# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## THE THIRD OPTION IN MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

HON. LARRY McDONALD
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. John Kirk Singlaub, USA (Ret.), recently made a significant address to the April 25, 1982, meeting of The Council for National Policy. The address was entitled, "The Third Option in Military Preparedness" and follows:

President Reagan during his campaign spoke frequently about the growing Soviet military threat, both strategic and conventional, and about the serious "window of vulnerability" which would open in the early 1980's. He was referring to the Soviet capability to use a minor percentage of their strategic missile force to destroy a major percentage of the total U.S. strategic forces—land based missiles, submarine launched missiles, and strategic bombers.

On 2 October, of last year, President Reagan announced a "comprehensive plan" for the modernization of our strategic forces. This program will end the relative decline of U.S. strategic capabilities and will put the United States in a position to reshape the U.S.-Soviet strategic competition in the years ahead. Presidential concentration on correcting the major deficiencies and weakness in our strategic forces is most appropriate because war at this end of the conflict spectrum poses the greatest threat to our national survival. It is absolutely imperative that we prevent war at this level of violence by demonstrating a capability to survive a Soviet first strike and then inflicting on them an unacceptable level of damage. By so demonstrating, we will deter the Soviet Union from using this military option as a deliberate way of waging and winning a war to continue planned Soviet expansionism. Most important, we must achieve this demonstrated capability to survive a Soviet first strike to prevent the Soviet Union from blackmailing us into inaction and acceptance of Communist expansion by less violent means.

If strategic nuclear war is at the high end of the conflict spectrum in terms of levels of violence and the greatest threat to a nation's survival, it must be recognized as having the lowest order of probability of occurrence. In the middle of this spectrum of conflict is what is commonly referred to as conventional warfare. Here we are talking about war involving battalion and division formations equipped with tanks and artillery and deployed and supported by conventional air and naval forces. Here the level of violence is less than in strategic warfare and the threat to national survival is less. But the probability of occurrence is considerably greater for this second option than it is for the first.

The Reagan defense program is significantly improving our capabilities in the conventional forces as well. The program includes procurement of ships and aircraft to improve our strategic mobility, new tanks and artillery to improve firepower, new radios to improve command and control, and more ammunition and fuel to improve readiness. When these programs are completed, our ability to respond to conventional military threat situations will be greatly improved. The Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force is being given some substance by this Administration for the first time since its creation a few years ago.

As we have previously stated, the most serious threat to the United States involves the recently acquired ability of the Soviet Union to destroy our strategic forces in a first strike. As we have pointed out, however, it is not the most likely attack to be launched against the free-world. The most likely force to be used is at the opposite end of the conflict spectrum—terrorism, subversion, guerrilla and irregular warfare which is known as unconventional warfare.

The term unconventional warfare includes, in addition to terrorism, subversion, and guerrilla warfare, such covert and nonmilitary activities as sabotage, economic warfare, support to resistance groups, black and gray psychological operations, disinformation activities, and political warfare. The Soviet Union today, acting directly or through their proxies and surrogates, is heavily engaged in all of these unconventional warfare operations against the free world. Because they are covert and generally conceal the involvement of the Soviet Union, there is a tendency to pretend that we are not under attack. We must understand that in the Soviet scheme of things, "conflict, struggle and violence are the driving force of human history." The Soviet empire, by the sheer necessity postulated by its doctrinal axioms, is relentlessly expansionist. This expansionism is not the result of personality quirks of successive leadership groups but rather the direct result of ideological core beliefs which are deemed immutable. Since the Soviets have recognized that expansion by a direct assault on Europe entails grave risks, they have concluded that it is much safer to resort to an indirect, but no less menacing strategy elsewhere. We can be absolutely certain that the Soviet Union with the help of their surrogates such as Cuba, East Germany, North Korea, Libya, and others will continue to use this unconventional form of conflict to expand their empire through "wars of national liberation as a part of the continuing class struggle"—to use their own words.

Unless we recognize that our enemies are exercising the "third option" in the conflict spectrum we cannot take the steps essential for our own defense. If we continue to ignore the unconventional or irregular warfare option we can be defeated just as certainly as we would if we ignored the threats posed at the upper end of the conflict spectrum.

The Soviets not only have a global strategy to implement their world-embracing ideology, but they have demonstrated a ruthless political will to employ their Special Purpose Forces of The Committee for State Security (KBG) to augment and complement in a covert way their overt foreign programs. Soviet unconventional warfare activities are managed at the highest level of government authority. In peacetime such as the current situation they are controlled by the KGB. In conventional war situations these special purpose assets might be placed under the operational control of the Main Intelligence Directorate (GRU) of the General Staff to operate in small groups against key political, military, command and control transportation and industrial targets in the enemy rear area. Today these elite forces are used in civilian clothes by the KGB in destabilization, penetration, and other subversion operations throughout Africa, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Central and South America. They are exceptionally well trained, superbly equipped, and fully funded.

On the other hand, the U.S. capability to counter terrorism or to participate in unconventional warfare operations was seriously curtailed by specific actions of the last administration. Not only did President Carter direct the dismantling of the CIA's Human Intelligence Collection and Covert Action capabilities, but the military's Unconventional Warfare forces, in all services, were cut back drastically. Some evidence of this weakness was demonstrated in April, 1980, during what has come to be known as "Jimmy Carter's Desert Classic" in Iran.

Today as we examine the situation around the world, it we are realistic, we find many places where the West is under direct or indirect attack by the Soviet Union using these unconventional methods. In many cases we don't even realize that we are under attack because there is a tendency in the West to assume that the Soviet Union and its allies have the same standards of behavior and the same humanitarian goals as ourselves. There has been a tendency to ignore what actually exists and concentration on what might be brought into existence. This denial of reality has produced serious misjudgements with often fatal consequences. As a result, we find ourselves forced into inactivity because we lack the capability and the will to exercise the third option for our own defense, to take pressure off an ally, or to exploit to our advantage the many vulnerabilities that now exist in the Soviet empire.

In distant Afghanistan, two years after the Soviet invasion to prop up an unpopular Marxist regime, the 85,000 Soviet troops have been unable to control the anti-communist Moslem freedom fighters. In recent weeks there is new evidence that the USSR has already started to reinforce its troops there with large numbers of new troop formations. The intelligence coming from that area suggests that there are now over 110,000 Soviet forces in that country and they plan to increase that number to 150,000 in time for the spring offensives against the defiant freedom fighters. The Communist Afghan Army continues to lose strength due to defections and casualties.

While the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan with conventional forces, assisted by Soviet Special Purpose Forces, presented a serious challenge to the West, in my opinion, we were correct in refusing to use our conventional forces to repell that conventional attack. Afghanistan is at the extreme end of a logistical supply line for the United States

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

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

but only a minor problem for the USSR. Because of the recently acquired strategic superiority of the USSR, it was clear that a threat to use our strategic forces lacked credibility. Disregarding what we might have done to prevent this take over if our intelligence and covert actions capabilities had been intact and judiciously employed, what is needed now is the ability to provide assistance and support to the valiant Afghan Freedom Fighters. Because our capability in this UW area is so seriously enfeebled, our efforts to support the Afghans must be handled through third parties without adequate supervision or direction.

In the mineral-rich West African country of Angola, the UNITA forces of Dr. Jonas Savimbi are conducting an heroic resistance to the occupation of Soviet, East German, and Cuban regular forces. These occupation troops constitute the only force which keeps the unpopular and ineffective communist MPLA government in power. The Savimbi forces completely control about 20 percent of the country and operate freely over another 40 percent. The morale of the UNITA force is very high and their support within Angola is increasing. The morale of the 23,000 Cubans is quite low with defections to UNITA causing serious problems for Fidel Castro and his communist masters. In my opinion, the United States should have the UW capability and the national will to assist the anti-communists in their valiant struggle for real freedom. At the present time a congressionally decreed limitation, known as the Clark Amendment, prevents the President from doing what is necessary and moral in this case. The issue in Angola is complicated by the fact that Gulf Oil has been extracting and refining oil in territory controlled by Angola and is thereby, subsidizing the Soviet and Cuban occupation of Angola. In fact, the Cuban military forces are providing the security for the Gulf Oil installations. Gulf Oil payments to Angola constitute the primary source of income for the communist MPLA government and its Soviet, East German, and Cuban protectors. It appears that it is the Gulf Oil lobby which is bringing pressures on the State Department and the House of Representatives to retain the limitations of the Clark Amendment.

In neighboring Namibia the communist movement known as SWAPO continues to launch terrorist raids from their sanctuary in that part of Angola under MPLA control. These raids against civilian villages are designed to destabilize efforts by the majority of the people of Namibia to form an independent multi-party, non-communist government. Without Cuban and East German assistance, support, and protection in other bases in Angola, SWAPO would cease to be a factor to be reckoned with in the area.

Closer to home, in fact, in our front yard in Nicaragua the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat is almost complete. There is no longer any serious effort made to conceal the fact that the leadership is now 100 percent Marxist. Most non-communists have been purged and the anti-communists eliminated. The Sandinistas are creating, with Cuban and Soviet assistance, an army and militia of over 250,000, equivalent to one-tenth the population. The combined forces of Nicaragua and Cuba, even without the Soviet Brigade in Cuba, will be larger than any army south of the Rio Grande.

The national economy of Nicaragua is collapsing. The country already owes almost $3 billion to foreign creditors, and this is increasing at $2.5 million per day. This foreign debt incurred by the Sandinistas in only two years, is almost equal to the giant indebtedness accumulated by the "corrupt" Somoza regime in 43 years of systematic pillage.

A very important fact came to light recently. According to an independent public opinion poll published on 10 November in Nicaragua, only 28 percent of the Nicaraguan people support the Sandinistas revolution. I should add that after those results were published, public opinion polls have been outlawed.

After the fall of Nicaragua to the communist-supported Sandinistas, the Cubans announced that the next target in Central America would be El Salvador. The evidence is irrefutable that weapons and other support has been flowing from Cuba through Nicaragua to El Salvador. The basic strategy of the Marxist guerrillas in El Salvador has been to develop enough strength that they could destroy the five bridges over the Rio Lempa with the view of separating the eastern one-third of the country from the rest. In keeping with this plan, one year ago the Marxists called for a general uprising or revolution. To the great surprise of Havana and Moscow, no one came to the party. In recent weeks they planned again to cut off eastern El Salvador with the view of establishing their own enclave. Thanks to some help from their neighbors, including Guatemala, the guerrillas have been unable to achieve any significant military success. The guerrillas or terrorists in El Salvador, as in most areas under communist assault, must use military power to seize control because they do not have the support of the people. The counter-guerrilla forces of El Salvador could use some help from our counter-insurgency experts. Unfortunately, this part of our Unconventional Warfare capability was dissipated and lost by the last administration. Current U.S. policy in El Salvador is simply to prevent a communist military victory while hoping wistfully that some sort of political solution will emerge from the recent election.

Although difficult for impatient Americans, we must be prepared for a protracted conflict in that area. We must also recognize that if we permit the terrorists a sanctuary in Nicaragua or elsewhere, we will be adding an unnecessary handicap to the situation and increasing the probability of communist victory.

On the other side of the globe, in the Korean Peninsula, the North Koreans continue the covert offensive against South Korea while continuing to build up their conventional military forces. North Korea continues its efforts to infiltrate agents into the Republic of Korea by crossing through and under the DMZ, by landing from specially constructed agent boats, by use of legal travelers from third countries, and by floating in with the tide up the Imjin and Han Rivers. The type, quantity, and disposition of North Korean weapons systems such as artillery and attack aircraft all indicate a concentration on offensive intentions rather than a concern for defense. The presence of U.S. conventional combat forces standing alongside those of the Republic of Korea constitutes a deterrent against any overt North Korean adventure to the south. But, the defense plans for the Republic of Korea must take into account the ongoing unconventional war being waged against it today and appropriate forces and strategy have been developed to cope with it.

In all of the situations just mentioned, freedom-loving people are being subjected to communist-inspired warfare in which a response by the United States at either the nuclear or the conventional warfare option is either inappropriate or lacks credibility as an effective course of action. There are many other areas of the world where individual and national liberties are being repressed by the covert, unconventional warfare efforts of the Soviet Union and its proxies as it carries out its globally-oriented expansionist foreign policy.

In other areas of the world, communist imperialism already has been imposed and Marxist governments now maintain control of vast populations by force of arms. This includes the captive nations of Eastern Europe, Africa, and Southeast Asia. In many of these nations, resistance to Russian controlled communism is well established and the populations are crying out for help and encouragement from the free world, especially the United States.

To frustrate Moscow's global strategy, it is essential to recognize and acknowledge that it exists. The Soviet Union continues resolutely to be committed to revolutionary activism in all corners of the globe. With a single-mindedness of purpose, the USSR is forging ahead to secure its position as the world's paramount power, using multiple agencies and multiple military options for achieving this goal.

We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that communist doctrine calls for the avoidance of a direct confrontation when it meets a wall of resistance. It is prepared to take a step backwards whenever it meets an obstacle to its expansion even if the obstacle is litle more than a wall of resolve.

The striking success of Moscow's foreign policy in recent years is the combined result of Soviet deception and Western self-deception. It is the unpalatable truth that the West is the Soviet's strongest ally in its own destruction. This has been demonstrated by the continuing export to the Soviet Union of our most advanced technology and by our enthusiastic willingness to pull Soviet chestnuts out of the fire by paying off satellite debts and providing agricultural products to compensate for communist inefficiency in the socialist management of its own agricultural sector.

In order to stymie Soviet imperial ambitions, and to reverse the trend, the U.S. has to come to terms with the existence of an enduring adversary relationship with the USSR, and to accept this challenge to the point of resisting it forcefully and exploiting to the maximum those weaknesses in the Soviet empire with a view toward rolling back communist tyranny and domination. What is needed as a matter of urgency is a national strategy which recognizes the whole spectrum of potential conflict and most especially the current unrecognized conflict at the unconventional warfare end of the scale. A central building block of this new strategy could be a return to the abandoned policy of containment as articulated by George Kennan in 1947 when he said that our policy should include: "* * * the adroit and vigilant application of counterforce at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points, corresponding to the shifts and maneuvers of Soviet policy." But in addition, because the Soviets have made such great progress in expansion since our policy of containment was jettisoned, the new national strategy must have a roll-back component which will give hope and encouragement to the captive nations and peoples of the world.

In addition to this expression of a new strategy, a demonstration of a new national will to carry out this strategy is required. This can be shown by the immediate assignment of the resources, human and financial, needed to carry out this new strategy. This would include as a matter of priority the revitalization of the Central Intelligence Agency and the reconstruction of that part of our military forces which will give us the capability to counter the ongoing attacks on our free world allies and also give us the option of exploiting the growing disillusionment and resistance inside the Soviet empire.

This strategy must be based on the indisputable fact that the USSR can ultimatley only be contained by the ready availability and demonstration of American power. There is no substitute for American leadership in this great venture. If we don't do it now, it may be too late.●

## HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT STILL HAUNTS US

### HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that our national unemployment level hovers around 10 percent. In my own Seventh District of Maryland, like many other inner cities, the level is slightly higher than the national average. Still further, unemployment among minorities, blacks, and particularly black youth remains at critical levels.

Such startling and prevailing statistics should necessitate, without question, a firm Government commitment to the Nation's small businesses, since these entities create the bulk of our new employment opportunities. Unfortunately, the current administration is succeeding in diminishing the Federal commitment in both providing a full employment economy, and undergirding small businesses.

The prevailing philosophy among most of our chief policymakers is to continue in the tradeoff: Keep unemployment high in order to fight inflation. Any denial of this by the current administration appears quite weak when we have witnessed severe budget reductions in every initiative which sought to provide job training, skills acquisition, and supplemental educational tools to those who are generally among the chronically unemployed. Additional evidence of the lack of any bona fide approach to the massive unemployment problem presents itself when we witness inflationary defense spending which will not induce the creation of much-needed labor-intensive facilities and projects. Lastly, if we talk about tradeoffs, what about a tradeoff which mandates that those large corporations which are recipients of the administration's tremendous additional tax incentives and writeoffs must illustrate a much greater commitment to addressing the problems of the chronically unemployed. Certainly those top corporate brains who are able to devise numerous ways to utilize tax incentives for mergers could think of more innovative ways for their establishments to help the Government address the massive levels of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we can fight the philosophical obsession with allowing high unemployment to purportedly fight inflation. What we can do, however, is struggle fiercely to maintain and strengthen our small businesses. These entities provide the greatest percentage of jobs, and have the potential to address our bleak unemployment situation in a way which we can all support.●

## GOODWILL FIRE COMPANY OF MUHLENBERG TOWNSHIP, PA.

### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 15, the Goodwill Fire Company of Hyde Park, Muhlenberg Township, Pa., celebrated their 75th anniversary.

