hall, assistant vice president for general planning, American Electric Power System; and Mike Buckner, research manager, United Mine Workers of America.

The symposium will begin at 2 p.m. in 2167 Rayburn House Office Building. All Members and their staffs are invited to attend.●

RIVERA Y DAMAS ASKS GUERRILLAS TO LAY DOWN ARMS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, although the media gave broad coverage to the elections in El Salvador and the overwhelming turnout, I saw no mention of comments by Salvadoran Bishop Rivera y Damas calling for the guerrillas to lay down their arms. The Salvadoran prelate's remarks characterize the elections as a valid expression of the Salvadorans' desire for peace and a political solution to the conflict in that country.

RIVERA Y DAMAS ASKS GUERRILLAS TO LAY DOWN ARMS

(PAO51931 Panama City ACAN in Spanish 1735 GMT 4 Apr. 82)

[Text] San Salvador, 4 Apr (ACANEFE).—Following last Sunday's elections for a Constituent Assembly, the various Salvadoran sectors must strive for the country's pacification, apostolic administrator of San Salvador Arturo Rivera y Damas stated today. During the Sunday homily at the metropolitan cathedral, Rivera y Damas indicated that this week the Salvadorans had lived through unprecedented elections held in the unusual environment of a civil war.

Rivera y Damas explained that the quantitative and qualitative vote of the Salvadorans should be analyzed, because no one can complain about the turnout, and the parties must be satisfied because the electoral process concluded happily. Qualitatively, Rivera y Damas added, we must analyze why the people voted massively. And here we must explain that they did so "because they are tired of violence and hope that this will be the beginning of a solution in this sea of confusion and sorrow in which we live." He added that the political parties now have "the tremendous responsibility of realizing that those who voted chose a given party because they really believed there were different ideologies among them."

Rivera y Damas asked: "If the belief had existed that all were ideologically the same, why were there so many different parties? Why didn't they use one banner? The parties must think about this, because the will of the people cannot be mocked," the prelate added.

Rivera y Damas said that the people hope the socioeconomic reforms underway will be continued and strengthened into a veritable political platform that will satisfy their hopes for peace and justice.

Rivera y Damas said that the leftwing FDR and the FMLN must accept the will of the Salvadoran people expressed at the polls for peace, democracy and justice. "The guerrillas must leave the path of arms and destruction to seek other paths that will permit them to gain credibility and confidence to contribute to the country's reconstruction and to secure peace," Rivera y Damas added. The prelate noted that all international observers unanimously recognized that the elections were honest, although security and surveillance measures did not permit the voting to be quicker. The apostolic administrator concluded by saying

that despite the enlightening lapse of the elections, the life of the Salvadorans is filled with clouds, of uncertainties "as when a storm is approaching."●

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AUTHORIZATION

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request, legislation to extend the authorization of the Endangered Species Act. The legislation has been submitted by the Department of Commerce and cleared by the administration. It provides for a 2-year authorization of funds to allow Commerce to carry out its activities under the act.

We are now preparing amendments to the Endangered Species Act in the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, which I am privileged to chair. We are working closely with all of the interest groups concerned with the act, and we believe that we are close to developing a package of amendments that will solve some of the problems in the act and make it a more effective and workable law to protect endangered species. We will use the bill introduced today as a vehicle and develop the legislation as we proceed through the committee process.●

ANDERSON SALUTES KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS ON 100TH ANNI- VERSARY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, this year marks the centennial anniversary of the Knights of Columbus. I rise today to congratulate and commend the Knights of Columbus on 100 years of service to the Nation and the world.

It was on March 29, 1882, in the then small community of New Haven, Conn., that Father Michael McGivney organized a group of 25 local laymen and founded the Order of the Knights of Columbus at St. Mary's Church. Today, the membership of the Knights exceeds 1,350,000 and their supreme knight, Virgil C. Deckert, presides over 7,165 local councils—the foundation on which the order is built and functions—located in the United States and 8 foreign countries.

The members of this Catholic fraternal organization should be extremely proud of their longstanding heritage

and unblemished record of dedicated service to their church and community. Through my years of public service, I have had frequent contact with the Knights of Columbus and am quite familiar with their very worthwhile projects. Their leadership and devotion to the community—particularly those less fortunate than us—is truly an inspiration and should set an example for all to follow.

As reported in the March 25, 1982, edition of the Catholic Standard:

In 1980 individual Knights distributed \$31.7 million for various activities to help the handicapped, the elderly, the young and others. They also donated 9.2 million volunteer hours to community and church services.

The article goes on to point out that—

By choosing Columbus as their patron, the founders were stressing Catholic legitimacy in the predominantly Protestant culture 100 years ago. Their strong pride in being American and Catholic eventually led to the forming of the Fourth Degree Knights, who have patriotic work as their goal. This patriotism also led the Knights to establish Knights of Columbus "Huts" as recreational facilities of U.S. troops fighting on the Mexican border against Pancho Villa in 1916 and then in Europe during World War I. This \$40 million venture in World War I carried an invitation to the Huts set up near the front: "Everybody welcome, everything free." The 1920's were a busy time for the society. Involved in a long battle with the Ku Klux Klan over Catholic bigotry, the Knights also set up a million dollar fund to help Mexicans fight Catholic persecution in that country. The decade also saw the successful fight against an Oregon law that would have prevented children from attending parochial schools. The law was found unconstitutional in 1925 by the Supreme Court. The Knights founded the construction of the Knights' Tower at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception and donated the bells for it. They also established the "Luke E. Hart Memorial fund" in 1979 to promote Marian devotion at the shrine.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we have been fortunate, as a nation, to have the Knights of Columbus and its extensive membership working on our behalf this last 100 years in order to make this a better place to live. The contributions attributable to the Knights are many and far reaching. My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating all the members of the Knights of Columbus—particularly those in the Los Angeles Basin—for a job well done. We hope that 100 years from now, the Knights of Columbus will be celebrating their bicentennial anniversary and the House of Representatives will again pass legislation commending them on another century of dedicated work to millions of people worldwide who benefit from their unselfish service.●

THE 70th ANNIVERSARY OF THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO SOCI- ETY

HON. LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. DeNARDIS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I had the high privilege of participating in the 70th anniversary celebration of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Society of Milford, Conn. At the turn of the century, as now, the Polish people were seeking freedom from the unrest in their homeland. Many found that freedom in the United States. In 1912, a group of these immigrants, concerned for the welfare of themselves and their families, formed a fraternal, nonprofit society to render aid to the sick. As hard-working farmers and devout Christians, they had but 1 day of rest on which to hold their meetings, namely, the Sabbath. The tradition of Sunday afternoon gatherings survives to this day.

The pride of these people in this, their adopted country, as well as in their Polish heritage, is manifest in the name they chose for their society. Thaddeus Kosciuszko was a civil engineer from Poland who distinguished himself as a patriot during America's fight for independence. Serving under Gen. George Washington, he designed and built our fortifications at Ticonderoga and West Point. In recognition of Thaddeus Kosciuszko's great contribution to the cause of American liberty, Washington commissioned him a brigadier general.

Like us 200 years ago, the Polish people today are faced with a grave threat to their freedom. The Soviet oppression of Poland is at least as pervasive and certainly more brutal than that of the British which led to the American Revolution. Naturally, the Polish crisis weighs heavily on the minds of those in the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Society. Their brethren have been systematically stripped of the most elemental of personal liberties, the rights to which every human being is justly heir. The Soviet Union, the last true imperialist nation on Earth, has sacrificed the liberty and happiness of millions of people in its raw quest for global dominance.

The founders of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Society were earnest working men. They came to our shores seeking freedom, stability, and opportunity for a better life for themselves and their families. Democracy and free enterprise allowed them and their descendants to realize that dream, and in bettering themselves they have made our country better, too. The Polish laborers who comprise Solidarity are just

the same kind of men—earnest, hard working, and desirous of a better life. The only difference is that they lack—rather than they are denied—the freedom and opportunity to achieve it. The existence of a workers' organization in opposition to the Communist regime shatters the last flimsy pretense that communism is a workers' government. The very proposition would be comical, were it not used to veil injustice of such depth and magnitude.

The situation in Poland is cause for outrage. But not for despair. It is not in the nature of the Polish people to succumb to oppression. Thaddeus Kosciuszko showed that. The Polish immigrants to America at the turn of the century showed that. And the members of Solidarity are showing it now. That is not to say that we should be content to let them struggle on their own, however. There is always the danger when good people see all the force of law, all the power of government on the side of evil—and witness no other way of life—that they will lose perspective and begin to believe that cruelty, injustice, and suffering are the way of the world, everywhere, always. Then the spirit of resistance weakens, and tyranny grows that much stronger.

That is a situation we can do something to prevent. By our history, culture, social attitudes, and our Christian faith, we and the Polish people share a Western heritage. They need to know that the free Western World has not forgotten them. All they have of freedom is a vision. We must fuel that vision to keep it burning bright. The governments and people of the free world should sustain constant, vigorous denunciation of the Soviet actions in Poland, and persistent, enthusiastic encouragement of the Solidarity movement. That is what we can do to hasten the outcome of freedom in Poland. And I believe it is the least we can do to repay our Polish compatriots, like Thaddeus Kosciuszko and the members of the society which memorializes him, for their inestimable contribution to the birth and growth of freedom in America.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should like the RECORD to show the names of the members of the society, including those who were specially honored at the centennial dinner. For their kind hospitality and warm fellowship, I am deeply grateful to all of them.

The officers are:

Society Officers: President, Joseph Tirita; Vice President, Frank Zielinski; Financial Secretary, Joseph Kaluzynski; Treasurer, Peter Penkala; Recording Secretary, Michael Fogler; Trustees, Joseph Gaidish, Edward J. Kozlowski, and Edward Sobocinski; Sick Committee, Joseph Stawski and Anthony Walakiewicz; Marshal, William Paskiewicz; Doorman, Emil Potsiadlo; Chaplain, Edward Tomaszek; Refreshment Com-

mittee, Edward A. Kozlowski and Richard Kaczmarczyk.

The following gentlemen received awards for their distinguished service:

Service Awards: Albert Olenski, President, 1955; Edward J. Kozlowski, President, 1956-62; Frank Zielinski, President, 1963; Steve Siekierski, President, 1964; Edward Fogler, President, 1965, 1976-78; Edward Sobocinski, President, 1967-68; Anthony Walakiewicz, President, 1969; Joseph Stawski, President, 1970; Robert Kapusta, President, 1971-72; Joseph Gaidish, President, 1973-74; Joseph Bogdan, President, 1975; Paul Pjura, President, 1979-81; Joseph Kaluzynski, Financial Secretary, 1967-71; Peter Penkala, Recording Secretary, 1970, 1973-77; and Eugene Ksiezak, Special Service Award.

One of the society's beneficent activities is the fostering of mental development by providing scholarships to worthy students of Polish descent who seek higher education. The following young men and women were scholarship recipients over the last 5 years:

Scholarship Recipients: 1975, Catherine Zielinski; 1976, Catherine Penkala and Carolyn Zielinski; 1977, Catherine Penkala; 1978, Thomas Olenski, Judith Guido, Peggy Guido, Cecilia Zielinski, and Camilla Wypychowski; 1979, Maria (Tomaszek) Harrington, Thomas Gaidish, and Terry Fogler; 1980, Thomas Gaidish, Ramona Prokoski, and C. Lumpinski; 1981, Marie (Tomaszek) Harrington, Thomas Gaidish, and Reena Olenski.

Lastly, the full roster of the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Society of Milford follows:

MEMBERSHIP

John B. Anderson, Ronald Benkoski, Joseph Bogdan, Clarence F. Dabrowski, Joseph Deleski, Henry Deptula, Leon R. Dolinski, Stanley Dudzinski, Edward Fogler, Michael Fogler, Robert Fogler, Stephen R. Fogler, Steve Fogler, Christian Fricke.

Walter Gabryszewski, Joseph Gaidish, Donald German, Harry F. Gill, Raymond Guido, Edward Janik, Richard Kaczmarczyk, Joseph Kaluzynski, Stanley Kaluzynski, Robert Kapusta, George J. Kasson, Andrew V. Kozlowski, Edward A. Kozlowski, Edward J. Kozlowski, John B. Kozlowski, Michael J. Kozlowski, Richard Kozlowski.

Eugene Ksiezak, Bruce S. Kuryla, Al Lumpinski, Chester Malinowski, Richard Merenda, James F. Miaski, Boleslaw Mieszkiel, James R. Mullenix, John P. Nowicki, Albert Olenski, Frank Pankiewicz, William Paskiewicz, Peter Penkala, Gary M. Pjura, Paul Pjura, Donald Potsiadlo, Emil Potsiadlo, Frank Rakocz.

Robert D. Sala, Joseph Salamon, Walter Salamon, David Siekierski, Leon Siekierski, Robert Siekierski, M. Steve Siekierski, Joseph Slonka, Donald Sobocinski, Edward Sobocinski, Wallie Sobocinski, Joseph Stawski, Joseph Surgalis, Joseph Tirita.

Edward Tomaszek, Adam Urbonas, Anthony Walakiewicz, Jan Wankowicz, Sr., Joseph Wojcinowicz, Jr., John Worozilcak, Edward Wypychowski, John Wypychowski, John Yasak, Joseph S. Yednasty, Frank Zielinski, Frank Zielinski, Jr., Walter Zientek.

They all deserve our heartiest congratulations on the proud occasion of the society's 70th anniversary. ●

THE NUCLEAR RESOLUTIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, April 21, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

No. 15—THE NUCLEAR RESOLUTIONS

One of the most surprising political developments so far in 1982 has been the sudden increase in public concern about the growth of nuclear arsenals in the United States and the Soviet Union. Localities across the land have passed resolutions calling for an immediate end to the arms race and for a new arms control accord. Members of Congress have introduced resolutions for the same purpose. President Reagan recently opened a news conference with remarks intended to slow the momentum of a congressional initiative calling for a freeze on nuclear arsenals. The national news media have covered the developments thoroughly and have even promoted them in some instances. Public opinion polls show a heavy majority of Americans favoring a freeze on nuclear weapons.

Several factors have converged to raise concern about the possibility of nuclear war and to create the demand for reductions in nuclear arsenals. The second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty was never ratified by the United States Senate and was not supported by candidate Ronald Reagan, who after his election chose tacitly to abide by the treaty's terms. Although he has indicated an interest in doing so, the President has not resumed negotiations on strategic weapons with the Soviet Union. His military budget contains major increases for strategic forces. Also, cutbacks in social programs and record budget deficits have focused attention on the growth of the military budget. In Europe, demonstrations against nuclear weapons brought pressure to bear on political leaders there for a more vigorous effort to control arms. The Reagan Administration is widely seen as having failed to take the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms seriously.

A number of proposals to freeze or reduce the nuclear arsenals of both superpowers have been made. The President has proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union eliminate certain European theater nuclear forces entirely. The Soviet Union has suggested staged reductions in intermediate-range missiles to 300 for each side, with a moratorium on further deployment of these missiles in the European part of the Soviet Union as an act of good faith. One congressional resolution calls for a freeze on the testing, production, and further deployment of nuclear weapons as an immediate objective of strategic arms control. It also calls on the two superpowers to work to cut the size of their nuclear arsenals. Another such resolution, considered a counter to the first one, calls on the President to propose to the Soviet Union a freeze at equal and reduced levels, leaving room for modernization of America's nuclear deterrent.

These resolutions bring several thoughts to mind.

First, we must acknowledge the legitimacy of people's anxiety about nuclear war. It is

no exaggeration to say that many people are very frightened—for good cause. They are concerned about the survival of life on earth. They are right to demand that we get on with the task of arms control.

Second, the two main resolutions under consideration in Congress have common features: they assert the dangers of nuclear war, seek deep cuts in nuclear arsenals, accept negotiation as the best method of achieving mutual cuts, and demand verification of any agreements. However, the one resolution would halt and then reverse the arms race while the other would allow the United States to match the Soviet strategic buildup prior to a freeze. Despite their similarities, these resolutions do not lend themselves to compromise.

Third, I consider the value of the initial freeze resolution to be primarily symbolic. Debate on it can educate all of us and help push the nation forcefully toward arms control as an integral element of our policy of national security. The passage of such a resolution would send a useful signal to the world that we are interested in arms control.

Fourth, this resolution has great appeal in a world which madly builds more and more nuclear arms as it careens toward nuclear holocaust. However, it is not a substitute for specific arms control negotiations or specific development of military capability, whether conventional or strategic.

Fifth, there are some very real problems with the resolution. For example, a freeze at present levels would lock the United States into certain military disadvantages. It would require extensive on-site inspection, something the Soviet Union has traditionally rejected. It would not allow us to modernize our strategic forces and thus might undercut our bargaining position.