I think it is indeed fitting to take this opportunity to acknowledge the enormous contribution these firefighters have made, and will continue to make, to the public safety.

The firefighter's job requires an exceedingly high degree of dedication, courage, and professional skill. They underline through their actions everyday, the community spirit of helping one's neighbors. Each day they place their very lives in jeopardy in order to secure the lives and property of the citizens they have sworn to protect. I would like to extend a personal note of gratitude, and I know that my colleagues in the U.S. Congress will join me, to the members of the Goodwill Fire Company, for their high degree of concern and dedication to the public safety and welfare. Their contributions exemplify the emphasis that our Nation has always placed on community action and service.●

## IMMUNITY-COMPELLED TESTIMONY

### HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, the highly charged Wayne Cryts bankruptcy case has brought to my attention a serious flaw in our Criminal Code as it relates to "Immunity-Compelled Testimony." It seems that there is currently no distinction between the issuance of a compulsion order in criminal, civil, or bankruptcy cases. I believe that this is a major oversight in the code, given the disparate nature of these cases.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would allow the presiding Federal judge discretion in deciding to issue a compulsion order in a civil or bankruptcy proceeding. Furthermore, this legislation would allow for the witness for whom the order is requested to present his case at a hearing on the compulsion order. However, my bill would maintain the present mandatory status of compulsion orders in criminal proceedings.

It is my belief that civil and bankruptcy cases are very different in nature than criminal cases. Present Department of Justice policy does not attempt to differentiate between them. Since the bulk of the requests for "Immunity-Compelled Testimony" orders are in criminal cases, there is little likelihood that civil and bankruptcy cases will receive the special review they deserve. My bill is an attempt to recognize this difference by giving the presiding judge discretion in these few special cases.●

## RECIPROCAL AGRICULTURAL TRADE ACT OF 1982

### HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Reciprocal Agricultural Trade Act of 1982. The purpose of this legislation is to establish the concept of reciprocity of market access as a key principle of U.S. agricultural trade policy and trade law. The bill requires the executive branch to identify and obtain the elimination of barriers maintained by our major trading partners and by strengthening the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974 that provide remedies against foreign unfair agricultural trade practices.

I am convinced that it is time to address the monumental problems that the U.S. agricultural sector is facing in international markets. Since the early 1970's with the huge expansion of exports, U.S. agriculture has become highly dependent on access to international markets. Agriculture is the only major U.S. industry that maintains a trade surplus and offsets the U.S. balance of trade which has been in a deficit position since 1971. U.S. agricultural trade surplus is projected to be $26.5 billion, the same level as last year. Nonetheless, the value of U.S.

exports for fiscal year 1982 is projected to be $42.5 billion, $1.3 billion below the level a year ago. This would be the first time since 1969 that the value of U.S. farm exports failed to increase from one year to the next.

Mr. Speaker, increasingly the American farmer is finding it difficult to compete in international trade on a free-market basis. Many foreign countries provide export subsidies or impose trade barriers which have threatened our export markets.

The European Community, through its common agricultural policy, maintains high domestic support prices for agricultural commodities through a system of import tariffs and variable import levies. These high support levels encourage excess production. With no limit placed on production, the excess is disposed in international markets through the use of export subsidies at our expense. In the current fiscal year, the EC will spend over $14 billion on agricultural programs. In addition, the EC member states spend even more on agricultural programs than the EC itself.

Since the inception of the CAP, the EC's share of world food product exports has increased gradually to the point that last year for the first time they became a net grain exporter. The EC now accounts for more than 15 percent of total world wheat exports.

The result of these subsidized exports is to reduce the export volume and place a dampening effect on prices of agricultural prices. We are increasingly facing competition from EC export subsidies in third-country markets.

Currently, soybeans and corn gluten feed are not subject to the EC's variable levy. However, the EC has asked for a ministerial mandate to negotiate limits on imports and unbind the zero-duty level of U.S. corn gluten. I find this proposal simply intolerable. The zero-duty binding on corn gluten was a concession granted to the United States in the Kennedy round of negotiations under the general agreement on tariffs and trade and was paid for with U.S. counterconcessions. If the request is approved by the EC Council of Ministers, it would jeopardize almost 3 million tons of U.S. corn gluten exports valued at nearly a half billion dollars. I have personally appealed to Agriculture Secretary Block to vigorously oppose this proposal and use all existing tools to resist it. As I understand it, the Council has temporarily deferred the request because of the serious consequences raised by U.S. officials.

Japan is the single most important market for U.S. agricultural exports. The value of U.S. farm exports is forecasted to total $6.1 billion, even though exports are projected to fall below year-earlier levels for the first time since 1975.

Japan also maintains significant protection of its agricultural sector. They have developed a system of formal and informal trade barriers, primarily on semiprocessed and processed goods. However, some raw products, such as corn for industrial use, wheat, and rice, are under quota.

In addition to quotas, the Japanese maintain tariffs, administrative guidance, State trading, plant and animal quarantines, health regulations and standards, and a generous rice-support program.

Taiwan, an increasingly important trading partner of the United States, maintains a foreign trade policy composed of high tariffs and a restrictive licensing system.

Thus, it is obvious that the American farmer has formidable tariff and nontariff barriers to the exports of their agricultural products. High interest rates, the renewed strength of the dollar, and large world supplies have only exacerbated the problem.

Currently, section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 provides guidelines for Presidential action to enforce U.S. rights under trade agreements and response to certain foreign trade practices. Several petitions have been registered by U.S. industries concerning unfair trade practices by the EC on several agricultural commodities. The petition on wheat flour was filed in 1975 and is yet to be resolved. Numerous industry petitions concerning EC import duties on U.S. citrus products have been filed since 1970. More recently, petitions have been filed covering poultry, sugar, pasta, and canned fruits and raisins. This administration, more than any other in recent past, has taken an aggressive stance in bringing our trading partners into line on fair trade issues.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing is designed to strengthen the provisions in section 301. It requires the administration to identify and measure the impact of foreign barriers to U.S. agricultural exports and provide an annual report to Congress regarding these barriers. The identification process would extend to foreign trade barriers irrespective of whether or not these are prohibited by GATT. In addition, the President would be required to propose such actions deemed necessary to offset these trade barriers if the executive branch fails to obtain their elimination.

Section 301 would be amended to allow the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives to file a petition with the U.S. Trade Representative to initiate formal 301 action. The International Trade Commission would provide estimates of the impact on the U.S. economy of the barriers under investigation. Finally, 180 days after initiating the 301 case, the President would be required to indicate which alternatives for retaliatory action he would consider using if efforts to eliminate the foreign barrier fail.

The dispute settlement procedure provided in the GATT and the accompanying Subsidies Code have not been particularly effective in resolving our trade disputes. The United States is expected to call for a renegotiation of the Subsidies Code at the meeting of Trade Ministers scheduled later this year. However, we cannot afford to rely on these negotiations to seek redress to our trade problems. I believe it is time to send a strong signal to our customers and trading partners that we intend to continue to be a reliable supplier and simply will not tolerate unfair intrusion to our markets through tariff and nontariff trade barriers.

I would urge my colleagues to examine the merits of this legislation and I would hope you would join me in cosponsoring it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

## SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HADASSAH

### HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor a very special anniversary; the 70th year of Hadassah. Founded in 1912 by Miss Henrietta Szold, an American-Jewish scholar, Hadassah has grown from a small Zionist women's study group to a highly respected and influential organziation claiming over 360,000 women members in the U.S.A. and Puerto Rico. Although devoted to the study of Jewish affairs, Hadassah involvement reaches beyond culture to touch all our lives.

Throughout its history this nonprofit voluntary organization has offered educational opportunities to anyone interested in Jewish studies. Thousands of young people have enriched their lives through experiences gained by participation in Hadassah-sponsored programs in Israel. Others of us have leaned about the plight of Soviet Jews through materials researched and published by this organization.

More than a mere resource for information, however, Hadassah has served as a symbol of unwavering support to Israel in its fight to preserve its homeland. It is this dedication to traditional liberties and ideals that we honor today. Happy anniversary Hadassah, and thank you for 70 years of excellence in leading this Nation to a better understanding of Israel, its people, and its importance to American life.●

## BUDGET RESOLUTION AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

### HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the upcoming deliberations on the first Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1983, I have submitted the following letter and amendments to the Rules Committee for its consideration:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., May 19, 1982.*

Hon. RICHARD BOLLING,
*Committee on Rules,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed are three amendments to H. Con. Res. 345, one relating to biomedical research, one relating to Medicare, and one relating to both biomedical research and Medicare. I respectfully request that each of these be made in order to H. Con. Res. 345 and to any substitute thereto.

Since I have not yet had the opportunity to review any substitutes or other amendments which might be offered to H. Con. Res. 345, I would also request the opportunity to offer further amendments to any substitute, or any amendment thereto, that might be offered to H. Con. Res. 345 and that might alter the budget authority levels or the budget outlays for the health (550) function or the reconciliation instructions to the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Let me briefly describe each of the attached amendments, beginning with the amendment relating to biomedical research. H. Con. Res. 345 provides $8.05 billion for discretionary health programs in FY 1983. While the Budget Committee included $150 more than FY1982/83 freeze level, the amount provided is still nearly $400 million below the CBO baseline for these programs for FY1983, a baseline which is itself based on the drastically reduced FY1982 funding levels. That $150 million increase would be insufficient to bring even biomedical research up to its baseline level, leaving nothing for needed increases in other vital public health programs. My amendment would restore $247 million in FY1983, $501 million in FY1984, and $766 million in FY1985. This would allow funding for biomedical research at the baseline levels, freeing up the $150 million increment by the Budget Committee for programs such as childhood immunizations, tuberculosis protection, veneral disease control, and food and drug safety.

With respect to Medicare, H. Con. Res. 345 proposes to cut outlays by $2.15 billion in fiscal year 1983. Included in this recommendation are potential savings from two proposals which my amendment would delete. The working aged proposal would require employers to retain private health insurance coverage for those elderly individuals who work, shifting $610 million in Medicare costs to those individuals' insurance plans and creating an incentive against employing the elderly. The proposal to delay the date of Medicare entitlement to the month following the month of eligibility would simply delay Medicare coverage and shift $145 million in costs to the aged and to private insurers. My amendment would eliminate the "savings" of $755 million in fiscal year 1983, $883 million in fiscal year 1984, and $1,007 million in fiscal year 1985 derived from these proposals.

In addition to these two amendments, I would also like the opportunity to offer an amendment combining the biomedical research and Medicare changes described above.

Please note that each amendment would increase revenues by the amounts necessary to offset any increase in outlays that would result. The amendments do not specify how revenues would be increased. However, revenues could be derived from revisions in the existing medical expense deduction for out-of-pocket health spending above three percent of income. Such a change in tax policy could generate the revenues needed to pay for these vitally important increases in health outlays.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and the Environment.*

AMENDMENTS TO H. CON. RES. 345, AS REPORTED

RELATING TO BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

Page 12, line 10, strike out "$677,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$676,835,218,000".

Page 12, line 12, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$31,835,218,000".

Page 12, line 14, strike out "$828,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$828,247,309,000".

Page 12, line 16, strike out "$780,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$780,685,218,000".

Page 14, line 16, strike out "$77,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$77,547,309,000".

Page 14, line 17, strike out "$80,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,235,218,000".

Page 22, line 4, strike out "$753,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$754,017,109,000".

Page 22, line 5, strike out "$846,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$847,173,568,000".

Page 22, line 8, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,017,109,000".

Page 22, line 9, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,173,568,000".

Page 22, line 12, strike out "$888,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$888,901,183,000".

Page 22, line 13, strike out "$952,850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$953,616,290,000".

Page 22, line 15, strike out "$826,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$826,767,109,000".

Page 22, line 16, strike out "$881,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$881,823,568,000".

Page 27, line 5, strike out "$81,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$82,201,183,000".

Page 27, line 6, strike out "$89,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,017,109,000".

Page 27, line 9, strike out "$94,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$94,866,290,000".

Page 27, line 10, strike out "$101,250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$101,873,568,000".

Page 35, line 1, strike out $31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$31,835,218,000".

Page 35, line 4, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,017,109,000".

Page 35, line 5, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,173,568,000".

Page 35, line 21, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$31,835,218,000".

Page 36, line 1, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,107,109,000".

Page 36, line 2, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,173,568,000".

RELATING TO MEDICARE

Page 12, line 10, strike out "$676,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$677,455,000,000".

Page 12, line 12, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,455,000,000".

Page 12, line 16, strike out "$780,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$781,305,000,000".

Page 14, line 17, strike out "$80,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,855,000,000".

Page 22, line 4, strike out "$753,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$754,533,000,000".

Page 22, line 5, strike out "$846,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$847,557,000,000".

Page 22, line 8, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,533,000,000".

Page 22, Line 9, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,557,000,000".

Page 22, Line 15, strike out "$826,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$827,223,000,000".

Page 22, Line 16, strike out "$881,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$882,207,000,000".

Page 27, Line 6, strike out "$89,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,533,000,000".

Page 27, Line 10, strike out "$101,250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$102,257,000,000".

Page 34, Line 16, strike out "$2,489,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,734,000,000".

Page 34, Line 20, strike out "$3,576,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,693,000,000".

Page 34, Line 22, strike out "$4,160,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,153,000,000".

Page 35, line 1, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,455,000,000".

Page 35, line 4, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,533,000,000".

Page 35, line 5, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,557,000,000".

Page 35, line 12, strike out "$2,548,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,793,000,000".

Page 35, line 16, strike out "$3,641,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,758,000,000".

Page 35, line 17, strike out "$4,232,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,225,000,000".

Page 35, line 21, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,455,000,000".
Page 36, line 1, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,533,000,000".
Page 36, line 2, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$67,557,000,000".

RELATING TO MEDICARE AND BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

Page 12, line 10, strike out "$676,760,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$677,590,218,000".
Page 12, line 12, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,590,218,000".
Page 12, line 14, strike out "$828,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$828,247,309,000".
Page 12, line 16, strike out "$780,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$781,440,218,000".
Page 14, line 16, strike out "$77,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$77,547,309,000".
Page 14, line 17, strike out "$80,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$80,990,218,000".
Page 22, line 4, strike out "$753,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$754,900,109,000".
Page 22, line 5, strike out "$846,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$848,180,568,000".
Page 22, line 8, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,900,109,000".
Page 22, line 9, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,180,568,000".
Page 22, line 12, strike out "$886,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$888,901,183,000".
Page 22, line 13, strike out "$952,850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$953,616,290,000".
Page 22, line 15, strike out "$826,400,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$827,590,109,000".
Page 22, line 16, strike out "$881,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$82,830,568,000".
Page 27, line 5, strike out "$81,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$82,201,183,000".
Page 27, line 6, strike out "$89,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$90,900,109,000".
Page 27, line 9, strike out "$94,100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$94,866,290,000".
Page 27, line 10, strike out "$101,250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$102,880,568,000".
Page 34, line 16, strike out "$2,489,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,734,000,000".
Page 34, line 20, strike out "$3,576,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,693,000,000".
Page 34, line 22, strike out "$4,160,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,153,000,000".
Page 35, line 1, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,590,218,000".
Page 35, line 4, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,900,109,000".
Page 35, line 5, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,180,568,000".
Page 35, line 12, strike out "$2,548,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,793,000,000".
Page 35, line 16, strike out "$3,641,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,758,000,000".
Page 35, line 17, strike out "$4,232,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,225,000,000".
Page 35, line 21, strike out "$31,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,590,218,000".
Page 36, line 1, strike out "$51,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$52,900,109,000".
Page 36, line 2, strike out "$66,550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,180,568,000".●

## UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT GROUP MASQUERADES AS DEFENSE ADVOCATES

### HON. THOMAS F. HARTNETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention two separate articles. These articles are "Misfire: How Pentagon Critics Shot Down Their Own Ace" by Jonathan Alter, appearing in the May issue of Washington Monthly, and "Second Thoughts on Schell" in the May 3 issue of Time magazine.

I have found these articles interesting for a number of reasons. Mr. Alter details the surprising "behind-the-scenes" activity surrounding the recent firing of Dina Rasor as director of the National Taxpayers Legal Fund's "Project on Military Procurement." In a similar vein, the Time magazine article highlights criticism of "The Fate of the Earth" by Jonathan Schell. Originally hailed as a leading antinuclear work by such journalists as Walter Cronkite and Mary McGrory, it is now being lampooned by even the most ardent liberal opinionmakers. I bring these items to the attention of my colleagues concurrently, Mr. Speaker, because they both demonstrate how individuals in the so-called defense "reform" movement are actually for unilateral disarmament.

For the past 2 years, Ms. Rasor has received considerable notoriety with her criticisms of many weapons programs. She has taken a particular interest in the hydraulic system of the M-1, the Sparrow missile and other military hardware. her work has been featured on the CBS television program "60 Minutes," the New York Times, the Washington Post, and numerous other publications.

While I have watched Ms. Rasor's work with interest, it has been rare that I have agreed with her particular criticisms. I often felt that her approach was misguided, but I am sure she is a sincere individual who was concerned about building a strong America. It is for this reason that I was surprised to learn that the NTLF board had removed her from her post.

The Washington Monthly describes the attitude of the "old left" as being "Why build effective weapons? To kill more people? No weapons are good; in fact, they're so hateful they shouldn't even be talked about. So just get rid of them."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the true identity of the Project of Military Procurement was in this case revealed, a unilateral disarmament group masquerading as defense advocates.

I bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I feel this incident goes far beyond the isolated case of Dina Rasor, but is an actual indictment of the so-called defense reform movement. The Center for Defense Information, the Council for a Livable World, and the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy are just a few of the many organizations which pretend to advocate a more efficient military, while actually working toward unilateral disarmament.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that the chairman of NTFL is former Senator Eugene McCarthy, who as a Member of the body in 1958, founded the Democratic Study Group, and of course achieved national prominence with his antiwar views in the late sixties. According to the magazine, McCarthy felt it was "more important to cut the Pentagon's lean than its fat."

An avowed disciple of Jonathan Schell, McCarthy is one of the few who remain committed to the ideas set forth in "The Fate of the Earth." In an article appearing in the New Republic, a stronghold of liberalism, columnist Max Lerner says that Schell's logic could be used to justify "certain surrender through unilateral disarmament by the West." A recent New York Times editorial blasted Schell for "utopianism," saying:

> The rest of us are left in the real world, stuck with the only available alternative to catastrophe. Deterrence it will have to be.

And Harper's magazine editor Michael Kinsley argues that Schell too readily subordinates "liberty," "national sovereignty" and other values to "survival," because the only alternatives he sees are worldwide incineration or peace at any price.●

## ANTHRACITE STEAM FIRE CO. NO. 1 CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the

Anthracite Steam Fire Co. No. 1 of Mount Carmel, Pa., who will be celebrating their 100th anniversary during the week of May 24 through May 30. The week of activities will culminate in a banquet on May 30.

The Anthracite Steam Fire Co. No. 1 enjoys the enthusiastic support of the community it serves and not only works to protect the lives of the citizens and their property, but has unceasingly 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 country. 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 members of the Anthracite Steam Fire Co. No. 1 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.●

## WORLD TRADE WEEK

### HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has proclaimed this week, May 16-22, as World Trade Week. This is a time designated to emphasize that trade is vital both to our domestic economy and to our international relations.

The theme for World Trade Week is "Exports Mean Jobs." In a proclamation signed by the President, he noted that exports account for almost 6 million U.S. jobs and generate billions of dollars for U.S. companies.

In a special message concerning World Trade Week, Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige said:

As the world's greatest trader, the economic health of the United States is closely tied to exporting. Exports create jobs. They support the value of the dollar. They blunt the thrust of inflation. They pay for critically-needed resources and materials from abroad.

He continued by saying, "* * * in the final analysis the kind of export performance we need requires the concerted efforts of American business."

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Export Opportunities and Special Small Business Problems, I am well aware that small- and medium-sized businesses constitute an untapped pool of export potential. I hope the events scheduled throughout the week will encourage more of these businesses to enter into the exporting field. We can all benefit from small businesses who broaden their marketing base outside of the United States. The rewards for investing the time and money into export expansion can be very substantial. The substantial growth of the U.S. economy can be assured, more jobs will be created to offset rising unemployment, the vital small business sector will be stimulated, and the sagging dollar with be enhanced.●

## THREATS TO THE ENVIRONMENT

### HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to share a copy of a speech delivered by Maryland State Delegate Larry Young before a Democratic National Committee forum on "Our Environment—Can It Survive the Reagan Administration?" Delegate Young has been a leading advocate for adequate environmental protections in our State and on the national level. I commend both Delegate Young and the Democratic National Committee for continuing to hold matters of the environment among their top priority.

"BUILDING FOR A BETTER TOMORROW"—REMARKS OF HON. LARRY YOUNG, MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES, BEFORE THE DNC FORUM ON "OUR ENVIRONMENT—CAN IT SURVIVE THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION?"—APRIL 21, 1982

Good evening. It is a true pleasure for me to be here with you this evening with such distinguished panelists to address a topic near and dear to me. The environment.

As some of you know, I began my environmental career in the early 1970s under the guidance of the late, great Joe Penfold, then with the Izaak Walton League of America. What a man and leader. Joe Penfold gave a speech in 1969 that provided focus and meaning to the word "environment." Joe said:

"If we can achieve the technology and create the artificial environment required to put men on the moon, we can preserve or restore a rewarding natural environment for the rest of us earth-bound mortals. Moreover, clean air to breathe and clean water to drink are inalienable civil rights that belong to all the people and may not willfully be abridged."

The message is clear. As Americans, we should expect a national policy that promotes a decent environment for all, just as we expect equal opportunity to be one of the basic cornerstones of our nation. There are many in this nation, namely the man on Pennsylvania Avenue, who do not believe in Joe Penfold's wisdom.

Many Republican and other right wing types have tried to tell the nation that the environmental movement is dead, unrepresentative of American society and made up of "liberals" who are out to get the Republicans and torpedo progress.

Let us ask ourselves these questions: Is the environmental movement over? Are we headed on a path of environmental decay in the 1980s? Are we going to allow Mr. Watt, Ms. Gorsuch and others to turn back the clocks to an era as objectionable as stealing from the poor box?

Believe me, the movement is not over. It is shifting into high gear to confront the turbulence ahead.

How long will it take? Long enough for the tremendous public outcry for a good, clean and decent environment to be translated into a cohesive block of voters. Faster, in my opinion, if we could translate the word "environment" to mean more than just water, trees and wildlife.

For environment means the totality of city life. It means the air we breathe; the housing we live in; the streets we drive and walk on; the schools our children attend; and the businesses we work in and buy from.

When we can integrate all of these concerns under the banner of environmentalism then we will no longer have to wait for clean air, clean water and a decent environment for all Americans. We have waited long enough.

Contrary to what the President and other conservative Republicans are saying, an improved environment—one that displays respect for even the most basic amenities like clean air—will positively benefit all segments of society. The effects of an improved environment will ripple across political boundaries.

Cleaner air will reduce the danger of disease. Pure water will improve health. Quieter neighborhoods will reduce the risk of hearing loss. Cleaner streets will reduce the dangers posed by rodents. Citizens will stand a bit taller and prouder of their neighborhoods.

But what is the short-term strategy of the anti-environmentalists that are one of the basic elements of the conservative Republican constituency? They would sacrifice short-term corporate gain for long-term human improvement. They look at the results of the Harris Poll and the New York Times/CBS News Poll that show a pro-environment sentiment in America with a defiant gesture that includes only their middle-finger.

The pitfalls of the Republican proposals will be reduced enforcement of environmental laws and the delay and/or rescinding of regulations taking effect. The total environment will suffer. Not just people, but housing, schools and stores. When individuals are asked to accept a political philosophy that says "we don't care about the human condition," then those same individuals will begin to look for allies in their war.

One of the consequences of 1980-84 will be a movement full speed ahead within the environmental movement. Some of the chief Republican villains whose names I have already mentioned have provided a renewed spirit and focus for environmentalists. While in the early 1970s the in-thing was to pass new environmental laws like the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, the job we have before us now is to tread water to maintain what we have.

In all honesty, this job would be made easier if the traditional environmentalists and urban groups could strike an important agreement—to work together for the betterment of all. These are two important Democratic constituencies that if pulled together and packaged, can become one of the

strongest and most potent political forces America has known.

The Republican anti-urban and anti-environmental policies have provided the impetus for this great coalition. We have talked of pulling it together. Now let's do it. What I mean is an all out drive by the DNC to keep these constituencies in the Democratic column forever.

And what if these constituencies don't come together in a peaceful marriage? What will be the consequences?

The result will be a continued voice screaming out because of environmental failures in our urban communities. There will continue to be an insensitivity to the potentials for solutions. There will continue to be those who can effectively use environmental progresss as the "scapegoat" for the lack of jobs in Black communities. And there will continue to be an effort to discredit those of us who care about the environment with thick, biased studies and glib one-liners.

What I am saying it that we must use now as the time to get our own house together. Let us consummate the urban/environmental marriage that I spoke about. The Republican party has given us the opportunity. Now, let us take advantage of their blunders.

As a Black legislator representing an inner-city area of Baltimore, I maintain a special, personal interest in environmental degradation. My own mother suffers from asthma and I have seen the human suffering on "pollution alert" days. I have seen thousands of dollars used to control rats because of improper sanitation when the money could be better used to create jobs. And I spend every legislative session in Maryland promoting environmental quality among my colleagues. We all must make a special effort to reach out. In no other time in recent years is the enemy of a clean environment and a decent urban life as identifiable as now.

On the economic front, we must undertake two fundamental policies. One—we must get our nation back to work. Two—we must put in place a fair and progressive tax system that spreads the burdens and benefits of government equitably.

Jobs are number one. Unemployment draws from the strength of America like cancer draws from the human body.

A fair and just tax system is number two. The Republican tax-cut of 1981 provides a windfall to the wealthiest Americans, the one's who need it least.

A Democratic economic policy should promote the creation of jobs. A CETA-like program is needed for the short-term. Private-sector jobs will come with the advent of an economic program—unlike the President's—that provides essential services to Americans and is relatively deficit free.

Democrats must examine the Kemp-Roth Christmas tree tax cut legislation of 1981. A high income surtax may be necessary. Rollbacks may be required. A minimum corporate tax makes sense. And the sale of tax breaks by corporations, while hungry children go without a decent school lunch, must be stopped.

I believe Democrats need not stray from a long life of concern for the human factor. From the New Deal, to the New Frontier, through the Great Society and to the present, Democrats have always showed a concern for human beings. In 1982, as opportunity knocks, let us look to Chairman Manatt, Speaker O'Neill, Senator Bob Byrd and other party and elected leaders for the wisdom and direction we need.

In closing, if a friend or enemy asks why Democrats care about the environment, ask them one which I have borrowed from an ex-Hollywood star: Is the environment better off now than it was in January, 1981?

Thank you.●

## WE SHALL NOT INTERRUPT AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY EXPORT CONTRACTS

### HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today identical to that which was introduced on April 21 by my two Senate Colleagues from Minnesota, Mr. DURENBERGER and Mr. BOSCHWITZ, which would prohibit the Federal Government from interrupting agricultural commodity export contracts except during a national emergency or a state of war.

If our foreign trade policy is one of a free market concept then we must assure our producers that contracts entered into with our foreign trading partners will be honored.

Because the United States has an enormous capacity to produce farm agriculture commodities and do so very efficiently, it is imperative that we seek new markets and continue to be a reliable supplier to our existing ones. This legislation would preserve the integrity of existing agricultural export contracts in the event of a trade embargo.

I am introducing this legislation in conjunction with another proposal I have introduced today entitled the Reciprocity Agricultural Trade Act of 1982. The purpose of this legislation is to establish the concept of reciprocity of market access as a key principle of U.S. agricultural trade policy and trade law. The bill requires the executive branch to identify and obtain the elimination of barriers maintained by our major trading partners and by strengthening the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974 that provide remedies against foreign unfair agricultural trade practices.

Our producers cannot be asked time and time again to produce food to feed the world just to have the Government use agricultural commodities as a tool of foreign policy without protection. The residual effects of the Carter embargo are still being felt by our farmers today with low commodity grain prices and this is of great concern to me. We must assure both our domestic producers and foreign trading partners that we are a reliable supplier of agricultural commodities and will not tolerate barriers or subsidies which are contrary to a free market policy. Because our agricultural contracts will be honored, foreign importers will be under pressure to plan ahead for their agricultural needs and will not be able to come into our markets when prices are depressed.

I feel that these two bills address the concerns that have been raised by farmers across the Nation and will do much to stimulate agricultural exports. I would ask my colleagues for their support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

## STUDENTS WHO CARE

### HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride and admiration that I call the attention of this chamber to a dedicated and exemplary volunteer force in my district—the high school student coaches of the Metuchen "Y" Stars.

This special Olympics "Y" Stars swim team was formed in 1974 with less than 10 competitors. Since that year, the program has grown to almost 40 competitors on two teams. For the past 3 years, our "Stars" have had one of the top teams in the State of New Jersey.

All this could not have been achieved without the generosity of their sponsor and host—the Metuchen YMCA—and the students at J. P. Stevens High who volunteer their time and energy to one-on-one coaching duties with each of the team members.

In addition to all their extensive coaching duties, these young people are very involved in other academic and extracurricular activities at J. P. Stevens. They also give holiday parties, birthday parties, picnics, and join their team members at plays and other activities, at the volunteer's expense. These same students are involved in hand-in-hand, one-to-one, special Olympics track, and wheelchair championships.

In behalf of the citizens of my district and handicapped people nationwide, I want to offer these young men and women—coaches and team members alike—our deepest appreciation and continued support.

This program and its people epitomize the spirit, dedication, community initiative, and caring that makes this country great. Theirs is an example we would all be wise to heed.●

## THE INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGH TECHNOLOGY TRADE ACT OF 1982


### HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the High Technology Trade Act of 1982. I do this for myself, for Mr. GIBBONS, chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, and for a number of my colleagues.

In the last few years, there has been a growing recognition of an important fact: High technology has rapidly become one of the industries most essential to the health of the American economy.

The fact that this remarkable field has grown so quickly and effectively has led some people to assume that America's superiority in this area will be as permanent as the Rock of Gibraltar.

But it is time we got realistic. The American high technology industry stands on the threshold of a major threat from Japan. The Japanese are in the middle of a major buildup that could sink America's superiority in both hardware and software just as surely as our ships were sunk at Pearl Harbor.

By now, hard experience should have taught us what happens when we take thriving sectors of our economy for granted. Today, many of our older industries are in deep trouble. Around the world we face closing markets, and the creation of market barriers.

In the fast-paced world of high technology, there is absolutely no time to sit and contemplate current successes. Things change too fast. We must move quickly to promote our interests, or our advantage will be permanently lost. If there were ever a time to set out a forceful, organized high technology policy, that time is now.

Specifically, the High Technology Trade Act of 1982 takes four major steps.

It authorizes the President to negotiate high technology trade issues on both a bilateral and multilateral basis.

It affirms U.S. commitment to national treatment in trade and investment.

It takes the important step of establishing a system which will track practices which distort trade and investment flows, and which will offer proposed remedies to any problems that develop.

And finally, it expands the President's current authority under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 to cover investment.

The High Technology Trade Act of 1982 will be effective because it anticipates the industry's critical future needs. These days, you hear a lot of talk about reciprocity. This bill proposes a more positive approach to resolving trade issues. Our purpose is to strengthen our Nation's ability to negotiate barriers in the areas of goods, services, information, and investment.

Ours is a frankly pro free trade bill. It is not sectoral. It would complement the general agreement on tariffs and trade, so as to insure that our U.S. Trade Representative has the kind of negotiating authority he needs and has requested.

With the High Technology Trade Act of 1982, we can begin today to address the challenges of the future. This bill will help us avoid the kinds of mistakes we have made in the past with other industries.

Let us not sit back on the complacent assumption that our currently thriving high technology industries are invulnerable to foreign invasions. They are not.

Economic defense requires a willingness to look ahead, a willingness to commit ourselves to future successes. By supporting this bill, we display exactly that kind of commitment.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

##### SHORT TITLE

Section 1 states that the Act is entitled the "High Technology Trade Act of 1982."

##### FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

In Section 2 the Congress recognizes the importance to the national interest and the U.S. high technology industries of an open world economy for international trade in goods, services, information and investment. Congress finds that international competition in high technology products is increasingly characterized by various forms of government intervention. Congress recognizes that strong, innovative high technology industries are essential to the U.S. national security and defense, future economic development, and international competitiveness, and states that the U.S. should recognize the importance of providing them with a favorable domestic environment. Congress further finds that joint scientific cooperation between U.S. and foreign companies is in the national interest, and that the results of cooperative efforts should be available to all participants. The purposes of the Act are to obtain maximum openness for international trade in high technology goods, services, information and investment, and to strengthen the international trading system.