Sixth, some opponents of the freeze argue that the United States has fallen behind in the arms race and needs to catch up. This argument is a serious one which must be considered carefully, but I am not persuaded by it at the present time. It is true that the West is behind in intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, that the Soviet Union could probably destroy many of our land-based ballistic missiles in a pre-emptive strike, and that the American strategic position is relatively weaker than it was ten years ago. However, it is also true that the United States is ahead in the number of strategic warheads it fields and in the capabilities of its nuclear submarines, of the ballistic missiles they carry, and of its strategic bombers. The balance is one of "essential equivalence" (as President Carter described it) or "rough parity" (as President Ford called it). No one really knows what will happen if these nuclear weapons are used. That uncertainty is one of the principal ingredients of deterrence.

The most pressing tasks before us are to reopen talks with the Soviet Union leading to control of strategic nuclear forces, to pursue energetically the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe, and to start discussions on limitation of short-range nuclear forces.●

**RABBI IRWIN GRONER
CELEBRATES 25TH YEAR**

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Rabbi Irwin Groner, who is marking his 25th year as a rabbi and his 15th year as spiritual leader of Congregation Shaarey Zedek in Southfield, Mich.

I have known Rabbi Groner for several years, and I have been deeply impressed with his moral conviction, social concern, and intelligent leadership. He has been a tireless worker on behalf of the poor and the oppressed in this country and throughout the world and has not hesitated to speak out on the major issues of our day. He has sought to provide guidance in the midst of confusion, and understanding in the place of ignorance.

In a recent article of Federal budget cuts, Rabbi Groner wrote:

It is a false and repugnant idea that somehow the poor are the cause of our economic problems and that solutions at their expense are permissible. . . . We believe that the spirit of America and the moral teaching of our religious faiths require of us that we not remain silent in the midst of injustice.

It is typical of Rabbi Groner to speak out against injustice and on behalf of those who are oppressed—the poor here at home, Soviet Jews who are persecuted because of their desire to live and practice their faith in freedom, the citizens of Israel who seek security and peace in the face of intransigent hostility.

Rabbi Groner exemplifies the highest values of personal, religious, and community leadership, and we are enriched by his efforts. I hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring this remarkable man for his achievements and in wishing him every success in the future.●

**CAN THE UNITED STATES BE
TRUSTED TO COMPLY WITH
NUCLEAR WEAPONS TREATIES?**

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Los Angeles Times carried an interesting article on one of the latest plans for the basing the MX missile system. As we all know, the basing mode for the MX missile is a matter of great controversy and uncertainty. Less known is the growing concern over whether the MX

missile itself is necessary, and whether a U.S. commitment to the MX missile implies a U.S. commitment to a first strike capability.

The news article which caught my attention deals with the latest plans to orbit MX missiles into outer space, in spite of the provisions of the Outer Space Treaty and the SALT II treaty. As one who has been concerned about an arms race in space, this report of U.S. military interest in moving the MX into space is a matter of great concern. It should interest every Member of Congress. I include the text of this article below.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to avoid and prevent an arms race in space. There are also many reasons why the Reagan administration should quickly disavow any intention to abrogate existing or pending international treaties. Perhaps the most important reason is the need for U.S. leadership in the effort to achieve and maintain world peace. My own congressional district has expressed concern about the Reagan administration's handling of nuclear weapons issues. In my recent postal patron poll, an overwhelming majority wanted negotiations on the limitation and reduction in nuclear weapons. And local editorials, such as the one which follows these remarks, have criticized the President for his failure of leadership in this most important matter.

I commend the following articles to my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 20, 1982]

**PLAN TO ORBIT MX'S STUDIED DESPITE
TREATY VIOLATIONS**
(By David Wood)

WASHINGTON.—A proposal to orbit MX missile warheads in space is being given "a close look" by Pentagon planners, even though the technology for controlling the orbiting warheads is uncertain and the scheme would violate arms control treaties according to defense officials.

Under the proposal, which is being studied at the Air Force Ballistic Missile Office at Norton Air Force Base near San Bernardino, Calif., the missiles would be launched into orbit at the first sign of a Soviet attack. The warheads would orbit high above the Earth, where they could either be activated and released toward their targets, or recalled to fall harmlessly in a remote area.

Although the proposal will likely be attacked by anti-nuclear forces, Thomas Summers, a research engineer with the Eyring Research Institute in Provo, Utah, who helped develop the MX orbiter concept, called it "the first step toward practical disarmament."

"The Russians aren't going to shoot if they know our missiles will be gone before their missiles get here," he said.

The orbiting warhead plan illustrates the pressure on the Defense Department to develop a method for deploying the MX missile in a way that is both militarily and politically acceptable. Just about every other plan the Pentagon has proposed has run into trouble.

What has attracted defense officials to the proposal is that the missiles would be

relatively invulnerable in orbit, rather than being exposed to a Soviet preemptive attack while sitting in undefended silos.

The issue of vulnerability of the 96-ton new-generation MX missiles, scheduled to come off the production line in 1986, is behind the controversy over the MX. Under current Administration plans, 40 missiles would be placed in existing silos as an interim solution. Government planners then would decide on a permanent basing plan by 1984 and carry it out at the end of the decade.

But Congress, reflecting the military's discomfort over the vulnerability of the missiles during the interim period, has been prodding the Administration to advance its planning schedule. Last month the Senate Armed Services Committee voted to kill the interim basing plan and to demand that the Administration come up with a final basing plan by December.

Pentagon officials had suggested that a basing plan called "dense pack," which involves clustering MX silos to make them more defensible, was the most probable final solution. But the officials said the idea of orbiting warheads, a concept that previously had been studied and rejected because of technological problems, is now gaining support.

One of the proposal's attractions is that it would be relatively inexpensive, involving only the addition of rocket booster power and command and control facilities to the MX system. It would not require massive new ground bases, which was a drawback to the Multiple Protective Shelters plan proposed by the Carter Administration.

"The proposal does have merit, and we are looking at it," an Air Force official said. "This is getting more of a close look than some of the other ideas that have been proposed."

A congressional weapons expert called the orbiting scheme "a little flakey," but he said the idea had aroused some interest in Congress.

Air Force officials involved in the study of the proposal concede, however, that it would violate provisions of the United Nations treaty on space as well as the second Strategic Arms Limitation treaty, both of which specifically prohibit maintaining nuclear weapons in space.

Although the Senate failed to approve the SALT II treaty and the United States never ratified it, both the United States and the Soviet Union have complied with its provisions. Administration officials say a deliberate violation of SALT II by the United States would be a major step that should not be taken lightly.

The treaty provides that neither side "develop, test or deploy . . . systems for placing into earth orbit nuclear weapons or any other kind of weapons of mass destruction."

But the proposal being studied calls for orbiting the U.S. warheads only after there had been signs that the Soviets had launched missiles toward this country—circumstances under which disarmament treaties probably would be considered moot.

Although the technology exists for placing the warheads in orbit, officials said that controlling the orbiting warheads is far more difficult. The proposal calls for as many as 500 mobile command and tracking stations, housed in tractor-trailers that could be driven around to avoid being targeted by Soviet missiles.

Additional tracking and command stations would be built outside the United States, and satellites would provide additional navigation and targeting information.

The officials said that under present technology, precise command and control systems could be knocked out by attacks on U.S. satellites by Soviet satellite killers. Additionally, the high-altitude explosion of Soviet nuclear warheads over the United States could wipe out long-range communications entirely.

"In a war situation, we don't know if we could control or recall the warheads properly," one official said, indicating that the control technology is the focus of current research.

Summers, the research engineer who worked on the plan, said the main benefit of the system could be that "it would move the whole concept of nuclear war 150 miles out in space. The initial exchange, to determine who's going to win, would be in space. That will make life a lot safer for everybody."

[From the Morning Press-Enterprise, Apr. 2, 1982]

ARMS IN PLACE OF LEADERSHIP

Americans, like the rest of the world, have lived in fear of nuclear war for more than a generation.

But not in the last 20 years has there been anything to compare with the apparent grass-roots nuclear freeze movement that first swept Europe and now has taken hold in the United States.

Popular sentiment, as illustrated by California's own initiative drive, town hall votes, congressional resolutions and mass demonstrations, has reached such a high pitch that President Reagan was forced to face the issue at his press conference Wednesday. He had to say what form of freeze he favored.