##### NEGOTIATING MANDATE

Section 3 authorizes the President to enter into bilateral or multilateral agreements which may include, nonexclusively, commitments by foreign governments not to discourage public or private procurement of foreign high technology products, services or information; commitments to reduce or eliminate tariff and nontariff barriers to high technology trade, including the acceleration of the tariff rates agreed to during the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations and the elimination of any tariffs of five percent ad valorem or equivalent or less; and commitments to provide national treatment. The President is further authorized to make commitments to change U.S. laws, regulations or policies as necessary and appropriate to ensure the competitiveness of U.S. high technology industries.

To carry out agreements negotiated under the Act, Section 3 authorizes the President to use existing procedures under the Trade Act of 1974 to affect duty treatment or to change U.S. law.

##### ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TO OBTAIN OPENNESS OF FOREIGN MARKET ACCESS

Section 4 directs the President to determine, on a continuing basis, whether any key country has failed to take sufficient actions to provide national treatment for U.S. high technology products and investments. The President is directed to promptly enter into consultations with any such country and, if consultations do not provide the means to obtain national treatment, promptly consider other action under existing laws and international agreements.

##### EFFECTS OF FOREIGN INDUSTRIAL POLICY

Section 5 directs the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the High Technology Industry Advisory Committee, to report annually to Congress on the extent to which any key country utilizes industrial policies or measures which have, or may have, substantially adverse effects on a U.S. high technology industry. This report is to contain an analysis of foreign government industrial policies and measures which are designed to enhance the competitiveness of, or increase the exports of, a foreign high technology industry, and which impair access to domestic markets, as well as subsidies, toleration of cooperation among firms, other anticompetitive activities, interference with the outward flow of nonstrategic technology, and other export-enhancing or import-inhibiting practices. The report to the Congress will also specify the steps the President is taking, or proposes, to remedy the adverse effects of such policies and measures on U.S. high technology industries.

Section 5 further directs the President to use existing authority, as necessary or appropriate, to eliminate or offset the effects of policies or measures which significantly distort trade or investment to the detriment of a high technology industry, or which may result in sales at less than fair value or the provision of a subsidy, and which cause or threaten material injury to a U.S. high technology industry.

##### MONITORING OF KEY COUNTRIES

Section 6 directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish a mechanism to evaluate the competitive opportunities available in foreign markets, by monitoring high technology trade and investment patterns. Specifically, the analysis will address import, export and investment flows, prevailing competitive conditions, and the nature and extent of government intervention in key countries. This analysis is to be contained in a report to the President, published annually by the Secretary of Commerce.

Section 6 further directs the U.S. Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce, after consulting with the High Technology Industry Advisory Committee, to report annually to the President any such measures which they consider to violate U.S. international agreements or to be unjustifiable, unreasonable or discriminatory and a burden or restriction on U.S. high technology trade, services or investment. In response, the President will consider action under existing U.S. laws and trade agreements to reduce or eliminate the measures.

Finally, Section 6 directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish a High Technology Industry Advisory Committee, and to consult with it regarding actions under the Act.

DEFINITIONS

Section 7 defines certain key terms. It specifies that in measuring the openness of foreign markets, structural barriers to U.S. trade and investment, structural advantages of foreign companies due to noncompetitive conditions, and the provision of national treatment, among other factors, will be considered.

National treatment is defined as treatment no less favorable than that accorded to any national, in the areas of establishment, tax and financial incentives, nonstrategic public procurements, and internal regulations and procedures.

AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

Section 8 amends Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 by allowing the President to respond to foreign acts or policies which burden or restrict U.S. investment abroad, and by broadening the range of responses, permitting the President to restrict foreign direct investment in the U.S. in response to unfair foreign trade and investment practices.

---

## H.R. 6433

A bill to authorize negotiations directed toward opening foreign markets to U.S. exports of high technology products, and for other purposes.

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "High Technology Trade Act of 1982."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the growth and maintenance of an open world economy for international trade in goods, services and information, and for investment is in the national interest and in the interest of the United States high technology industries;

(2) international competition in high technology products is increasingly characterized by a high degree of Government intervention through central planning, joint establishment of industrial objectives, subsidization, anti-competitive practices tolerated or fostered by Government policy, denial of national treatment, nontariff and tariff barriers, investment performance requirements, access to preferential financing, and sponsorship of limited-access joint research projects;

(3) the strength, vitality and innovativeness of the United States high technology industries are essential to the national security and the national defense, the future development of the United States economy and the competitiveness of United States industry in international trade;

(4) domestic policies play a critical role in determining the international competitiveness of United States high technology companies, and therefore the United States should take into account the importance of providing a favorable domestic economic environment for United States high technology industries in order to preserve United States international competitiveness; and

(5) the pursuit of joint scientific cooperation in areas of mutual interest between companies of the United States and companies of the trading partners of the United States, through such measures as financial participation and technical and personnel exchanges, is in the national interest, and access by all participants to the results of any such cooperative efforts should not be impaired.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to obtain and preserve the maximum openness with respect to international trade in high technology goods, services, and information, and for investment in high technology industries; and

(2) to strengthen the international trading system as embodied in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and related agreements.

SEC. 3. NEGOTIATING MANDATE.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to enter into such bilateral or multilateral agreements as may be necessary or appropriate to achieve the purposes of this Act.

(b) AGREEMENTS.—Agreements under this Act may include but need not be limited to—

(1) a commitment that official policy of signatory countries will not discourage government or private procurement of foreign high technology products, services or information;

(2) the reduction and elimination of all tariffs on, and other barriers to, imports of high technology products, including, but not limited to—

(A) the acceleration of the full concession tariff rates on high technology products agreed to during the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations; and

(B) the elimination of any tariff which on the date of enactment of this Act is 5 percent ad valorem (or ad valorem equivalent) or less; and

(3) a commitment to provide national treatment.

(c) ACTIONS BY PRESIDENT TO CARRY OUT AGREEMENTS.—In order to carry out any agreement concluded under this Act, the President is authorized with respect to products which he deems to be high technology products—

(1) to proclaim such modification or continuance of any existing duty, duty-free or excise treatment, or such additional duties, as he determines to be required or appropriate, pursuant to the procedures governing tariff agreements in sections 131 through 135 of the Trade Act of 1974; and

(2) to utilize the procedures contained in sections 102 and 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (and corresponding provisions of law) in the event that changes in United States laws are required or appropriate.

(d) CHANGES IN LAW.—The President is authorized to include in any agreement concluded under this Act commitments to make changes in United States laws, regulations and policies that are considered necessary and appropriate to ensure the continued competitiveness in open international markets of the United States high technology industries. Such changes shall be considered by Congress as provided in subsection (c)(2) of this section.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ACTIONS TO OBTAIN OPENNESS OF FOREIGN MARKET ACCESS

(a) DETERMINATIONS BY PRESIDENT REGARDING NATIONAL TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure that national treatment is accorded by a key country to—

(A) United States high technology companies for sales in such country, and

(B) United States persons for investments in high technology industries in such country,

the President shall, on a continuing basis, determine whether such country is taking actions sufficient to provide national treatment in such country for United States exports of high technology products and United States investments in high technology industries.

(2) BASIS OF DETERMINATIONS.—The President shall base the determinations under paragraph (1) on such product categories as are deemed appropriate in accordance with the procedures established under such paragraph.

(b) ACTIONS INVOLVING NEGATIVE DETERMINATIONS.—If the President determines under subsection (a) that a key country is not providing national treatment, the President shall promptly enter into consultations with such country with a view to establishing national treatment in such country and achieving the purposes of this Act. If such consultations do not provide the means to obtain this objective, the President shall promptly consider taking such actions, within his power as he deems necessary or appropriate, under trade agreements to which the United States is a party and under provisions of United States law.

SEC. 5. EFFECTS OF FOREIGN INDUSTRIAL POLICY

(a) REPORT BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the High Technology Industry Advisory Committee established under section 6(c), shall analyze and report annually to the Congress—

(1) the extent to which any key country utilizes industrial policies or measures which significantly distort international trade in goods, services or information, or investment flows, and which have or may have substantial adverse effects on any United States high technology industry; and

(2) the steps which the President is taking or proposes to take domestically and internationally to remedy any adverse effects determined under paragraph (1), including any adverse effect arising out of any action which provides a subsidy with respect to articles imported into the United States or the sale of such articles at less then fair value in the United States market.

(b) SCOPE OF ANALYSIS.—The analysis under subsection (a) shall include an analysis of—

(1) any foreign government industrial policies and measures—

(A) which are designed to enhance, or having the effect of enhancing, the international competitiveness of a foreign high technology industry, or

(B) which increase the rate of savings and investment, decrease consumption, channel private or public financial or other resources to favored industries, or otherwise have the effect of increasing high technology exports, and

(C) which impair access to domestic markets; in the case of key commodity components (for example, random access memories (RAMs)), access shall be measured by reference to the extent to which sales in a major developed country of such products manufactured by United States companies in the United States or abroad, taking into account the relative size of markets, are less than sales of those products in other international markets where more open conditions of competition prevail, and such other factors as the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe;

(2) specific foreign government industrial policies and measures such as—

(A) subsidies,

(B) toleration of cooperation among firms, or

(C) other anticompetitive activities, including allocation of product or geographic markets, exclusive nonstrategic joint research and development activities, interference with the outward flow of nonstrategic technology, and other export-enhancing or import-inhibiting practices.

(c) OTHER PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS.—If the President determines under subsection (a) that a foreign country has foreign industrial policies or measures which—

(1) significantly distort international trade or investment to the detriment of any United States high technology industry; or

(2) may result in sales of articles at less than fair market value in the United States market or provision of a subsidy with respect to articles imported into the United States, and cause, or threaten to cause, material injury to any United States high technology industry,

the President shall take whatever steps within his power that he deems are necessary or appropriate (including entering into agreements) to obtain the elimination of such practices or to offset their adverse effects.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms "less than fair value", "material injury" and "subsidy" shall have the same meaning as they have under Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.).

SEC. 6. MONITORING OF KEY COUNTRIES: REPORTS

(a) ANALYSIS OF COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES.—The Secretary of Commerce shall establish a mechanism to analyze high technology trade and investment patterns in key countries to evaluate competitive opportunities offered in foreign markets, and to further the objectives of this Act. The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and publish annually a report to the President containing the results of his analysis which shall include, but not be limited to, information with respect to—

(1) United States exports and imports of high technology products to and from such key countries;

(2) direct and indirect investment flows;

(3) the conditions of competition in such countries, including the nature and extent of intercompany cooperation and coordination in joint research and development, market allocation, and the development and implementation of industrial objectives; and

(4) the nature and extent of government intervention, including the development of industrial objectives, the financing of research and development, the providing of financial, tax and other incentives, and the directing of procurement.

(b) REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT—

(1) REPORT.—The United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce shall, after consultation with the Advisory Committee established under subsection (c), report annually to the President with respect to measures enumerated in the report submitted under subsection (a)—

(A) which they consider to be violations of United States international agreements, or

(B) which are unjustifiable, unreasonable or discriminatory and a burden or restriction on United States high technology products, services or investments.

(2) ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT.—The President shall consider what action may be taken under the laws of the United States and trade agreements to obtain the reduction or elimination of such measures.

(c) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary of Commerce and the United States Trade Representative shall—

(1) establish a High Technology Industry Advisory Committee comprised of representatives of interested high technology industries; and

(2) fully consult with this Committee with respect to actions under this Act relating to—

(A) the preparation of negotiating positions,

(B) the conclusion of any agreement,

(C) the imposition of any restriction, and

(D) the monitoring of the results of any such agreement or restriction.

The provisions of section 135(f) of the Trade Act of 1974 shall apply to the Committee.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS

(a) OPENNESS OF FOREIGN MARKETS.—For the purpose of this Act, openness of international trade and investment shall be measured by reference to—

(1) the existence of structural barriers to United States trade and investment;

(2) structural advantages enjoyed by foreign companies by virtue of an absence of fully competitive market conditions in their home markets;

(3) the extent to which national treatment is afforded United States investments to produce and sell high technology products and services for sale in the local market of a major developed country; and

(4) such other factors as the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe.

(b) NATIONAL TREATMENT.—The term "national treatment" shall include, but not be limited to, treatment not less favorable than that accorded to any national with respect to—

(1) the freedom of establishment of a market;

(2) taxation and financial incentives;

(3) nonstrategic government purchasing and public contracts; and

(4) internal regulations and practices.

(c) KEY COUNTRY, ETC.—For the purpose of this Act—

(1) the term "key country" means Japan, the European Economic Community, Canada, and any other foreign country (including any newly industrialized country) designated by the President as a key country for any purpose of this Act; and

(2) The term "newly industrialized country" means Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia, Brazil, Argentina, Hong Kong, Singapore, Spain, Mexico, and Israel, and any other foreign country designated by the President.

SEC. 8. AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

(a) Subsection (b)(2) of section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2411(a)) is amended by adding the words "or foreign direct investments" after "services".

(b) Subsection 301(d)(1) is amended—

(1) by deleting the period; and

(2) by adding the phrase "and direct investment abroad by citizens or nationals of the United States."

(c) Subsection 304(b) is amended—

(1) by deleting the word "or" the first time it appears, and replacing it with a comma; and

(2) by inserting the words "or direct investment" after the word "service".●

## STATEMENT ON HIGH TECHNOLOGY TRADE ACT OF 1982

---

## HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the principal sponsor of this legislation, Congressman JIM SHANNON, to introduce the High Technology Trade Act of 1982 for consideration by the House of Representatives. Currently, our high technology industries are being threatened by our inability to set forth a coordinated and aggressive trade policy in response to our international competitors in this field, particularly the Japanese.

Passage of the legislation we are introducing today, I believe, will go a long way toward providing the necessary impetus to dealing with this problem. It does not advocate a protectionist trade policy. Rather, it is designed to insure that our domestic industries are provided the opportunity to compete in a free and fair international trading environment.

The pivotal provisions of this legislation are designed to open up foreign markets to U.S. products and to insure that our domestic industries are afforded no less favorable treatment in doing business in foreign countries than are that nation's own domestic firms. As we all are aware, the United States has been losing its competitive edge in many instances because of the establishment by foreign countries of nontariff barriers to trade that severely restrict the ability of U.S. firms to penetrate their markets for sales. These barriers include subsidies, performance requirements, and barriers to investment and access to capital. We cannot afford to tolerate use of such nontariff barriers by our trading partners any longer.

This legislation includes two major provisions: First, it provides a congressional mandate to the President to undertake negotiations with our international trading partners to eliminate barriers to free trade in high technology, and to provide for national treatment of U.S. firms in foreign countries with respect to investment, taxation, research and development, and government procurement. The bill leaves with the President the final decision regarding any action that might be appropriate in response to a failure to obtain these conditions.

Second, the legislation establishes a High Technology Advisory Committee, which together with the Secretary of Commerce, is required to assess the effects of foreign industrial policy on the flow of international trade in goods, services, or information. A ca-

pacity to understand the connection between foreign industrial policy and international trade is essential if we are going to be able to effectively deal with the impact of industrial policy planning abroad on our economy.

The future of our domestic high technology firms is critical to the maintenance of a strong U.S. industrial base and defense capability. Moreover, high technology items will grow more important to the preservation of a strong manufacturing sector in our economy as high technology items are utilized to bring about process and product innovations that will improve productivity performance and profitability. Many of our competitive high technology industries are at a critical juncture—semiconductors, specialty steel, communications, and electronics—and the aggressive implementation of our trade laws and international agreements could well be the critical factor which will determine their long-term survival and international competitiveness.

Over the years, the United States has always maintained an excellence in basic research and in an ability to patent new products and processes. It is clearly our inability to take this scientific excellence and to coordinate it with national policy goals that is damaging our economy today. Because we are no longer the unchallenged world economic leader, we must begin to define our economic goals and pursue them through trade policies and other domestic policies that will ultimately impact positively on our competitiveness in the international marketplace.

One in every seven manufacturing jobs in the United States and over 5 million American jobs remain tied to our ability to export, and our ability to coordinate with our trading partners a fair and effective international trading policy. The High Technology Trade Act is a step in the right direction in dealing with the future survival of a critical sector of our economy. More than this, the elimination of nontariff barriers to trade that can be accomplished under this act will lead to progress toward a more open international trading system in general, and this will be a benefit to all nations of the world.

I commend this legislation to your attention and urge that this legislative body move forward on consideration of it without delay.●

## THE MISTAKE OF CUTTING FEDERAL AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

### HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I strongly condemn the administration's proposed reductions of Federal support for higher education. Clearly, the Federal budget has grown alarmingly over the past few years, but so has the cost of education. In fact, since 1980, college tuition has risen significantly above the inflation rate. Last year, with inflation running at 8.9 percent, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges found that its schools increased tuition costs by 17.7 percent.

Putting an end to waste in any entitlement program is a valid, desirable objective; however, the President's proposals in the area of education are so overly broad that students in genuine need will suffer. A 41-percent reduction in Federal support for higher education during the next 3 years is penny wise but pound foolish. I feel, very strongly, that the Government should encourage postsecondary learning for only through knowledge and competence will America emerge from its present state of disarray.

I particularly disapprove of the administration cutting funds for the guaranteed student loan program (GSL) and the Pell grant program. Currently, 3.5 million students receive GSL's, the Government's largest student-aid program. By 1983, due to a doubling of the 5-percent origination fee, a needs-analysis test applicable to students at all income levels, and the elimination of graduate and professional students from the program, this number will fall to 2.8 million.

President Reagan recently voiced his assumption that those cut from the GSL program would be able to finance their educations through new, lightly subsidized loan programs. Unfortunately, the facts of the situation—that half the States do not have such programs and banks show little interest in starting them—render the President's starry-eyed assumption impractical.

Instead of redirecting the $912 million saved from cuts in GSL's toward lower income students, three low-income aid programs—supplemental grants, National direct student loans, and State student incentive grants—are proposed for elimination.

Pell grants, in the next few years will also be severely restricted. By 1983, the highest grant possible from this particular program will be reduced to a maximum of $1,600. In this age of $5,000 plus tuition bills, $1,600 is not a particularly weighty sum. Adding to the severity of this cut is the strictness of the proposed eligibility requirement. In order to receive a Pell grant, a family of four must have a maximum adjusted income of $16,000. This 40-percent reduction from the 1982 maximum of $27,000 is unreasonable.

I sincerely hope we do not make the mistake of sacrificing long-term benefits of higher education for the relatively minor role that savings from cuts in this area will play in balancing the budget. I would like to include in the RECORD at this point an outstanding editorial on the true impact of these cuts and the administration's failure to be candid about the cost of these cuts. This administration apparently thinks education is expensive—but wait till they discover the cost of ignorance.

[From The Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1982]

THE FACTS ABOUT STUDENT AID

The President's radio broadcast last Saturday—in which he set out to dispel what he claimed was a "great misconcept" of his plans for aid to higher education—strikes us as different in kind from his occasional press conference garbling of certain facts. In this case there was ample time for preparation. And while Mr. Reagan may have surprised many of his aides by his choice of topics, the array of statistics included in his prepared remarks makes it clear that he had access to ample staff assistance. In this case it was not in fact the numbers that were wrong. What was wrong was that the numbers he used don't tell the story about what he is proposing to the country.

"We haven't cut [student] loans," said the president, "we've cut the cost to taxpayers of making these loans available. Surely, no one can quarrel with the reduction in administrative costs that results in more money for needy students."

The fact is, however, that these administrative savings aside, the administration has already cut student loans and it wants to cut them more. As of last October, students from families with incomes above $30,000 have had to prove need to get a partial or full loan. Maximum interest rates for students were raised to 9 percent and for parents to 14 percent. (Private banks make the loans, but the government pays all interest on student loans while the students are in school and the difference between market rates and the subsidized rate thereafter. Presumably that's what the president meant when he said that "not one dime of the money being cut has ever gone directly for loans to students"—it just went to make the loans affordable.)

Because these changes weren't effective before the start of the school year, their impact won't be felt until next year—but they are part of what is currently worrying many students. In his 1983 budget, the president wants to tighten up further by applying the needs test to lower-income students, cutting graduate students out of the 9 percent loan program, terminating interest subsidies two years after graduation or if a student quits school, and doubling loan fees. All of this is expected to save over $900 million in 1983 and affect several hundred thousand students. The president assumes that these students will get aid from new, lightly subsidized loan programs—which is

why his figures don't show a drop-off in students aided—but half the states don't have such programs yet, and banks have shown little interest in starting them.

The money saved will not be used for lower-income students. Instead, the grant programs for these students will also be cut. The major Pell grant program is slated for a 40 percent reduction—not counting inflation—and three other aid programs now serving several hundred thousand low-income students would be eliminated entirely. All in all, the House budget committee estimates that almost 2 million fewer college students would receive aid in the 1983-84 school year than in the previous year.

When the president returns to the airwaves next Saturday, perhaps he will want to defend the case for these cuts. But he cannot deny they are real or that many people will be affected by them—and it is baffling to us why he would have so distorted his administration's position in a public nationwide broadcast.●

## MORE CHRISTIANS BEING PERSECUTED IN ROMANIA

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the number of people being jailed or being deprived of their human rights in Communist Romania continues to grow. Among them are:

Ioan Raceala, Str. Vasile Alexandrii 20, Slobozia, Jud. Jalomita. His wife's name is Maria. They have two children. Ioan has been sentenced to 5 years and 6 months in prison.

Petru Furnea, Str. Zidari 1, Ploiesti, Jud. Prahova. His wife's name is Fiwi. They have four children. Petru has been sentenced to 5 years and 3 months in prison.

Hans Holzmann, Str. Dragos Voda 20, Brasov. His wife's name is Rosi. They have five children. Hans has been sentenced to 5 years and 6 months in prison.

Horst Feder, Str. Ilarie Chendi 87, Sighisoara, Jud. Mures. His wife's name is Ilse. They have two children. Horst has been sentenced to 5 years and 6 months in prison.

Dr. Silviu Cioata, Str. Intrarea Petuniei 9, Bloc 148, Sc. B, App. 20, Ploiesti, Jud. Prahova. His wife's name is Elena. They have 3 children. Dr. Silviu has been sentenced to 5 years and 6 months in prison.

Georgescu Costel, Soseaua Vestului 20, Bloc 101, Sc. B, Etage 9, App. 73, Ploiesti, Jud. Prahova. Georgescu has been sentenced to 6 years in prison.

Ioan Toader, Str. Veronica Micle 42, Ploiesti, Jud. Prahova. His wife's name is Elena. They have one child. Ioan has been sentenced to 5 years and 3 months in prison.

Mircea Cioata, Bulevardul V.L. Lenin 1, Bloc A, Sc. B. App. 19, Ploiesti, Jud. Prahova. His wife's name is Florica. They have three children. Mircea has been sentenced to 5 years and 3 months in prison.

According to my sources their only crime is the possession and distribution of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. This certainly again demonstrates that Romania is not worthy of extension of her Most Favored Nation status, and my hope is that the President will not recommend a continuation of this status to the Congress unless the situation in Romania improves.●

## IMMUNIZATION FUNDS REDUCTION

### HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1982, the Los Angeles Times ran an article titled "Putting Children in Danger of Death," concerning the Reagan administration's 1983 budget request for the childhood immunization program. The article questions the commitment of the Reagan administration to the immunization program, despite the fact that the administration's budget request for the program in fiscal year 1983 is $1 million greater than actual spending this year.

Secretary Richard Schweiker responded to the article in a letter published in the March 15, 1982 edition of the Los Angeles Times, detailing the success of the immunization program, and justifying the level of spending requested by the administration. I have included a copy of the Secretary's letter, and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

IMMUNIZATION FUNDS REDUCTION

The following is our department's response to the article by Carol Levine, editor of the Hastings Center Report, on the Administration's 1983 budget request for the immunization program, which appeared in The Times (Editorial Pages, Feb. 24).

"Putting Children in Danger of Death" is a very scary headline. However, it has nothing to do with the reality of the successful childhood immunization program being funded nationwide by the Department of Health and Human Services—a program the Reagan Administration fully and strongly supports, a program continuing on a steady course.

The fact is that our immunization program is in no danger whatsoever—nor is our determination to protect those most precious of all America's resources—our children. Two days after Carol Levine's article appeared, alleging a letdown in the immunization program, news accounts from the Centers for Disease Control reported another in a long series of immunization-related successes. Cases of measles, the report showed, continued to decline in January, hitting a record low of just 36 cases nationwide—71 percent below the same reporting period last year. Measles is on the way to being wiped out altogether in this country.

Continuing this immunization progress to protect our children is something I feel very deeply about as secretary of health and human services.

Over the years, as a U.S. senator from Pennsylvania, I was deeply involved in virtually every major piece of health legislation passed in this country, including legislation funding childhood immunization.

I've seen these immunization programs work. I've seen them battle measles, polio, mumps and rubella to a standstill.

Unfortunately, Levine's criticism failed to take into account the background of our ongoing commitment to immunization of children.

To suggest that, because the fiscal year 1983 budget request of $29 million for immunization represents only a modest increase over last year's funding level, it somehow marks a lessened commitment to protect our children is seriously inaccurate.

Last month, Dr. William Foege, director of the Centers for Disease Control (and a professional who was not appointed by the Reagan Administration), summarized the budgetary needs of the immunization program this way:

"We believe the decrease in the numbers of susceptible children, improved program efficiency and widespread public involvement in the immunization program will more than offset any decline in the purchasing power of federal funds."

In other words, we've come such a long way that, obviously, we don't need as many dollars to keep the momentum of the program going as we did to start it and get it up to speed in the first place. Moreover, any fiscal year 1983 "decrease" in federal funds results only from the effects of inflation and rising vaccine costs. Our actual budget request is $1 million higher for fiscal year 1983 than we are spending this year.

Back in 1977, we had 57,345 cases of measles in America. In 1981, we had just 3,032. Six years ago, only 75 percent of our children were inoculated against measles, only 78 percent against diphtheria, tetanus and pertusses. Only 70 percent were inoculated against rubella, 72 percent polio.

Today, that's changed. Virtually all children—95 percent or better of all school enterers—are inoculated.

With only about 5 percent of our children entering school still requiring inoculation, instead of 22 percent to 30 percent a few short years ago, it stands to reason we don't need the same number of dollars.

We have the money to do the job. If we didn't, I'd be the first one to go to Capitol Hill to ask for more. All 50 states now have immunization requirements for school entry; 39 states, and the District of Columbia, have immunization requirements for all students, from kindergarten through 12th grade.

Moreover, voluntary groups, PTAs and, especially, parents, are wholeheartedly involved in the campaign to conquer childhood diseases once and for all. Parents' understanding of the benefits of inoculation has improved tremendously. Parents are aware and concerned. They're cooperating by taking the steps necessary to help protect their children.

So, too, are local health departments in communities across America. They are justifiably proud of the efficient immunization system they have helped build over the years.

Additionally, any state needing more funds for its immunization program can now turn to the preventive health and the

maternal and child health services block grants that are given to the states to use as they see fit under newly passed legislation authored by the Reagan Administration last year.●

## CRAMER HILL BOYS' CLUB HONORS CAMDEN ATHLETES

### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of sharing a very special evening with members and friends of the Cramer Hill Boys' Club of Camden, N.J. On Saturday, May 8, the club held it's 27th annual sports banquet, where it recognized many of the community's young athletes.

The Cramer Hill Boys' Club is the oldest youth organization in the city of Camden. Incorporated in 1954, the club has been a leader in promoting neighborhood activities for its young people and enhancing civil responsibility and service to others. I am proud to have been a close observer and supporter of the club's work for many years.

Today the club serves between 350 and 400 Camden youth. For more than a quarter century the club has provided invaluable guidance and encouragement to many thousands of young people in scholastics, athletics, development of character, and community involvement.

Mr. Speaker, the Cramer Hill Boys' Club is composed of interested and thoughtful persons who are working hard to improve their community and their children's future. Anthony Iezzi is president. I know that my colleagues will want to join me in saluting the achievements of the Cramer Hill Boys' Club, and wishing them continued success. At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD the names of the young men and women who were awarded special recognition this month at the club's annual sports banquet.

Boy of the Year—Gerald Dorso
Girl of the Year—Joanne Graves

BASEBALL—MOST VALUABLE PLAYERS

Little League—Rodney Chandler
Minor League—Mike Rocabaldo
V.F.W. League (American Division)—Don Rocabaldo
V.F.W. League (National Division)—Michael Iezzi

SOFTBALL—MOST VALUABLE PLAYERS

Age 10-12—Margaret Iezzi
Age 13-15—Terry Ayers
Age 15-18—Beth Mandruck

BASKETBALL—MOST VALUABLE PLAYERS

Age 13-15—Michael Hadley
Age 16-18—Lou Simpson

FOOTBALL—MOST VALUABLE PLAYERS

Chris Broccoli (70 lbs. division)
Al Alfred (85 lbs. division)
Joe Edwards (110 lbs. division)
James Weathers (130 lbs. division)

CHEERLEADING

Robin Gant, Bridgette Getts, Cindy Genery, Terry Collins●

## THE NEW ILLITERACY

### HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most alarming trends of recent years concerns the declining capabilities of American students in the maths and sciences. At a meeting last week of the National Academy of Sciences, stern warnings were sounded over the fact that greater and greater proportions of students are graduating American high schools despite the fact that they are scientifically and technologically illiterate. Our science and math education compares sorrowfully with what is afforded to students in the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, East Germany, and Japan.

The specter of an American populace ill-equipped to deal with the worldwide technological boom is truly frightening. Our ability to make educated decisions in an increasingly technological society, our ability to form a productive economic base which can provide jobs and our ability to insure a strong national defense all vitally depend upon adequate educational preparation.

If we are going to insure a defense system in which soldiers can operate sophisticated weaponry, and a civilian economic system in which there is an adequate supply of technologically competent men and women, and a political system where everyone participates in decisionmaking, we cannot have scientific know-how in the hands of a select few. The scientific training must be broadly disseminated to all of our Nation's citizens.

I commend to my colleagues the following two editorials from the May 16, 1982, Washington Post. These prescient essays describe in greater detail the crisis we face in the area of scientific and technological preparation of our Nation's youth:

FALLING BEHIND IN MATH AND SCIENCE

(By Paul DeHart Hurd)

The fastest growing minority group in the United States is the scientifically and technologically illiterate. Chances are that if you know a young person finishing high school this spring, he or she is part of it.

Of the 25 instructional hours available in a school week, elementary school children get an average one hour of science and less than four of arithmetic. In junior high, students continue math, but most don't start algebra until the 9th grade, and then only two-thirds of 9th graders do so. The science program is mixed up, with few opportunities to explore a science or engineering topic in any systematic way.

Only 34 percent of our 3 million annual high school graduates have completed three years of math. Only 8 percent complete a course in calculus—only 31 percent of the high schools even teach calculus. Most seniors have had a biology course, a little over a third have had chemistry. Physics is a part of this sequence for perhaps as few as 10 percent.

Three successive nationwide assessments have shown a decline in achievement in science. Two assessments of mathematics have shown a negligible decline in mathematics learning in elementary schools, but the decline increased for 13-year-olds and was greatest for 17-year-olds. The mean score in mathematics on the Scholastic Aptitude Test dropped from 502 in 1963 to 466 in 1980. The proportion of students who scored at the highest level declined by 15 percent between 1967 and 1975, while the lowest scoring groups grew by 38 percent. There has been a 70 percent increase in remedial math courses in public four-year colleges over the last five years.

There is one bright spot: in the 1970s the number of students taking advanced placement examinations more than doubled. If we can assume that these are the students best qualified to pursue scientific and technical careers, our schools are generating a talent pool of some 50,000 students each year. Even if this number were sufficient to provide us with our future researchers and professional engineers—and no one knows if it is—it would still leave our country without other scientifically knowledgeable young people.

There is a critical shortage of qualified science and mathematics teachers. During the 1970s, we experienced a 77 percent decline in the number of secondary school mathematics teachers being trained and a 65 percent decline in science teachers. Of those trained, more and more are leaving teaching for business or industry. Nationwide this school year, 50 percent of the teachers employed by high schools to teach mathematics and science were unqualified and are now teaching with emergency certificates.

Compare science and mathematics education in the United States with that in the Soviet Union, East Germany, China and Japan:

Their school years average 240 days, and absences, considered a family responsibility, are minimal. Typically, our school year is scheduled for 180 days but shrinks to 160 because of absences.

Their schools have a five-and-a-half or six-day school week and a six- to eight-hour school day. Our children attend school four to five hours a day, five days a week.

Their school vacations are short and dispersed to minimize interferences with the learning sequence. Our children have a three-month intellectual vacation in the summer.

Each of the four countries has a national educational policy emphasizing the importance of science and mathematics to economic and cultural progress. We have no such policy.

As with our own, children abroad begin instruction in science and arithmetic in elementary school. Specially trained teachers take over science and mathematics in grade four. For the most part, our elementary school children have one teacher for all subjects throughout the first six years, and sometimes the first eight years.