He came down in support of a freeze only after the U.S. had been allowed to "catch up" to the Soviets. A counter proposal, favored by Senators Kennedy and Hatfield, calls for an immediate freeze on Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals to be followed by arms reduction talks.

The Kennedy-Hatfield version is based on the premise that each side has enough nuclear firepower to blow the other away, no matter who presses the button first. The latter version assumes that the Soviet Union could launch a nuclear war, absorb a U.S. retaliation, and fire again.

The president may, indeed, be right. But because he has failed to set forth a clear and sensible arms policy, a growing number of people seem to believe that Mr. Reagan is not only contemplating a nuclear war but getting the country ready to "win" it. In the last 15 months, the president or his top aides have mused about the possibility of a limited nuclear war in Europe or firing a nuclear warning shot to scare the Soviet Union. There has been Pentagon speculation that the United States could completely recover from a nuclear war in four years—tops. And early last month, the administration secretly put the country's emergency nuclear attack communications system through its paces—just to let Russia know it still works.

The otherwise budget-cutting president wants to pour billions into a civil defense program and trillions into defense. But even congressional supporters aren't sure where he wants to put the money.

True, Mr. Reagan proposed to halt missile deployment in Europe if the Soviets get their already installed missiles out. That was good poker, perhaps, but not realistic. And even that proposal didn't emerge until thousands of protesting Europeans finally got the message through that Ronald Reagan was scaring the hell out of them.

So far it has been Ronald Reagan the follower—waiting for a movement to build, then trying to defuse it with belated reassurances. If this is "leadership," it is an example of bad leadership.

On perhaps the most critical issue—nuclear arms control—it is the president, but not necessarily the United States, who has a demonstrated window of vulnerability. ●

CONGRESS HAS A CHANCE TO ACT ON PAY REFORM

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from New York (Mr. LEE) in introducing the most comprehensive package of bipartisan reforms to the congressional pay system since ratification of the Constitution.

It has become obvious, after the events of last December when Congress voted itself a hefty tax break, that reform is needed. This country is in a time where we are asking American citizens to sacrifice for the sake of economic recovery. Members of Congress have that same obligation. We are not royalty. We are elected representatives of the people and it is time for Congress to get its own house in order.

The Omnibus Congressional Compensation Reform Act of 1982 incorporates seven major reforms of the procedures used by Congress to give itself pay, tax treatment or outside earning improvements.

Congress frequently loses its perspective when faced with setting its own economic conditions. It responds instead to its own whims and wants. It is imperative that all provisions of the legislation are acted upon in a swift manner.

The bill has received the support of Members on both sides of the aisle. An identical companion measure was introduced in the Senate. Chief among its sponsors is the Senate President pro tempore, STROM THURMOND.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated numerous times that proper legislation is needed if we are going to preserve the integrity of the institution of Congress in the eyes of the people. Our first and primary responsibility is to our constituents.

Just recently I saw an advertisement in the Los Angeles Times. It said, "If the people will lead, then the leaders will follow." Let us hope the ad is not correct. Congress must set the example. What better way to start than to deal with the issue of our own pay in a responsible way.

I urge my colleagues to show their support for this legislation by signing

on as a cosponsor. Fairness and integrity know no party. ●

IN OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL
VOLUNTEER WEEK

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure today in rising to salute the many Americans who unselfishly give up their time to help the less fortunate members of our society.

I, of course, refer to that great army of American volunteers, who every year, with little or no public recognition, give time and services to our Nation worth millions of dollars.

It is only fitting and proper that we salute these true American heroes by designating this week as National Volunteer Week.

In this hectic age we live in, it is most heartening to know that the American tradition of voluntarism is still thriving. Whether they be teenagers working as candy strippers in our hospitals, scout leaders, the Kiwanis Club or other civic organizations, they all share the sense of community involvement and care for their neighbors that has made our Nation great.

During this era of economic distress, we must do all that is possible to insure that our volunteer organizations remain fiscally solvent. It is for that reason that I have cosponsored H.R. 768, the volunteer mileage bill, which provides that the standard mileage rate used in computing Federal income tax deductions be the same for charity workers as they are for business-related driving.

We must keep the American volunteer spirit alive. Allowing this income tax deduction would be a key step in insuring that our volunteers will be able to continue with their vital work. ●

THE B-1 "PEACEMAKER"

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the former distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) in a major speech before the floor of the House, has offered us his reflections regarding the critical issue of the defense of our Nation. While a number of his points are well-taken, others are sure to provoke vigorous debate and none more so than his views on the B-1 bomber or, as I prefer to call it, the B-1

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Peacemaker" because that is its primary function—to act as a deterrent and so keep the peace.

Mr. Rhodes recommends that the B-1 be scrapped as a budget savings measure in favor of a Stealth bomber. He then goes on to candidly admit that "not building the B-1 may result in a defense 'gap' in the middle and late 1980's. Personally, I will take a chance on that."

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental difference between the former minority leader and myself is that he is willing to accept that dangerous defense gap whereas I, in good conscience, cannot. Let me briefly go into the reasons why I cannot support my distinguished colleague.

While Mr. RHODES is content to wait for the development of the Stealth bomber, it is a well-known fact that the Soviet Union already has its version of the B-1, namely, the Backfire bomber which is capable of reaching the United States. Placed in service in the mid-1970's, the Backfire is a twin-engine, swing-wing, turbofan powered bomber capable of carrying freefall bombs and air-to-surface missiles. Over 70 Backfires are presently deployed with long-range aviation with a like number assigned to Soviet naval aviation. The Backfire is a versatile, multipurpose aircraft capable of performing nuclear strikes, conventional attacks, antiship and reconnaissance missions and is currently being produced at the rate of about 2½ aircraft a month or 30 a year. In short, the Soviet Union considers it imperative to have a sophisticated bomber now.

As my distinguished colleague knows from his years on the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, two legs of our defensive strategic triad are dangerously weak. Our land-based missiles must be significantly strengthened to be able to sustain a Soviet first strike while the air-breathing leg of the triad—our B-52 bombers—are ancient relics from the early 1950's with the pilots, in many instances, younger than the aircraft they fly. Time has taken its toll on the B-52's. As recently as October 30 of last year (1981), a member of the Air Force Reserve, 1st Lt. Navigator Kendall Wallace, crashed in a B-52 D model 10 miles from LaJunta, Calif. Can we in good conscience jeopardize the lives of our young men with inferior, obsolescent aircraft? A fleet of slow, aging, subsonic aircraft is hardly a match for the sophisticated Backfire, particularly when you consider that, as they near Soviet airspace, our B-52's would face the world's most impressive air defense, including thousands of supersonic surface-to-air missiles and fighters.

Mr. Speaker, as I have endeavored to point out on numerous occasions the B-1 aircraft—the first squadron of which is expected to be operational in

1986—is acknowledged by the majority of aviation experts to be the best bomber ever developed by man. As a former U.S. Air Force fighter pilot and as one who has personally piloted the B-1, I can attest to the sophistication, the versatility, and the aerodynamic superiority of this remarkable aircraft. The B-1 is not a prisoner of a predetermined, computerized course. It can take swift, evasive action. It can dodge and weave and avoid enemy weapons. It can be recalled if launched while the United States is under possible, but not confirmed, surprise Soviet nuclear attack. The flexible B-1, armed with cruise missiles, can respond to an infinite variety of battle conditions in a fashion that even the most sophisticated drone aircraft or missile never could. We simply cannot rely on missiles alone—the Soviets do not.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur once wrote: "The history of failure in war can be summed up in two words: too late. Too late in comprehending the deadly purposes of a potential enemy; too late in realizing the mortal danger; too late in preparedness; too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance; too late in standing with one's friends."

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to resubmit my remarks of November 18, 1981, regarding the B-1 for the RECORD.

[From the Congressional Record, Nov. 18, 1981]

B-1 PROJECT

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues here today in support of President Reagan's efforts to restore funding for the B-1 bomber project which President Carter had terminated. Now that we have a President more committed to maintaining the delicate strategic balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. In pursuit of that balance, President Reagan has announced his intention to build the long-delayed B-1 bomber. This aircraft is acknowledged by the majority of aviation experts to be the best bomber ever developed by man. It is capable of penetrating Soviet air space undetected and may continue to have that ability until the 1990's or later. Only after the Soviets spend massive funds on improved radar systems will they be even able to detect the B-1.