Specialized study begins for children in other countries in the sixth grade with separate courses in mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics and geography. Each course

extends over a period of four to six years. These courses are required of all students. The time spent on these subjects, based on class hours, is approximately three times that of even the most science-oriented students in the United States.

But at no time do the course requirements in science and mathematics in those countries exceed what is allocated to the social sciences, humanities and languages. Indeed foreign language study—usually English—is encouraged to make it possible for students to tap the world's largest resource of scientific and technical information—ours. There are more students and adults learning English in China than there are English-speaking people in the United States.

Russia requires precollege science teachers to carry out a research project in their major field before they may teach in a secondary school. Each of the four countries has provisions for continuing programs of in-service education. Local colleges and universities are expected to assume much of this responsibility. Members of the Academy of Sciences in each of the countries share a responsibility for keeping curriculum materials up to date and socially valid.

None of these comparisons means we should do the same. But they do tell us that other countries recognize the importance of science and mathematics to meeting future economic challenges and that they succeed in encouraging a large percentage of students to pursue careers in science, mathematics and engineering, and in generating a supportive citizenry for scientific endeavors. I am not sure we are doing the same.

Among the developed and developing countries throughout the world there is widespread recognition of the importance of science and technology in fostering human welfare and in meeting the economic and political demands of living in the 20th century and beyond. For the United States to meet these demands will require a knowledgeable and concerned public as well as specialists in the generation of scientific knowledge and technological innovations. A commitment to precollege education in the sciences, in technology and in mathematics must be made by the American public.

THE NEW ILLITERACY

Prof. Paul Hurd outlines a frightening national trend on today's op-ed page. American precollege students are heading toward scientific and technological illiteracy in a world where security and prosperity increasingly depend on science and technology. Dr. Hurd presented his warning to a convocation at the National Academy of Sciences last week.

At the meeting, educators told of steadily declining student achievement in mathematics and the sciences and of less demanding and more out-of-date curricula. School administrators confirmed an appalling shortage of science and mathematics teachers. The superintendent of Houston's public schools reported that thousands of students had graduated without ever having had a qualified math or science teacher.

Representatives of industry, both the new high-technology companies and the traditional "smokestack" industries, warned that they are already unable to find workers sufficiently trained and comfortable with mathematics and technology, and that their need for such workers is going to grow steadily. The secretary of defense linked the problem directly to national security because of manpower needs in both the armed services and defense industries. Numerous speakers reminded the audience that its literate work force has been a traditional advantage of the U.S. economy since the beginning of the industrial age.

Specialists reported that while science and mathematics education has been allowed to fall into decline in the United States, it is being accorded the highest priority elsewhere. Prof. Hurd illustrates some of the ominous differences between this and other countries. Yet even more than in those other societies, democracy demands that citizens understand the choices they have to make. A very small number of American students are being well prepared for careers in science and engineering, but nearly everyone else—about 98 percent of high school graduates—is leaving school as a functional illiterate in these fields in effect denied full citizenship.

Twenty-five years ago, Sputnik galvanized the United States into the realization that it had fallen way behind. This time, there is no single foreign threat—at least not yet—though the problem may be worse. Last time, there was an immediate federal response and the programs worked, until funding and attention dissipated in the late '60s. This time, there is little or no federal money available and a disinclination to look toward Washington for a solution.

Certainly the solution will require the efforts of nearly every sector of society. But the first question that needs to be answered is whether an enterprise run by 16,000 independent and underfunded school districts, with 95,000 directors (school board members) who have a 20 percent annual turnover, can do what is required without concerted leadership and money from Washington.●

## REVEREND GRAHAM AND THE SOVIET PEACE OFFENSIVE

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as the Second Special Session on Disarmament at the United Nations nears, a crescendo of rhetoric and media hype builds so as to culminate on June 12. On that date a mass demonstration is scheduled in support of a nuclear freeze—if not unilateral Western disarmament, and acceptance of the Soviet peace proposals as enunciated at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union last year.

It has long been an aim to legitimize support for such pro-Soviet policies through the use of well-meaning citizens in this country and Europe. One particular group sought after has been the clergy. Their deep concerns for peace and brotherhood have often led to support of actions which in the long term would aid Soviet foreign policy objectives. The most recent example of this can be seen in the Reverend Billy Graham's visit to Moscow and the reception he received from the Soviet authorities.

I strongly commend to the attention of my colleagues Mr. John F. Burns' article in the May 16, 1982, New York Times, entitled "Soviet Peace Charade Is Less Than Convincing," as an example of Soviet manipulation of the press and clergy in this country and Europe. The article follows:

SOVIET PEACE CHARADE IS LESS THAN CONVINCING

(By John F. Burns)

Moscow.—When the Rev. Billy Graham departed last week it seemed clear that his sojourn here would be remembered in the West mainly for his observations about the degree of religious freedom he found during his six-day stay. But the value of his visit for the Kremlin probably lay less in the evangelist's generous view of the state-controlled churches than in his attendance at a conference promoting the Soviet "peace" campaign, a curious bowdlerization of the movement against nuclear weapons that has been gathering momentum in the West.

Though the forms the Soviet movement has adopted are a deft facsimile of its Western counterparts, only the most credulous could equate them. The Kremlin campaign has its rallies and its slogans, and its polemicists have shown understanding of the oral and spiritual concerns that underpin Western antinuclear protests. But there is nothing impartial about the Soviet version, no propensity to look for fault at home. As in everything of consequence in Soviet life, the Kremlin has imposed its monopoly.

American clerics, who remained at the conference after Mr. Graham left, fought successfully for an amendment to its communique that added an approving reference to President Reagan's agreement to open strategic arms talks to the otherwise pro-Soviet text. But the concession seemed unlikely to perturb the Russians, who seem well-organized to keep the peace issue running their way; elaborate peace programs have been a staple of Soviet foreign policy since Lenin. The current Soviet peace committee apparatus was established in 1950 and the committee has served as a conduit for Soviet influence in the World Peace Council in Helsinki, a faithful supporter of Soviet positions. With the advent of the Reagan Administration and the resurgence of the nuclear issue in Western European politics, the committee has assumed new importance.

Its recently named chairman is 73-year-old Yuri A. Zhukov, a senior Pravda commentator who presides in a shiny new steel-and-glass headquarters complete with conference hall, film theater and a staff of 100. It operates 120 branches whose reach can be judged by their success in obtaining 180 million signatures in the 1976 "Stockholm appeal" for an end to the arms race, and by the recent marshaling of six million letters to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from young Russians protesting plans to deploy new American missiles in Europe. The committee budget comes from popular contributions and activities such as the "peace shifts" that were worked in thousands of factories last weekend to mark the 37th anniversary of the end of World War II.

HELPING PEACE MOVEMENTS ALONG

Demonstrating its total control, the peace committee held protest meetings and rallies last week and was able to announce in advance how many people would attend each event—for example, "a meeting with antiwar slogans in Brest Fortress—40,000 people." To nobody's surprise, the meetings

produced "spontaneous" denunciations of President Reagan's policies on nuclear missiles, the neutron bomb and chemical weapons, which could have been clipped from Pravda.

The committee publishes no accounts, but some of its largesse evidently has been bestowed on Europeans opposing the Western alliance plan to deploy new missiles as a counterbalance to Soviet SS-20's. Moscow has ridiculed President Reagan and NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns for suggesting the link, but a Norwegian group, Art for Peace, acknowledged receiving Soviet financial help for a "peace meeting" last year and the Danish representative on the World Peace Council came under investigation after $45,000 was found hidden in a cupboard in his home. A Soviet diplomat in Copenhagen was declared persona non grata for activities that included contacts with the Danish peace campaign and a Tass correspondent was expelled from Holland for his contacts with the Dutch antinuclear movement.

The Soviet agent's help probably amounts to little more than a jog in the direction that the protestors would have gone anyway. More intriguing is Mr. Zhukov's assertion that his committee is independent of the Soviet Government. That its policies happen to be identical with the Kremlin's, he said, is no wonder, since it is the Soviet leadership that is "objectively" pushing for peace.

Similar circular arguments were expressed in an October 1980 article in Voprosy Filosofii, a Soviet Academy of Sciences journal, by Maj. Gen. Arsenii F. Milovidov, dean of philosophy at the Lenin Military-Political Academy. He argued that nuclear missiles were "fearsome weapons of war" in imperialist hands but "a shield for peace" in the Communist armory.

Of late, there have been signs of anxiety that the emphasis on peace may have gone too far, and that encouragement of European protests could backfire by stimulating similar manifestations in Moscow. How unwelcome that would be was demonstrated last month when European visitors who attempted to unfurl a disarmament banner in Red Square were thrown to the ground by K.G.B. security agents and hauled off for interrogation.

Kremlin worries that popular feelings may yet erupt have shown up in warnings about what the newspaper Sovietskaya Rossiya called "toothless pacifism." The newspaper did not have to explain that in parks in Moscow and other Soviet cities, young people gather with guitars and sing peace songs, including some borrowed from the American antiwar movement of the 1960's. In a booklet entitled "Always Ready to Defend the Fatherland," Marshal Nikolai V. Ogarkov, chief of staff of the armed forces, lamented that two generations of Soviet people have grown up since World War II "not knowing what war is" and consequently adopting "easy-going attitudes and carelessness." Such attitudes, the marshal said, were "a dangerous phenomenon, fraught with grave consequences" that should be eradicated by the party and the Young Communist League by all possible means.●

## AMENDMENTS TO THE FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION

### HON. WYCHE FOWLER, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a brief summary of three amendments I hope to offer to House Concurrent Resolution 345, the first concurrent resolution on the budget, and to the Michel substitute to House Concurrent Resolution 345.

### AMENDMENT SUMMARIES: AMENDMENT NO. 1—PROVIDE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

[In billions of dollars]

| Function and description | Change in— BA [1] | Outlays |
|---|---|---|
| 050—National defense | −4.10 | −1.80 |
| 270—Energy | +.19 | +.10 |
| 500—Education, training, employment, and social services | +2.20 | +1.70 |
| Total | −1.71 | |
| **AMENDMENT NO. 2—INVEST IN OUR FUTURE** | | |
| 250—General science, space, and technology | +0.50 | +0.46 |
| 300—Natural resources and environment | −1.90 | −1.90 |
| 350—Agriculture | +.60 | −.35 |
| 400—Transportation | +.05 | +.05 |
| 500—Education, training, employment and social services | +1.15 | +.85 |
| Total | +0.40 | −0.89 |
| **AMENDMENT NO. 3—MAINTAIN BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE/ESTABLISH REAL FEDERALISM** | | |
| 300—Natural resources and environment | | |
| 370—Commerce and housing credit | +4.80 | +.70 |
| 400—Transportation | −7.90 | −7.98 |
| 750—Administration of justice | +.08 | +.08 |
| Total | −3.02 | −7.20 |

[1] Budget authority.

### AMENDMENT NO. 1—PROVIDE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

[In billions of dollars]

| Function and program | Change in— BA [1] | Outlays |
|---|---|---|
| 050—Cancel MX program, except for $200 million R. & D. program for additional study of survivable basing modes (including sea basing) | −4.00 | −1.70 |
| 050—Slow growth in defense atomic energy activities to reflect cancellation of MX program | −.10 | −.10 |
| 270—Eliminate funding for Clinch River Breeder Reactor | −.21 | −.20 |
| 270—Add funding for research and development for solar and renewable energy, and fossil fuels and for energy conservation | +.20 | +.10 |
| 270—Add funding for strategic petroleum reserve (construction and oil purchases), all to be included on-budget | +.20 | +.20 |
| 500—Add funding for job training by adopting community partnership for employment and training program to replace CETA and to be funded at a level of $5 billion | +2.20 | +1.70 |
| Total | −1.71 | |

[1] Budget authority.

### AMENDMENT NO. 2—INVEST IN OUR FUTURE

[In billions of dollars]

| Function and program | Change in— BA [1] | Outlays |
|---|---|---|
| 250—Increase funding for National Science Foundation (to upgrade scientific equipment and instrumentation, and to fund science and engineering education and minority institutions science improvement programs at fiscal year 1981 levels | +0.15 | +0.13 |

### AMENDMENT NO. 2—INVEST IN OUR FUTURE—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

| Function and program | Change in— BA [1] | Outlays |
|---|---|---|
| 250—Increase funding for NASA to provide for the following programs: mission operations and research analysis, 30/20 GH$_z$ communications satellite demonstration, solar electric propulsion system, Venus orbiting imaging radar; comet rendezvous, and Shuttle/Centaur launch of Galileo mission | +.35 | +.33 |
| 300—Increase funding for land and water conservation fund, historic preservation, and urban parks | +.10 | +.10 |
| 300—Increase funding for EPA operations with additions concentrated in the fields of drinking water, air and water quality, and hazardous wastes | +.40 | +.40 |
| 300—Reduce funding for water resources program by ending Federal support for least cost-effective project construction in fiscal year 1983. Move to $3.5 billion block grant in fiscal year 1984. (See amendment No. 3) | −.40 | +.40 |
| 300—Impose additional user fees for national resources to more fully recover costs to the Federal Government. Target areas include livestock grazing, ocean dumping, hardrock mineral production, irrigation, deep draft ports usage, improved collection of Federal royalty payments | −2.00 | −2.00 |
| 350—Provide financial incentives for producers of surplus commodities who reduce acreage planted and employ qualified land conservation practices | +.50 | +.45 |
| 350—Increase funding for Agricultural Research and Services (including research, extension, and animal and health programs) | +.10 | +.10 |
| 350—Gradually reduce dairy price support levels to bring supply more into line with projected demand | | −.90 |
| 400—Increase funding for NASA aeronautical research and technology program | +.05 | +.05 |
| 500—Increase funding for elementary and secondary education programs (education for the disadvantaged, education for the handicapped) | +.90 | +.60 |
| 500—Increase funding for higher education programs (Pell grants, college work study) | +.25 | +.25 |
| Total | +40 | +.89 |

[1] Budget authority.

### AMENDMENT NO. 3—MAINTAIN BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE/ ESTABLISH REAL FEDERALISM

[In billions of dollars]

| Function and program | Change in— BA [1] | Outlays |
|---|---|---|
| 300—Establish block grant for water resources program in fiscal year 1984 and fund at $3.5 billion. States would be able to use their allocation for all programs currently funded under this account plus urban water system maintenance. States would be allowed to carry forward their allocations to future years | | |
| 370—Establish temporary mortgage interest rate subsidy program for purchases of single family homes in order to make homeownership more affordable, and to stimulate the depressed housing industry | +3.50 | +.70 |
| 370—Establish multifamily rental housing construction block grant program, targeted to areas of low vacancy and to low income households | +1.30 | |
| 400—Turn back Federal highway programs (and the revenues to finance them) to State governments. Remove highway programs from the Federal budget and levy an additional 10 cents/gallon motor fuels excise tax that would be returned to State governments to fund highway construction and maintenance at an annual national level of about $11 billion | −8.50 | −8.30 |
| 400—Block grant, and increase funding for federal mass transit assistance to qualifying local governments | +.30 | .12 |
| 400—Increase funding for airports and airways programs and reject defederalization of major airports | +.10 | +.10 |
| 400—Increase funding for the Coast Guard to better enable it to accomplish its missions, including environmental protection and drug enforcement | +.20 | +.10 |
| 750—Increase law enforcement grants to State and local governments for selected successful anticrime programs | +.08 | +.08 |
| Total | −3.02 | −7.20 |

[1] Budget authority.●

## THE EXPORT TRADING COMPANY ACT

### HON. THOMAS F. HARTNETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, with unemployment at unacceptably high levels, this body must be on the lookout for ways to create new American jobs. At the same time, budget constraints dictate that we must find these jobs in such a way that we do not put a further burden on the taxpayers.

I commend to my colleagues a job-creating bill that accomplishes both of these goals. The Export Trading Company Act would create over 300,000 new American jobs—4,000 to 5,600 in South Carolina alone—by encouraging the development of effective and knowledgeable trade intermediaries to market American goods and services overseas.

Many American companies now produce goods and services that can be competitive with anything on the world market. The problem is that they lack the necessary expertise to develop the foreign markets. In addition, they are not in a financial position to assume the heavy risk involved.

Export trading companies would be in a position to provide the expertise, as well as provide the economies of scale necessary to reduce the risk to acceptable levels.

If these trading companies are so great, why have they not been developed before? The answer is that there are currently two areas of significant disincentives that have discouraged the formation of trading companies. First, small companies fear that any collaborative efforts will run afoul of antitrust laws, even though the activities occur outside the United States. The legislation under consideration by the House would provide for a "preclearance" of the proposed activities, and a certificate of review would be issued to insure that the companies' activities tended not to violate the antitrust laws.

Second, banks would be allowed to bring their considerable financial clout—with adequate safeguards for depositors—and international expertise to the trading companies.

Mr. Speaker, this is a first-class idea whose timing could not be better. I urge my colleagues to give this bill their strong support.●

## REV. WALTER J. VETRO OF BROOKLYN, N.Y.

### HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will join me in commending and congratulating Rev. Walter J. Vetro, of Brooklyn, N.Y., as he celebrates his 40th anniversary in the priesthood on May 23.

Born in New York City, Reverend Vetro has served as the pastor of St. Nicholas Roman Catholic Church in Brooklyn for the past 10 years. Reverend Vetro earned his degree as bachelor of sacred theology at the Gregorian University of Rome, Italy, in 1940. He also possesses a master's degree in science in education on the level of administration and supervision, as a graduate of St. John's University, New York in 1962.

Reverend Vetro is the chairman of the board of directors of the St. Nicholas Neighborhood Preservation and Housing Rehabilitation Corp. He also serves as the vice chairman of the board of the Jennings Hall Senior Citizen Housing Development Fund Corp. and is a member of the community planning board No. 1 in Brooklyn. In addition to his outstanding service in the community, Reverend Vetro is the chairman of the Brooklyn Diocesan Council for the administration of church properties and chairman of the board of directors of the Pastoral Institute for the continuing education of clergy and religious of the Diocese of Brooklyn. Reverend Vetro has demonstrated an exceptional zeal, not only in his religious calling, but in the field of community development and housing, for which a testimonial is being sponsored by the 40th anniversary committee, whose members include St. Nicholas Church trustees, parish organizers and clergy associates, business associates and friends. Mr. Joseph Farco is the committee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this exceptionally dedicated spiritual and community leader in the Greenpoint-Williamsburg neighborhood of Brooklyn, Rev. Walter J. Vetro, is worthy of our highest praise as he achieves yet another milestone in his illustrious career.●

## PARRIS SUPPORTS PARK MEMORIAL

### HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, almost 50 years ago, in 1933, an innovative program was initiated by the U.S. Government under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. This program, the CCC—Civilian Conservation Corps—offered hope and opportunity to some 4.5 million Americans from 1933 to 1942. About 2 million of these individuals are active today and have formed the NACCCA, the National Association of Civilian Conservation Corps Alumni. A nonprofit organization organized in 1977, they have come to Capitol Hill to ask for congressional support for a very special effort. So you can appreciate their endeavor, let me first inform you of their goals. The objectives of the NACCCA are to recapture and preserve the history and accomplishments of the CCC, to help resolve problems of our growing senior population, to assist America's youth, and to beautify our countryside and our parks.

To asssist in accomplishing these worthwhile goals this organization has requested that Congress grant NACCCA the use of land in the Prince William Forest Park in Virginia for the purpose of establishing a museum, headquarters, and other buildings for use as a memorial to the Civilian Conservation Corps. This legislation will not represent any cost to the taxpayers since funds would come from private donations. The legislation also contains provisions which will assure that plans for the memorial are satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and that the authority to use the Prince William Forest Park land for memorial purposes shall lapse unless privately donated funds adequate to develop the memorial are available within 5 years. The operational costs of the memorial will be dereived from NACCCA funds.

The executive council and the memorial task force of the NACCCA had considered several locations and concluded that a site in the vicinity of the Nation's Capital and within a unit of the national park system would be most appropriate. The Prince William Forest Park offers a unique opportunity to commemorate the Civilian Conservation Corps and to make known to the public its history and accomplishments nationwide during the decade of its existence. Paramount in the opinion of the task force was: First, the Park's location about 30 miles from Washington with easy access from U.S. Interstate Highway 95; second, the presence of a CCC campsite with a variety of remains that could contribute to an understanding of what a typical CCC camp looked like; and third, the national symbolism provided by an attractive park, reforested and developed from submarginal farmland, largely by CCC personnel. Additionally, the site illustrates an accomplishment of the Recreational Areas Development Program, a New Deal agency responsible for acquiring the privately

owned farmlands which were incorporated in the park.

The interpretive program of the memorial would focus on the original CCC campsite, and a museum-history center constructed on lands adjacent to the campsite and on which would be located a parking area with easy access to existing park roads. Pedestrian paths would link the two major interpretive units.

The museum-history center would provide space for the perservation and use of objects and documents related to the CCC program and especially to the more than 2,500 camps originally located throughout the United States; a centrally located display telling the story of the Civilian Conservation Corps program, utilizing modern museum and interpretive techniques; the preservation for public use of plans for recreational facilities that were prepared in the CCC era; a small reference library of publications pertaining to the Civilian Conservation Corps, and facilities for the reception and comfort of visitors. In addition, the structure would contain office space for the National Association of CCC Alumni. It is anticipated that the Center would be used by scholars performing research and would encourage such use, as well as that of the general public.

The museum-history center structure will be designed so that its exterior will harmonize with the local environment. The interior design will emphasize the functional and will be reasonably modern in appearance, particularly where it is necessary to protect the items collected from excessive heat and humidity. Wherever possible, modern day energy concepts such as solar and wind energy would be used. The structure would be designed to permit future floor space expansion, if it should be required.

The original campsite would be developed either as a fullscale reproduction of the original buildings, or a restoration of the remains of the camp, plus such reconstruction as may be needed to develop the total story. The access paths to the site would be developed to conform in appearance to the local environment. Interpretive devices along the paths would explain facets and details of the story. If needs indicate it, a study would be made of such adaptive uses of the structures that would conform to national park policy and serve additionally to interpretation.

Should the needed legislation be approved, the association would launch a nationwide full scale fund raising drive, the purpose of which would be to raise the moneys needed for the total project, including the establishment of a fund for the operation and maintenance of the facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the National Association of Civilian Conservation Corps Alumni's worthwhile endeavor.●

## THE RULE OF THE LAW

### HON. WENDELL BAILEY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. BAILEY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I submit the attached remarks by Chief Justice Robert T. Donnelly delivered at the annual meeting of the committees of the Missouri bar in Jefferson City, Mo. on April 30, 1982, for inclusion in the RECORD:

Remarks of Chief Justice Robert T. Donnelly follow:

THE RULE OF THE LAW

As one who stems from a family of lawyers, I have an abiding devotion to The Rule of Law. Over the years I have become more and more disquieted by the progressive tendency of the Supreme Court of the United States to identify its moral convictions with constitutional imperatives, substituting the justices' personal predilections for the governing law. You may recall Justice Holmes' 1930 dissent in *Baldwin* v. *Missouri* in which he stated:

"I have not yet adequately expressed the more than anxiety that I feel at the ever increasing scope given to the Fourteenth Amendment in cutting down what I believe to be the constitutional rights of the States . . . I cannot believe that the Amendment was intended to give us carte blanche to embody our economic and moral beliefs in its prohibitions.[1]"

His successors have continued to identify their convictions with constitutional requirements. Justice Douglas disclosed in his autobiography that "the 'gut' reaction of a judge" [a]t the level of constitutional adjudications . . ." is the main ingredient of his decision.[2]

Concerned by this course of events, I delivered an address before the General Assembly of Missouri on January 7, 1982, the heart of which was that "even the United States Supreme Court should not be permitted to wield power it was never given." In response to my remarks, Senator Thomas Eagleton sought to align me with "opponents of rational thinking" who would "subvert the basic guarantees of our constitutional democracy;" with "jurisdiction strippers" who whould "toss aside the Constitution."[3]

He protests too much. And he accuses me unjustly—I do not question the benevolence of the Court's legislative efforts—I merely urge a rededication to to The Rule of Law.

In 1958, in *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, the Supreme Court asserted the power to amend the Constitution by judicial fiat: it declared its decisions the supreme law of the land and of binding effect on the States. On January 7, I proposed an amendment to Article V of the Constitution which would give a decision of the Court such stature only "when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States . . ." In a government derived from the consent of the governed, nothing is more important than the right of the people to govern themselves. In the words of Senator Eagleton, "the very survival of our constitutional democracy" is at stake.[4]

I do not yield to Senator Eagleton in my dedication to "the basic guarantees of our constitutional democracy."[5] Those guarantees rest upon a basic principle which he would ignore: ours is a government of "limited and defined powers."[6] In 1942, the Court stated that "courts possess no power not derived from the Constitution."[7] The Court confessed in *Ferguson* v. *Skrupa*[8] that it had gone out of bounds during the Lochner Era, saying:

"We have returned to the original constitutional proposition that courts do not substitute their social and economic beliefs for the judgment of legislative bodies, who are elected to pass laws."[9]

Unfortunately, the Court thereafter merely transferred its penchant for constitutional revision from the economic to the libertarian sphere, leading Professor Philip Kurland of the University of Chicago to say that "the most immediate constitutional crisis of our present time [is] the usurpation by the judiciary of general governmental powers on the pretext that is authority derives from the Fourteenth Amendment."[10]

Thus is posed the essential issue: has the Court usurped power? If it has, our system of checks and balances must provide a cure—otherwise the Court will be free to exercise illimitable power, contrary to the constitutional scheme.[11]

Let me therefore turn to judical usurpation. The watershed case was *Brown* v. *Board of Education*,[12] the desegregation decision, about which I wrote in 1979: it was inspired by "consecrated principles," by "decency and justice," but "[u]nfortunately, it also established a pattern for subsequent distortions of the judicial process."[13] It hardly needs argument to a body of lawyers that a Court may not overleap the bounds of its power in order to achieve a benign result. Substitution of "[an] individual sense of justice," Cardozo wrote, "might result in a benevolent despotism if judges were benevolent men. It would put an end to the reign of law."[14]

Was Brown authorized by the Fourteenth Amendment? A proponent of expansive judicial review, Professor Michael Perry of Ohio State University, recently observed that "the legislative history of the fourteenth amendment clearly discloses that the framers did not mean for the amendment to have any effect on segregated schools or segregation generally."[15] The desegregation decision represents, he indicates, the Court's displacement of the Framers' value choices by "a value judgment of its own."[16] Perry finds that "[t]here is no plausible textual or historical justification for constitutional policymaking by the judiciary," and that such policymaking "cannot be justified by reference either to the text or to the intention of the Framers of the Constitution."[17] Another activist, Professor Paul Brest of Stanford University, agrees that "[f]undamental rights adjudication is open to the criticism that it is not authorized and not guided by the text and original history of the Constitution,"[18] and he has been driven to maintain that the Judges are not bound by the Constitution.[19]

Among the grievious consequences of my point of view, Senator Eagleton asserts, is the threat to rights secured by the [Federal] Bill of Rights.[20] Chief Justice Marshall held in *Barron* v. *Baltimore*[21] that the Bill of Rights applied only to the federal government, not to the States. This holding is

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

supported by the First Amendment's language that "Congress shall make no law . . ." and is confirmed by legislative history.[22] For more than 160 years that was unchallenged learning until Justice Black, dissenting, propounded the theory that the Fourteenth Amendment "incorporated" the Bill of Rights en bloc,[23] a view never accepted by the Court.[24] Perry concluded that the Fourteenth Amendment did not incorporate the Bill of Rights, as was demonstrated "by such renowned historians as Charles Fairman and, more recently, by Leonard Levy," and "is amply documented and widely accepted."[25]

In place of Black's doctrine of wholesale incorporation, the Court proceeded to a process of piecemeal, selective incorporation. The result was, in the words of Justice Brennan, that "from 1962 to 1969 . . . the face of the law changed. Those years witnessed the extension to the states of nine of the specifics of the [Federal] Bill of Rights."[26] This "extension" was not authorized by an amendment; it was judicial construction without constitutional warrant. Professor Louis Henkin of Columbia University concluded that "selective incorporation finds no support in the language of the amendment, or in the history of its adoption."[27] One of the most respected federal judges, Judge Henry Friendly of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, wrote, "It appears undisputed that the selective incorporation theory" has no "historical support."[28]

Let me tick off a few other revisions of the Constitution by the Court. Although its overthrow of segregation was morally just, it was done in spite of the Framers' intention to leave segregation untouched by the Fourteenth Amendment. The "one person-one vote" doctrine contradicts what Justice Harlan stated was the "irrefutable" intention of the Framers to exclude suffrage from the scope of the Fourteenth Amendment.[29] *Shapiro* v. *Thompson*[30] held that the "right to travel," never satisfactorily located in the Constitution by the Court, carries with it the right of an indigent to immediate support at the terminus, overthrowing hundreds of years of English, colonial and State Law to the contrary and imposing back-breaking burdens on certain Eastern States overrun with indigent migrants.[31] *Furman* v. *Georgia*[32] called death penalties into question on the theory that they constitute "cruel and unusual punishments," notwithstanding that in the 100 years between 1689, when the English framed the phrase, and 1789, when it was adopted by the Founders, death penalties were inflicted both in England and the colonies. The death penalty was a commonplace of State law and was never questioned until 1972.[33] The issue, it bears emphasis, is not whether we are for or against death penalties, but whether the Court may deprive the people of the right to enact them.

What of the Court's alleged duty to bring the "cruel and unusual punishments" clause into harmony with more benign modern views? Should the Court be made the arbiter of morals on an issue upon which opinion is sharply divided? As an immediate reaction to Furman there was "a virtual stampede of State reenactments" of death penalties.[34] More important, Hamilton, the most vigorous proponent of judicial review, assured the Farmers in Federalist No. 78 that until the "people" changed the Constitution by amendment, it was binding, "and no presumption, or even knowledge of their sentiments, can warrant their representatives in a departure prior to such an act." A departure by the Court, on the basis of Justices' morals, was not even dreamed of. In our time, Justice Black dismissed "rhapsodical strains about the duty of the Court to keep the Constitution in tune with the times," pointing to the Framers' provision for change by amendment.[35] And Justice Harlan declared:

"When the Court disregards the express intent and understanding of the Framers, it has invaded the realm of the political process to which the amending power was committed, and it has violated the constitutional structure which it is its highest duty to protect."[36]

I am therefore in very good company when I protest against the Court's exercise of ungiven power.

It is a fact that my January 7 proposal was buried in a House Committee many weeks ago. However, if the Court has "violated" the Constitution, if it is acting in excess of its power, then there must be some remedy; for unlimited power is alien to our democratic system. One of the foremost proponents of expansive judicial review, Professor Charles Black of Yale University, considers the jurisdiction-limiting powers conferred on the Congress by Article III to be "the rock on which rests the legitmacy of the judicial work in a democracy." Indeed, Black declared, "I am not sure that I would defend as consistent with the postulates of democracy a system which really did put nine men, with life tenure, in an absolutely invulnerable position of final power. I am very sure that the designation of such a government as one of 'checks and balances' would be quite absurd."[37] Black concludes that "those people are very badly mistaken who think they strengthen the position of the Court by arguing that its jurisdiction is outside congressional control."[38]

From the beginning of the nation the Supreme Court recognized power in the Congress to limit the jurisdiction of the lower federal courts. Article III, § 1, provides that the judicial power shall be invested in "such inferior courts as the Congress may . . . ordain and establish." The Court early held that "although the judicial power has its origin in the Constitution" it is "dependent for its distribution . . . entirely upon the action of Congress, who possess the sole power" of investing the inferior courts "with jurisdiction . . . and of withholding jurisdiction from them" as Congress may deem "proper."[39] What Congress delegates it can withdraw.

Article III § 2, provides that the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction shall be subject to "such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." In 1810, Chief Justice Marshall declared that the Court's appellate powers "are limited and regulated by the judicial act.[40] He was referring to the Judiciary Act of 1789, enacted by the First Congress. Thus, the power of Congress to "limit" the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court received early recognition both from the Congress and the Court.

During the Reconstruction era the Court, in *Ex parte McCardle*,[41] affirmed Congress' power to withdraw its jurisdiction in a case involving the constitutionality of Reconstruction legislation, and this during the pendency of an appeal. Chief Justice Chase said, "[the] power [of the Congress] to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction [of this court] is given by express words."[42] And in 1881, Chief Justice Waite observed that the Supreme Court's appellate powers "always have been proper subjects of legislative control . . . [and] whole classes of cases [may] be kept out of the jurisdiction altogether."[43]

No case in the Supreme Court, to my knowledge, has questioned these cases. Certainly one who relies on these cases may not be dismissed as exhibiting a desire to "toss aside the Constitution." In the most charitable view, Senator Eagleton is unfamiliar with the case law, law that is incompatible with his charge that "jurisdiction stripping proposals are . . . unconstitutional as a matter of law," and are merely "disguised efforts to amend the Constitution."[44] Instead, it is he who would ignore the Constitution by reading out of it the unambiguous provisions for limitation by the Congress of federal court jurisdiction.