The citizens of my 27th Congressional District can be particularly proud of the B-1 bomber project; much of the research/development and manufacture is the work of local citizens. The Reagan decision to recommend funding for the construction of the B-1 is based upon some logically accepted assumptions. The United States must depend heavily on bombers—and seabased forces—while we take steps to strengthen our land-based missiles. We cannot afford the luxury to wait for the Stealth bomber, which presently exists only on paper. There are currently technical uncertainties about the Stealth bomber. It is expected that these uncertainties will be resolved during development and the advanced technology bomber will be a very effective aircraft when ultimately deployed. Without the B-1, there would be pressures to accelerate the

Stealth bomber, which would increase program risks and possibly result in a less capable aircraft being deployed. Building two bombers will stimulate competition and give the Defense Department the flexibility to adjust bomber production in accordance with any changes in estimates of the cost and effectiveness of the two aircraft, as well as any changes in the Soviet military capabilities.

President Reagan has proposed building 100 of the variant bombers. The term variant is used because research and development has continued on the B-1 since the Carter cancellation. Innovations and efficiencies developed in the 5 years since its cancellation will be incorporated in the new variant model. The first B-1 squadron is expected to be operational in 1986.

Mr. John W. R. Taylor, editor of *Janes All the World's Aircraft*, is universally recognized as one of the foremost experts on every type of military and civilian aircraft. Mr. Taylor warns,

"It is therefore vital for all people to understand that the fragile co-existence maintained for generations by balanced East-West military power is being allowed to slip inch by inch from our grasp."

When Mr. Taylor was asked about his thoughts on the opposition that has been raised to the B-1, he replied:

Most of that has been due to the high cost. But really, I do not think that the cost is the main consideration. It is a question of what it does for you. Does it keep you alive? If there is anything else that will do the job less expensively, by all means build it. But, in this case, there just isn't anything else.

The decision to build the B-1 is a clear move away from the previous administration's policy of unilateral arms restraint. The Reagan administration wants to be sure that any weapon system forgone by the U.S. Government is reciprocated by the Soviet Union. The new policy direction will increase the Soviet incentive to seriously discuss arms limitation agreements. In turn, assisting our Nation in achieving its most important foreign policy goals: Preservation of peace and valid arms limitation agreements with verifiable provisions in any treaty that is agreed upon.

The B-1 bomber will have advantages that no other leg of our triad of strategic nuclear forces possesses. Some of these are:

Bombers are the only element that can be launched prior to a decision to employ these weapons, and permits a trained crew to take actions and accept responsibilities that cannot be anticipated or preprogrammed in missile systems.

Weapons-carrying bombers can be launched to insure their survivability, or to signal national resolve during times of crisis with the confidence that the crew can be redirected or recalled as the situation develops. Bombers can be put on increased ground alert, dispersed to remote airfields, flown on airborne alert, or dispatched to trouble spots throughout the world without a final commitment to use their weapons. In a time when the availability of foreign bases and ports is uncertain, the B-1 will provide the quickest, and in some cases probably the only, means to mount a rapid show of force.

Bombers provide the only capability to engage unanticipated or mobile targets by using the crew and aircraft sensors to determine target location at the times of delivery.

In assisting maritime roles, bombers have the inherent capability to provide an important supplement to U.S. Naval Forces. They

can provide collateral maritime support in long range sea surveillance and interdiction, mine laying and, potentially, in antisubmarine warfare.

As a reusable strategic weapons system, bombers have the capability to accurately deliver large nuclear or conventional payloads throughout the course of the conflict, regardless of the level.

The B-1 is going to enter into the defense of our Nation's borders much later that it could have or should have. It will nevertheless play a vital role on our strategic defense until the year 2000, and perhaps beyond. First as a penetrating bomber, later as a bomber capable of standing off the coast of an adversary nation and launching cruise missiles. Its manufacture sends a strong signal to the Soviets that we are as serious about our defense as we are about pursuing arms agreements.

And one more item before I close. I will be circulating a letter to colleagues which will be sent to the President asking him to appoint the Nation's No. 1 "junkyard dog" and a bona fide "cheap hawk" as the project manager for the B-1 project. I of course refer to A. Ernest Fitzgerald who was removed some 10 years ago from his position of authority in the C-5A cargo plane project because he "committed a truth" with respect to the C-5A cost overruns in testimony before a congressional committee. I think that the appointment of Mr. Fitzgerald will further add credibility to the President's efforts to build up the defenses of the United States without at the same time breaking the national treasury. ●

IN CELEBRATION OF DUTCH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of Queen Beatrix's address to today's joint session of Congress is the highlight of our national celebration of 200 years of Dutch-American friendship, marked by the Queen's visit to the United States.

I join with the voices of countless other Americans in welcoming our visitors from the Netherlands. I am privileged to represent an area of the Nation which is of strong Dutch heritage—the 29th Congressional District of New York. In fact, this region of New York was graced by a visit of then-Princess Beatrix to Hudson, N.Y., where she was officially received and honored in 1959.

The 350 years before that occasion, in 1609, Capt. Henry Hudson navigated the waters of what is today the Hudson River and sailed through what is now the 29th Congressional District of New York. To this day, one of the cities of the 29th District is named after Henry Hudson's ship, the *Half Moon*. This exploration marked the beginning of a long and fruitful relationship between the New York Hudson Valley and the Dutch people. Many of the first permanent settle-

ments in this area were founded by Dutch settlers, and their constant industriousness was unrivaled in other settlements in the American colonies. These Dutch settlers constituted some of the most important farming families anywhere in the colonies, firmly establishing the Hudson Valley as a vital agricultural area. One enterprising group of Dutch-descendent colonists in Coxsackie, N.Y., even drafted their own declaration of independence, predating Thomas Jefferson's immortal document by slightly more than 1 year. And equally important, one of the three American Presidents of Dutch heritage, Martin Van Buren, was born and lived in the Hudson Valley and returned there after the expiration of his term of office as our eighth President. Throughout our Nation's history, these Hudson Valley dwellers of Dutch descent have made astounding contributions to the growth and development of the Northeastern region of the United States.

Today, a large number of my constituents are of Dutch descent. They join with me and all other Americans in commemorating 200 years of strong, unending friendship between the United States and the Netherlands, and in heralding the continuation of this most special relationship for many, many years to come. ●

LLADRO BROTHERS BRING "THE BEST OF LLADRO" TO WASHINGTON, D.C., FOR EXHIBIT

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Washington area was privileged to have an exhibit of "The Best of Lladro" at the L'Enfant Plaza Hotel. The three Lladro brothers, together the founders of the unique Lladro porcelain figurines, were in the Nation's Capital with the most comprehensive collection of Lladro ever exhibited in the United States. Lladro porcelains are renowned worldwide and this area was privileged to host such an extensive exhibition of these figurines.

Lladro porcelain is the creation of the three Lladro brothers—Juan, Jose, and Vincente. All three studied painting and sculpture at the Escuela de Artes y Oficios de Valencia in Valencia, Spain, just 4 miles from their home in Almacera.

In 1951, the three started their ceramic atelier in their family home. Their first products were ceramic flowers, used as decorative elements on lamps and sold in Valencia's shops. Soon the demand was so great for decorative flowers that the brothers were training young artists from their area

as flower modelers. In 1955 a retail outlet was opened in Valencia and in 1958 a factory was established in Tabernes Blanques. At that time, production centered solely around decorative flowers and ceramic figures. By the mid-1960's a wide variety of moderately priced, stylized figures, modeled after characters of the Italian Commedia dell'Arte, Shakespeare and Oriental folklore, as well as religious figures, historical groups, and animals and wildlife subjects, had become popular throughout the world.

The Lladro collection expanded into vases, mermaids, and chess pieces in the next few years. Today, the Lladro brothers still have their factory at Tabernes Blanques and employ 2,000 workers and craftsmen. Their work has added an important element to Spanish art and has added an even more important element to the venerable history of the art of porcelain.

I am pleased that the Lladro brothers selected Washington, D.C., to introduce additions to their distinguished fine line of porcelain. I know their exhibit has been a great success and has generated a great appreciation for and interest in the art of producing porcelain.●

TRIBUTE TO BOYS' TOWNS OF ITALY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, more than three and one-half decades have passed since the founding of the Boys' Towns of Italy by Msgr. John Patrick Carroll Abbing. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the thousands of men and women in the United States who have given so much of themselves in service to the homeless and forgotten teenagers of Italy and the world.

The story of Boys' Towns of Italy is a reminder of the great love of the American people for the children of the world. When Msgr. John Patrick Carroll Abbing founded Boys' Towns to care for the abandoned children left homeless by the war, his actions were based on faith, love, and trust. Now the services of this organization have spread to many nations and to both young men and women who have been neglected by society.

Through the caring citizens of Italy, America, and the world, these children are given homes, a sense of purpose in life and a feeling of responsibility toward their fellow men. Dwight Eisenhower once noted that "the success of Boys' Towns is a tribute to the great heart of the American people." I believe that we have much to be proud of.

The battle to save the lives of these young people has not ended. Many thousands are still in great need, including great numbers who still remain victims of the recent shattering earthquakes in Italy.

Local chapters of Boys' Towns of Italy are still working to mold fine citizens of the world from the homeless teenagers living in the streets of Italy today. American men and women remain dedicated to lifting up these young people from the devastation which exists in their lives today.

I cannot possibly mention everyone who has helped in this cause, but I want to pay a special tribute to the Mercer County Chapter of the Boys' Towns of Italy for their tremendous work. Under the leadership of Samuel J. Plumeri, this chapter has done a great deal to increase public awareness of the plight of young people in Italy and around the world. They continue to support Msgr. John Patrick Carroll Abbing's work through their love and dedication to troubled youth.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in commending the American volunteers to Boys' Towns of Italy. They have sacrificed of themselves, and have contributed to a new generation of magnificent men and women. We owe them a debt of thanks.●

EL SALVADOR: THE MEANING OF THE ELECTIONS

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, The March 28 elections in El Salvador have produced conflicting analyses of the significance of those elections and their impact on the civil war within that country.

It is clear, however, the elections did not produce the result for which the State Department had hoped and upon which U.S. policy had been based. The Christian Democrats did not win control of the Legislative Assembly.

I visited El Salvador in February because of my concern over deepening U.S. involvement in the armed conflict in that country. Prof. Jorge Lawton of the University of Maryland Baltimore County accompanied our congressional delegation as academic adviser. The Baltimore Evening Sun published an analysis of the March 28 election written by Professor Lawton in its April 6 edition. I ask unanimous consent to include the Lawton article in the RECORD, and urge my colleagues to consider very carefully this informed, realistic appraisal of the Salvadoran elections.

[Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Apr. 6, 1982]

SALVADOR'S ELECTION SOLVED NOTHING

(By Jorge A. Lawton)

Much of El Salvador has voted. Amidst an ongoing war which already has claimed more than 30,000 lives in the past 30 months, an entire people is aching for peace. Their vote, even within the sadly stunted range of candidates, is a desperate cry of "Bata Ya"—"Enough"—to the killings.

If nothing else, these elections should lay to rest the insulting stereotype that El Salvador's excruciating suffering somehow derives from a "culture of violence," endemic to those people. Such racial stereotypes only obscure the uncomfortable fact that there are conscious authors of these killings. The truth is that the people of El Salvador value life just as much as the people of Baltimore.

But in essence what will change in El Salvador's war as a result of the March 28 elections? The destabilizing factors of long-term structural injustice and today's civil war continue. The war is now likely to intensify. Suffering and killing will increase rather than decrease.

The locus of power was and is in the army. The chance for moderate civilians to press the army for reforms is now weakened, if not eclipsed entirely. In fact, these elections have returned to political office the same oligarchy which for 50 years had crushed any hope of peaceful evolution in El Salvador.

Short term expediency—the U.S. insistence on holding elections at a time when center and center-left candidates could not participate—may well have complicated further the search for long-term stability in El Salvador. Just this past month Archbishop Riveray Damas lamented to a U.S. congressional delegation that it was "the least appropriate moment for democratic elections." In fact, the elections have narrowed the policy options still open for the United States in the crisis.

The last time meaningful elections were held in El Salvador was in 1972. Then centrist Christian Democrats and Social Democrats could and did participate. Their centrist coalition won an overwhelming majority of the votes. But this came before the days of armed guerrilla forces. No international observers were present. The army's National Conciliation Party (PCN) declared itself the victor and installed itself in power. The Centrist coalition's appeal to the United States to support electoral integrity in tiny El Salvador fell on deaf ears.

Repeated attempts by more and more grass roots organizations to gain some degree of participation in the political system by peaceful means were rejected and repressed by the military. The United States remained silent. As frustration over all attempts at peaceful reform continued to swell, political options in El Salvador naturally grew more and more polarized.

Finally, on October 15, 1979, a mix of younger, reform-minded military officers together with other traditional, older officers negotiated the removal of the latest in a long line of dictators, General Romero, in a bloodless coup. Part of the price for Romero's departure, unharmed and well financed, was that the dictator's trusted comrade-in-arms, Colonel Garcia, stay.

Garcia successfully blocked each attempt by the reformist young officers, grouped around Colonel Majano, to implement any democratic opening of Salvadorean society. A small group of progressive Christian Dem-

ocrat and Social Democrat civilians struggled to tip the balance of the military in favor of limited reforms and to plead with the Salvadorean people once more for their continued patience and trust.

Within 80 days the internal power struggle had been decided. All but one of the 39 cabinet and sub-cabinet officers resigned in protest. That one member was Colonel Garcia.

Still another patchwork coalition of more conservative Christian Democrats formed another Junta with Colonel Garcia. Their attempt lasted only 60 days. Massive evictions and an increase in peasant killings to 20 per day made a mockery of the agrarian reform. Centrists within the Christian Democrat Party resigned in protest, leaving only the conservative Old Guard.

In March 1980 the opposition political forces, swollen now by the former Christian Democrats, created the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) umbrella group. On March 24, El Salvador's beloved Archbishop, Oscar Romero, was assassinated after calling for the United States to stop supplying weapons to the army.

The Old Guard remnants of the Christian Democrats reacted to the massive defections of progressives and centrists from their party by moving farther to the right. Clinging to an ever decreasing possibility for reforms, these Old Guard Christian Democrats lent their civilian image to the now ascendant military. They called upon Jose Napoleon Duarte, political veteran of the 1960s, to serve as their titular head. The inevitable policy differences between civilian Duarte and military strongman Garcia were settled by the latter.

In 1982, ten years after it had ignored the military's electoral fraud against Duarte, the U.S. attempted to revive and legitimize the Old Guard wing of the Christian Democrats. The United States now felt that it needed the PDC to preempt the alternative program presented by the FDR. Under conditions where the FDR candidates could not compete and where only far right parties remained as opponents, the U.S. now pressed for elections.

The Reagan administration strategy was that given the people's exhaustion with the war, the extremely narrow and stark choice of candidates, and the obligatory nature of voting in El Salvador, a majority of those voting would opt in favor of Duarte's Christian Democrats. In the process the FDR would appear as anti-electoral and lose prestige.

But there was little appreciation of just how discredited Duarte's Christian Democrats has become after sharing power with the Army during the past two years. Nor did the administration take seriously enough until too late the simplistically appealing promise of "Bobby" d'Aubisson for a quick, military solution to the nation's crises.

Neither the Christian Democrats nor any other single party won a simple majority on March 28. The PDC tally of 41 percent can only be converted to a voting majority in coalition with one of two far-right parties. These are, (1) the National Conciliation Party (PCN), through which the dictatorships governed from 1961-1979, with 17 percent of the vote, and (2) the Nationalist Republican Alliance (ARENA), with 29 percent.

ARENA's leader, ex-Army Major d'Aubisson, can be accused of many things, but not of ambiguity. He has equated any negotiations with "total surrender" (as have General Garcia and the Salvadoran Joint Chiefs),

threatened to assassinate Mr. Duarte, and pledged to solve Salvador's crisis militarily by "wiping out all the guerrillas in three months" using napalm as needed. Founder of the White Warriors Union death squad, Major d'Aubisson attempted two military coups against Mr. Duarte in 1980, and was indicted under Salvadoran law for the murder of Monsignor Romero. Subsequently d'Aubisson was freed and the judge fled the country.

Such are the fruits of the constituent assembly elections. The far-right parties have threatened to form a "government of national unity" excluding the Christian Democrats entirely. The Reagan administration's efforts to salvage their flawed electoral strategy by insisting that the far-right parties at least prominently display a few token Christian Democrats while hiding Major d'Aubisson behind the scenes, will only prolong the Salvadorean people's agony. But now that they have painted themselves into a corner few other options are still open to the Reagan administration.

Depolarization and detoxification continue to be urgently needed in El Salvador in order to lay the minimal preconditions for any genuinely democratic choice. Such may have to wait until the deaths of hundreds or thousands more Salvadoreans punctuate the myth that social peace can be reached through a "military solution."

Once again the common working people of El Salvador, renowned for their industriousness and endurance through the daily hell, have reached out for a democratic solution. Once again they are being defrauded of the only basis for lasting stability and true peace. Only by seizing without further delay the Mexican initiative for unconditional negotiations between all the warring factions can that basis be begun. ●

UNION CAMP IN NEW JERSEY: A SUCCESS STORY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recent news stories have dwelled on the problems besetting American business. We hear so much about low worker morale, aging plants and equipment, and low productivity that it seems many industries have gone into an irreversible decline.

One plant in my district, Union Camp Corp. corrugated container plant in Trenton, N.J., is proving that the problems of manufacturers in the United States are not insurmountable. The company has made a commitment to building productive relationships between workers and management and opening up lines of communication. The plant has coupled this commitment with a sound business plan and a competitive spirit. In so doing it has demonstrated that it is possible to turn an operation around even in difficult economic times.

Union Camp has manufactured corrugated boxes in Trenton for 35 years. In the mid-1970's the plant on East State Street suffered a serious drop in prof-

its. In 1978 the plant lost nearly three-quarters of a million dollars.

Union Camp's planners, based at the corporate headquarters in Wayne, N.J., believed that the plant's basic business, box manufacturing, was sound, and that New York area market, though extremely competitive, could still be highly lucrative. It made a commitment to keep the plant alive.

A newly appointed general manager, John R. Thomas, concentrated first on worker attitudes. "When I came on board, a lot of people felt they were on a sinking ship," Thomas said. "I had to convince them that the ship was strongly built, and, with the right direction, could carry us along."

Thomas worked hard to eliminate an adversarial relationship between management and union workers. To help achieve this, he brought in Frank Lesnock, a plant superintendent at a Union Camp facility in Pennsylvania, and soon promoted him to manufacturing manager. Lesnock's approach made a big difference. According to Thomas, Lesnock "can assess people quickly, find out what makes them tick and create a desire in them to work for him."

Gradually the barriers between workers and management came down. Workers felt free to offer constructive suggestions. They became personally involved in the success or failure of the plant. According to Thomas, "they began to realize that if their productivity and quality were a notch above the competition, they would strengthen their job security."

Thomas also encouraged managers to communicate directly among themselves. He scheduled management meetings every Tuesday and Thursday at 7:45 a.m. to discuss shipping dates, set deadlines and resolve problems. Memo writing has practically stopped, and information moves freely throughout the plant. To make sure information moves up and down the organization, Thomas has maintained a policy of seeing any employee at any level who has a constructive suggestion. He encourages supervisors to do likewise.

These improvements in attitude have more than intangible value. "Our greatest asset is our people's ability to work with one another," Thomas said.

Having established a positive climate, the managers tackled the business problem. A key problem was the business mix. The plant was serving too many marginally profitable accounts and producing too high a percentage of low-profit products. Management carefully studied which boxes produced the most profit. Richard Hostinsky, the plant's sales manager, successfully carried out a plan to bring in more customers who needed the profitable products. The plant also in-

vested in new machinery to increase productivity.

All this activity, and the determination to succeed, have dramatically altered the picture for Union Camp's 130 Trenton employees. In 1979, for example, it took 8.4 man-hours to produce 1 ton of finished boxes. In 1980 it took 7.3 man-hours, a productivity improvement of 15 percent, representing an annual saving of over \$200,000. The plant now operates at profit.

Mr. Speaker, my own visit to the Trenton plant left me very impressed. I can confirm John Thomas' claim that the plant's hourly workers are "hard working and dedicated" and "some of the best in the business." Workers, supervisors, and senior managers seemed to know each other and get along well. The plant was busy filling orders. Its recent profitability record speaks for itself.

Union Camp Corp.'s Trenton plant sets an excellent example for all American manufacturers. I want to commend its efforts to Congress. ●

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, April 22, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 23

9:00 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax proposals, including S. 473, S. 474, S. 710, S. 1854, and S. 1923.
2221 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the role of the Federal Reserve Board in the operation of automated clearinghouse services.
5302 Dirksen Building
Judiciary
Security and Terrorism Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, and on proposed authorizations therefor.
2228 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2002, proposed Bilingual Education Amendments of 1981, and other related proposals.
4232 Dirksen Building
Special on Aging
To hold hearings on the impact of the Administration's housing proposals on older Americans.
5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Armed Services' Subcommittee on Military Construction on S. 2205, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for military construction programs of the Department of Defense, and S. 1990, revising certain provisions of law relating to military construction and military family housing.
212 Russell Building
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building

Armed Services
Military Construction Subcommittee
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Military Construction on S. 2205, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for military construction programs of the Department of Defense, and S. 1990, revising certain provisions of law relating to military construction and military family housing.
212 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the world petroleum outlook.
3110 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on proposed budget recommendations for fiscal year 1983 for the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Architect of the Capitol.
301 Russell Building

APRIL 26

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2172, creating a jurisdictional framework to apportion the authority regulating cable systems between the Federal and state governments, and providing for a competitive

marketplace for cable systems in the telecommunications industry.
235 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the Department of Energy research and development programs.
3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To resume hearings on S. 2227, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for international security and development assistance programs, focusing on assistance to Asia.
4221 Dirksen Building
Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Office of Management and Budget's Circular A-95, focusing on Federal planning requirements for Federal grant programs, and to review recent OMB policy revisions therefor.
3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2002, proposed Bilingual Education Amendments of 1981, and other related proposals.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of the Secretary, International Affairs, Bureau of Government Financial Operations, Bureau of the Public Debt, and the Bureau of the Mint, Department of the Treasury.
1114 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for programs of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To continue hearings on S. 2227, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for international security and development assistance programs, focusing on assistance to Asia.
4221 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Customs Service, U.S. Secret Service, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Department of the Treasury.
1114 Dirksen Building

Finance

Oversight of the Internal Revenue Service Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2369, clarifying standards for determining whether certain individuals qualify as independent contractors for employment income tax purposes, and improving the level of tax compliance among independent contractors exempt from mandatory wage withholding.

2221 Dirksen Building

3:00 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2367 and S. 2377, bills authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.

5302 Dirksen Building

APRIL 27

8:30 a.m.

Appropriations Interior and Related Agencies 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, Department of the Interior, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

1318 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 2172, creating a jurisdictional framework to apportion the authority regulating cable systems between the Federal and state governments, and providing for a competitive marketplace for cable systems in the telecommunications industry.

6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Securities Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1869, S. 1870, S. 1871, and S. 1977, bills revising or repealing certain provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

5302 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To resume hearings to review U.S. policy in Central America and the Caribbean; to be followed by a business meeting, to consider pending legislation and nominations.

4221 Dirksen Building

*Labor and Human Resources Labor Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up 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 his appeal, and clarifying the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor relating to detection and investigating criminal violations relating to ERISA; and S. 2349, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 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 National Science Foundation.

1224 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 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

Select on Intelligence

Closed business meeting, to resume markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1983 for the intelligence community.

S-407, Capitol

11:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1992, extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and other pending calendar business.

2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Peace Corps, and the Inter-American Foundation.

S-128, Capitol

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Selwa Roosevelt, of the District of Columbia, for the rank of Ambassador during the tenure of her service as Chief of Protocol for the White House.

4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up S. 2222, revising and reforming U.S. immigration laws.

412 Russell Building

APRIL 28

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, receiving testimony from public witnesses.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2367 and S. 2377, bills authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.

5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2059, revising the special prosecutor provisions of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, to insure independent investigations of high-ranking Federal officials and to remove inequities in the present law.

3302 Dirksen Building

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up S. 349, providing for limited judicial review of the administrative action of the VA, and for reasonable fees to attorneys representing legal counsel for veterans; S. 2384, extending for one year VA authority to provide contract health care to veterans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; S. 2383, extending VA authority to provide construction grants to State veterans' home facilities; S. 1034, providing an equitable formula for computing per diem rates for the cost of care provided veterans in State nursing homes; S. 2385, authorizing funds for the VA health professional scholarship program; S. 2389, maintaining and improving the VA health-care system, and authorizing funds for certain VA health-care programs, and other related measures.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 2172, creating a jurisdictional framework to apportion the authority regulating cable systems between the Federal and State governments, and providing for a competitive marketplace for cable systems in the telecommunications industry.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

*Environment and Public Works Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up S. 1018, prohibiting the Federal Government from funding commercial and residential growth on undeveloped barrier beaches and islands; S. 327 and H.R. 1486, bills authorizing funds for the establishment of the Protection Island National Wildlife Refuge in Jefferson County, Wash.; and H.R. 1952, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984 for certain conservation programs on military reservations and public lands.

4200 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of guidance and counseling programs of the Department of Education.

4232 Dirksen Building

1:00 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on S. 1606, establishing a Federal supplemental property insurance fund for nuclear powerplants, and providing funds for the cleanup of the damaged Three Mile Island Unit No. 2 nuclear power reactor (TMI-2).

4200 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.

Conferees

On S. 1193, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the Department of State, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the International Communications

Agency, and authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the Board for International Broadcasting.
S-116, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs' education programs.
1224 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies 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

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to review capabilities of U.S. Armed Forces to carry out U.S. foreign policy commitments and treaty obligations worldwide.
4221 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2284, proposed Federal Radiation Protection Management Act.
3302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposals providing for a ban on the manufacture or sale of nonsporting handguns, mandatory sentences for the use of a firearm in committing a felony, and a preclearance procedure for the sale or transfer of any handgun.
Room to be announced

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on current economic development programs as they affect Indians.
5302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2332, extending until July 1, 1983, the expiration date of section 252 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, which provides a limited antitrust defense for U.S. oil companies participating in the international energy program.
3110 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 legislation recommendations for fiscal year 1983 from officials of AMVETS and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.
318 Russell Building

1:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activities of the Secretary of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Conferees
On S. 1193, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the Department of State, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the International Communications Agency, and authorizing funds for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the Board for International Broadcasting.
S-116, Capitol

3:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for international security assistance programs of the Department of State.
S-128, Capitol

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act Amendments (Public Law 94-263), and on proposed authorizations thereto.
235 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works
Transportation Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal-aid highway program.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for programs of the Department of Transportation and related agencies.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, and the Executive Office of the President (excluding the Office of Management and Budget).
1114 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review certain programs administered by the Office of Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, and the Economic Regulatory Administration and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for activi-

ties of the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 3

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2305, insuring all energy and mineral resources on public lands and on the Outer Continental Shelf are provided for under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.
3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation improving the efficiency of the Federal procurement system.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
4232 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for the Department of Labor; and the Health Services Administration, Centers for Disease Control, and the National Cancer Institute, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for programs of the Department of Transportation and related agencies.
1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 4

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Smithsonian Institution, Holocaust Memorial Council, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Office of Technology Assessment
The Board, to hold a general business meeting.
S-120, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and

Stroke, and the National Institute of Arthritis, Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases, Department of Health and Human Services.
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

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
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the General Services Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, National Institute of Dental Research, National Institute on Aging, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, National Eye Institute, Division of Research Resources, Health Care Financing Administration, and the Social Security Administration (including Office of Refugee Resettlement), Department of Health and Human Services.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Administrative Conference of the United States, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, Committee for Purchase from the Blind, and the Federal Elections Commission.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, and the Health Resources Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Vice Adm. James S. Gracey, U.S. Coast Guard, to be commandant, and Rear Adm. Benedict L. Stabile, U.S. Coast Guard, to be vice commandant, each for the U.S. Coast Guard.
235 Russell Building

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the Department of Labor's handling of labor union pension fund abuses.
4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on current economic development programs as they affect Indians.
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 National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings on a Veterans' Administration proposal to decentralize certain medical automated data processing facilities.
412 Russell Building

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Human Development Services, Office of Community Services, and certain health and human services programs, Department of Health and Human Services; and for elementary and secondary education programs, bilingual education program, and the impact aid program, Department of Education.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Endangered Species Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation improving the efficiency of the Federal procurement system.
3302 Dirksen Building

MAY 6

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Institute of Museum Services.
1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 604 and S. 2355, bills providing adequate telephone

service to persons with impaired hearing.
235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
*Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for education programs for the handicapped, rehabilitation services, vocational and adult education, higher education, and the National Institute of Education, Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the care of the U.S. Supreme Court Building by the Architect of the Capitol, U.S. International Trade Commission, Federal Maritime Commission, and the Marine Mammal Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Soil and Water Conservation Subcommittee
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings on S. 1825, prohibiting the Federal price support program to be used to subsidize crops grown on certain lands in the western part of the United States which have not been cultivated in the past 10 years.
324 Russell Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Personnel Management, Merit Systems Protection Board, Federal Labor Relations Authority, and the U.S. Tax Court of the Judicial Branch.
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

1:30 p.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for student financial assistance, libraries/special institutions, civil rights, women's educational equity, and related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the U.S. Postal Service.
1223 Dirksen Building

Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2094 and related proposals, establishing the concept of reciprocity of market access as an objective for U.S. trade policy where American products are competitive.
2221 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for certain programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.
1114 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1877, S. 1908, S. 1909 and S. 1941, bills providing for the reinstatement and validation of certain U.S. oil and gas leases, S. 2095, directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a certain oil and gas lease, and S. 2146, extending the lease terms of various Federal oil and gas leases.
3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation improving the efficiency of the Federal procurement system.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for environmental research and development programs; and other pending business.
4200 Dirksen Building

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation premium rate increases.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 1929, establishing an Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health to coordinate Federal and private activities to educate the public about the health hazards of smoking.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1844, permitting the development of coal pipelines as part of the national energy transportation and distribution system.
3110 Dirksen Building

Finance
To hold hearings on the administration's New Federalism proposal.
2221 Dirksen Building

MAY 11

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Na-

tional Endowment for the Humanities, National Capital Planning Commission, and the Office of Surface Mining of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Judiciary.
S-146, Capitol

Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of block grant programs.
357 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Aging, Family and Human Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the extended family.
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 Institute of Building Sciences, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and National Credit Union Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Office of Management and Budget.
1318 Dirksen Building

Armed Services
To hear and consider the nomination of Gen. John W. Vessey, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
1202 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume consideration of proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs which fall under its legislative jurisdiction.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, receiving testimony from public witnesses.
1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 12

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae).
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93, and related proposals, reaffirming the policy of relying on the private sector to meet public requirements for goods and services, S. 1782, eliminating retainage on Federal Government construction contracts, and proposed legislation improving the effectiveness and fairness of the Federal Government's contractor suspension and debarment programs.
3302 Dirksen Building

MAY 13

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to resume consideration of proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs which fall under its legislative jurisdiction.
4200 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for territorial affairs of the Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules Subcommittee
To continue hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 93, and related proposals, reaffirming the policy of relying on the private sector to meet public requirements for goods and services, S. 1782, eliminating retainage on Federal Government construction contracts, and proposed legislation improving the effectiveness and fairness of the Federal Government's contractor suspension and debarment programs.
3302 Dirksen Building

MAY 18

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to review Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation premium rate increases.
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 Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Heather J. Gradison of Ohio, to be a Member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on Federal property management and disposal.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 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

Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1866, revising regulatory procedures relating to safe drinking water requirements, and S. 2131, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of Indian education programs.
6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 20

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Federal crop insurance program of the Department of Agriculture.
324 Russell Building

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1626, removing the requirement for Federal regulation to allow the competitive market system to establish petroleum pipeline transportation rates while maintaining safeguards to protect the industry and consumers against unlawful discrimination.
3110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of the Federal crop in-

urance program of the Department of Agriculture.
324 Russell 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 programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 25

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Rural Development, Oversight, and Investigations Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review the energy needs of rural communities.
324 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1626, removing the requirement for Federal regulation to allow the competitive market system to establish petroleum pipeline transportation rates while maintaining safeguards to protect the industry and consumers against unlawful discrimination.
3110 Dirksen Building

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

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

MAY 26

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Rural Development, Oversight, and Investigations Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the energy needs of rural communities.
324 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1866, revising regulatory procedures relating to safe drinking water requirements, and S. 2131, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for the safe drinking water program.
4200 Dirksen Building

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on law enforcement problems on Indian reservations including the authority and effectiveness of the Bureau of Indian Affairs police, tribal police, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the quality of U.S. prosecution of criminal offenses.
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

APRIL 28

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, receiving testimony from congressional and public witnesses
1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for international organizations, Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.
S-146, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, receiving testimony from congressional and public witnesses.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To resume hearings on certain inland waterway projects, including S. 810, prescribing a system of user fees to be levied on commercial transportation, amendment No. 32, thereto, expediting inland waterway construction, and assuring that the users of such projects repay a fair percentage of the cost of such works, amendment No. 637, thereto, clarifying the intent of the bill, and other related measures.
4200 Dirksen Building