Respectable opinion holds that the school prayer and busing decisions, for example, represent judicial revision of the Constitution because the Bill of Rights does not apply to the States and because segregation was excluded from the scope of the Fourteenth Amendment. And it is even more plain that if the Court has acted unconstitutionally, there must be some remedy lest we be ruled by judicial despotism; and that a cure, as the Court has repeatedly recognized, is furnished by the power of Congress to limit the Court's jurisdiction under the provisions of Article III.

The tone of Senator Eagleton's critique suggests that it is lese majesty to question the decisions of the Court. Judges as different as Chief Justice Burger and Justices Douglas and Frankfurter insisted on their right to look behind decisions to the Constitution itself. Burger "categorically" rejected the "thesis that what the Court said lately controls over the Constitution,"[45] Douglas affirmed that a judge swore "to support and defend . . . [the Constitution] . . . not the gloss which his predecessors may have put upon it."[46] Frankfurter did the same.[47] I too claim the right to look at the Constitution for myself. Surely a State court judge may be permitted to point out that both the Founders and the Framers of the Fourteenth Amendment were deeply attached to State sovereignty. Roscoe Conkling, a member of the Joint Committee for Reconstruction, said in 1866 that the proposal to limit State denial of suffrage "encounters a great objection on the threshold. It trenches upon the principle of existing local sovereignty."[48] That principle was delineated by Madison in Federalist No. 39: "[the federal] jurisdiction extends to certain enumerated objects only, and leaves to the several States a residuary and in violable sovereignty over all other objects."[49] His assurance was fortified by the Tenth Amendment's expressed reservation to the States of all powers not delegated to the federal government. Those expressed reservations ought not to be neutered by resort to what the activists themselves label as the "inscrutable," "obscure," and "indeterminate" terms of the Fourteenth Amendment.[50]

I would not deny those who seek change the right to alter the Constitution, but would insist that the exclusive medium of change is amendment by the people, not the Justices. I agree with Washington who said, "let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."[51] Self-government, not rule by Platonic Guardians, is crucial for the survival of a democracy, and it can only be assured by clinging to *The Rule of Law*, which

is not to be confused with assertions of "morality" on the part of the Justices. Those who under the aegis of moral imperatives, espouse more than a *restraining role* for the Court, preach false doctrine. To borrow from Thomas Huxley: "The *foundation* of morality is to have done, once and for all, with lying." [52] (italics mine).

I have been asked: Why, as you enter the twilight of your life, did you deliberately expose yourself to the distortions and vilification which you must have known would follow the giving of the speech to the Missouri General Assembly? There are at least two reasons: The first is that "[o]nly when the people understand that it is the Justices, not the Constitution that require [extravagant intrusions into their lives] . . . will they be moved to reassert their right to self-government." [53] The other is that I do not wish to die with music left in me. Thank you very much.

FOOTNOTES

[1] 281 U.S. 586, 595 (1930) (Holmes, J., dissenting).
[2] Douglas recounts that when he came on the bench, Chief Justice Hughes told him, "you must remember one thing. At the constitutional level . . . ninety percent of a decision is emotional. The rational part of us supplies the reason for supporting our predilections." W. O. Douglas, The Court Years 1939-1975, 8 (1981).
[3] Remarks on the floor of the United States Senate in Senate Press Release, March 17, 1982, pp. 1 and 2.
[4] *Id.*, at 8.
[5] *Id.*, 1.
[6] Loan Association at Topeka, 87 U.S. (20 Wall.) 655, 663 (1874). Chief Justice Marshall declared that the government "can exercise only the powers granted to it . . ." McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 405 (1829).
[7] Ex parte Quirin, 317 U.S. 1, 25 (1942).
[8] 372 U.S. 726 (1963).
[9] *Id.*, at 730.
[10] Quoted on dust jacket of *R. Berger, Government by Judiciary: The Transformation of the Fourteenth Amendment* (1977).
[11] See comments of Charles Black, *infra* in text corresponding to notes 37-38.
[12] 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
[13] Baker v. State, 584 S.W.2d 65, 70 (Donnelly, J., dissenting).
[14] *Benjamin N. Cardozo, The Nature of the Judicial Process* 136 (1937).
[15] Perry, *Interpretivism, Freedom of Expression, and Equal Protection*, 42 Ohio St.L.J. 261, 292 (1981).
[16] *Id.*, at 293.
[17] *Id.*, at 275.
[18] Brest, *The Fundamental Rights Controversy: Essential Contradictions of Normative Constitutional Scholarship*, 90 Yale L.J. 1063, 1987.
[19] Brest, *The Misconceived Quest For the Original Understanding*, 60 B.U.L. Rev. 204, 224 (1980).
[20] Eagleton remarks, *supra* n. 3, at 5-6.
[21] 32 U.S. (7 Pet.) 243 (1833).
[22] Perry, *supra* n. 15, at 291, n. 122.
[23] Adamson v. California, 332 U.S. 46, 74 (1947) (Black, J., dissenting).
[24] So Justice Black acknowledged in Betts v. Brady, 316 U.S. 455, 474 (1942) (Black, J., dissenting); *see* Henkin, *"Selective Incorporation" in the Fourteenth Amendment*, 73 Yale L.J. 74, 74-75 (1963).
[25] Perry, *supra* n. 15, at 285-286.
[26] Brennan, *State Constitutions and the Protection of Individual Rights*, 90 Harv. L. Rev. 489, 493 (1977).
[27] Henkin, *supra* n. 24, at 77.
[28] Friendly, *The Bill of Rights as a Code of Criminal Procedure*, 53 Calif. L. Rev. 929, 934, 935 (1965).
[29] Harlan charged in Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479, 501 (1965), (Harlan, J., concurring), that the reapportionment decisions were "made in the face of irrefutable and still unanswered history to the contrary . . ." Professor Louis Lusky is of the same opinion, Lusky, Book Review, 6 Hastings Con.L.Q., 403, 406 (1979).
[30] 394 U.S. 618 (1969).
[31] Berger, *Residence Requirements for Welfare and Voting: A Post Mortem*, 42 Ohio St.L.J. 853 (1982).
[32] 408 U.S. 238 (1972).
[33] *R. Berger, Death Penalties: The Supreme Court's Obstacle Course* (to be published in the Fall of 1982).
[34] *J. Ely, Democracy and Distrust* 65 (1980).
[35] Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479, 522 (1965) (Black, J., dissenting).
[36] Oregon v. Mitchell, 400 U.S. 112, 203 (1970) (Harlan, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part).
[37] Perry, *Noninterpretivist Review in Human Rights Cases: A Functional Justification*, 56 N.Y.U.L.Rev. 278, 332 (1981).
[38] *Id.*, at 334, n. 213.
[39] Cary v. Curtis, 44 U.S. (3 How.) 236, 245 (1845); *see also* Lockerty v. Phillips, 319 U.S. 182 (1943).
[40] Durousseau v. United States, 10 U.S. (6 Cranch) 307, 314 (1810).
[41] 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 506 (1868).
[42] *Id.* at 514.
[43] The "Francis Wright", 105 U.S. 381, 396 (1881).
[44] Eagleton remarks, *supra* n. 3, at 2, 1.
[45] Coleman v. Alabama, 399 U.S. 1, 22-23 (1970) (Burger, C.J., dissenting).
[46] Douglas, *Stare Decisis*, 49 Colum.L.Rev. 735, 736 (1949).
[47] Graves v. New York ex rel. O'Keefe, 306 U.S. 466, 491-492 (1939) (Frankfurter, J., concurring). "[T]he ultimate touchstone of constitutionality is the Constitution itself and not what we have said about it."
[48] Berger, *supra* n. 10, at 61; for the Founders *see id.*, 60-64; and *R. Berger, Congress v. The Supreme Court* 260-262 (1969).
[49] The pervasive attachment to federalism, *i.e.*, State control of local institutions, Philip Paludan repeatedly emphasizes, was "the most potent institutional obstacle to the Negroes' hope for protected liberty." Berger, *supra* n. 10, at 155.
[50] *J. Ely, Democracy and Distrust* 98 (1981) ["inscrutable"]; Mendelson, Book Review, 6 Hastings Con.L.Q. 437, 451 (1979) ["obscure"]; Professor Paul Brest refers to the "indeterminacy" of the equal protection clause. Brest, *supra* n. 18, at 234, n. 115.
[51] 35 *George Washington, Writings* 228-229 (J. Fitzpatrick ed. 1940).
[52] H. T. Mencken, *Treatise of Right and Wrong* 197 (1934).
[53] R. Berger, *Residence Requirements for Welfare and Voting: A Post-Mortem*, 42 Ohio St.L.J. 853, 877 (1981).●

## MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION ACT OF 1982

### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a parent or legal guardian to deduct certain expenses incurred in connection with their child's required medical treatment.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, only transportation costs are clearly defined as medical deductions in those cases when a parent must accompany a severely ill child to a medical facility for treatment.

The purpose of my legislation is to expand the availability of medical deductions by allowing a parent or legal guardian to deduct certain living expenses, that is meals and lodging, for themselves and their dependent child, who is receiving medical attention as an outpatient.

While my bill does not attempt to deal with every hypothetical situation that may occur, I am hopeful that it will prompt discussion among my colleagues in the Congress who need to focus attention on this most important issue.

Although I clearly recognize that we are living in austere times, I firmly believe this Congress should enact this compassionate legislation. In the last several years, our Tax Code has become replete with deductions and credits for such things as adoption fees and child care expenses. While these are certainly well-meaning programs, I cannot think of a more deserving group of individuals, for this type of tax treatment, than those parents or guardians who are facing the crushing economic burden as well as the psychological strain of watching their child suffer from a debilitating disease.

In my own city of Houston, we are extremely fortunate to have one of the finest facilities for cancer treatment and, for that matter, many other major diseases. As a result, many people from all over the Nation travel to Houston so that their children may receive cancer treatment, chemotherapy, and radiation. While this treatment does not necessarily require full-time hospitalization, it may require treatment administered on an outpatient basis which calls for extended periods of time away from home.

As a result, a parent or guardian may find his or her living expenses reaching an interolerable level and may be faced with the unenviable prospect of abandoning the child or suffering financial insolvency. I do not believe these individuals, at a time of personal crisis, should be forced to make such a decision.

Additionally, I believe it has been clearly demonstrated at hospitals, like those in Houston, that these parents and legal guardians not only provide irreplaceable comfort to these young children, but actually assist in their child's medical care by insuring a proper diet, by providing medication, by assisting in physical therapy, and by generally attending to their emotional needs which is so important to the overall success of their medical treatment.

At a child's most critical moment of need, upon entering the hospital or as an outpatient, a parent or guardian can and does make the difference between a stable period of medical treatment and one of unquestionable anxiety.

My bill is an attempt to utilize the Tax Code to assist these parents or guardians, at this critical time, in a realistic manner. For instance, by bill only allows one parent or a guardian to deduct their living expenses; it limits deductability for those children under the age of 18; it restricts availability to expenses incurred outside one's hometown; and it encourages the

affected individuals to maintain accurate records of their living expenses and those of their child.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation which will clarify our Tax Code so that a parent or guardian may deduct living expenses on those unfortunate occasions when it is necessary for them to accompany their severely ill child to a medical facility for required medical treatment.

I urge the adoption of the Medical Expense Deduction Act of 1982.●

## LEGISLATION AMENDING THE AT-RISK RULE FOR THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

### HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to amend one of the technical rules in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (ERTA) extended the at-risk rule in the tax law to apply as a condition for claiming the investment tax credit (ITC). Thus, a person generally will receive an ITC only with respect to that portion of the property's basis for which he is at risk. Previously, the at-risk rule only applied as a condition for claiming depreciation deductions.

The term "at-risk" generally means that the taxpayer must be personally liable on loans used to finance the purchase of the property for which he is claiming a tax benefit. Thus, taxpayers who use nonrecourse loans may jeopardize some of the tax benefits on the property so financed.

A principal objective of this provision was to curb the overvaluation of tax shelter property. However, one unfortunate side effect is that legitimate, active businesses may be caught up in such broad antitax shelter measures. This fact first was recognized when the original at-risk rule for depreciation was established. The at-risk rule for depreciation provides an exception for active equipment leasing businesses.

The ERTA ITC at-risk rule provides an exception for a person who is at least 20 percent at risk and who borrows from an unrelated financial institution. This limited expection is helpful but it does not go far enough in accommodating active business operations.

In particular the situation of active subchapter S corporations requires further attention. The issue is whether each subchapter S shareholder must independently satisfy the at-risk rule or whether the at-risk loans of the subchapter S corporation will be imputed to the shareholders. Under prior law the ITC generated by a subchapter S corporation was allocated to the respective shareholders in a manner proportionate to their ownership interests. Some persons maintain that ERTA sought to allow for a comparable allocation of at-risk loans made to a subchapter S corporation among the shareholders in section 46(c)(8)(C). Other persons maintain that such a broad interpretation of section 46(c)(8)(C) would undercut the antitax shelter objective of the ITC at-risk rule. That is, they maintain that an expansive interpretation of section 46(c)(8)(C) would go beyond accommodating active businesses and provide a means for tax shelter participants to circumvent the ITC at-risk rule.

My current objective is to provide a limited accommodation in the ITC at-risk rule for active subchapter S corporations without casting a judgment on the extent to which section 46(c)(8)(C) applies to subchapter S corporations. The proposed legislation is modeled on section 465(c)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code which provides an exception to the depreciation at-risk rule for active, equipment leasing businesses. The legislation provides that the at-risk loans of an active subchapter S corporation in the automobile leasing business will be allocated among the shareholders in a manner similar to their ownership interests. Thus, the owners of automobile leasing companies with substantial operations will be allocated part of the corporation's at-risk loans for purposes of meeting the ERTA ITC at-risk rule. The result is that the operators of legitimate, active automobile leasing companies will not have their ITC jeopardized by sweeping at-risk rules which were intended to curb unproductive tax shelters.●

## MIDDLESEX ELEMENTARY SCHOOL VISIT TO OUR NATION'S CAPITOL

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 19, 1982, 32 young men and women from the Middlesex Elementary School, Essex, Md., will journey to Washington for a first-hand look at their Nation's Capitol.

The students, led by parents and teachers, will tour the Capitol, the White House, and Mt. Vernon.

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

Students visiting us Wednesday are: Stacy Asbury, Eric Bates, Doug Boyer, Joey Cook, Bridgette Fleming, Randy Helton, Jennifer Iglehart, Dawn Pahl, Beth Ritterbusch, Dina Schenning, Janice Suehs, Drew Williams, Scott Wood, Mike Ayres, Ricky Stokes, Nicole Bocam, James Bryant, Michele Buckler, Steven Clark, Toby Hall, Tammy Paris, Denise Paulus, Robert Purkey, John Rockstroh, Bryan Sanders, Deanna Saraceno, Alissa Schaub, Jeff Sefa, Joan Weiman, Ray White, Lisa Zornes, and Joseph Mummert.

Teachers and parents accompanying the students are: Mrs. Sandra Louderback, Mr. Walter Blake, Mrs. Lilian Bocam, Mrs. Vicky Bryant, Mrs. Peggy Buckler, Mrs. Shirley Clark, Mrs. Sandy Hall, Mrs. Brenda Paris, Mrs. Linda Paulus, Mrs. Phyllis Saraceno, Mrs. Della Schaub, Mrs. Vickie Sefa, Mrs. Linda Zornes, Mrs. Mummert, Mr. Michael Hartin, Mrs. Thelma Asbury, Mrs. Helen Helton, Mrs. Margaret Schenning, and Mrs. Donna Ayres.●

## ATLANTIC RICHFIELD'S ROBERT O. ANDERSON TO RECEIVE BOYS CLUBS OF AMERICA'S HIGHEST AWARD

### HON. MANUEL LUJAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to rise before this body and tell you of another New Mexican who has received national acclaim. It is my pleasure to represent a State which has produced so many national government, civic, and business leaders. The latest is Robert O. Anderson, a New Mexican who has received the Boys Club of America's highest award—the Herbert Hoover Humanitarian Award. Mr. Anderson is chairman of the board of Atlantic Richfield Co. and joins a distinguished list of American leaders who have been honored with this award. He is being honored because of his commitment of the productive use of America's resources and for leading his company to an enviable record of community service. I ask that the House join me in congratulating Mr. Anderson for this award, which will be presented on Wednesday in New York.

TELEGRAM FOR ROBERT O. ANDERSON

BOB: Congratulations on receiving the 1982 Herbert Hoover Humanitarian Award from the Boys Clubs of America. I can't think of anyone who deserves this award more and, as a New Mexican, I am proud to see you so honored.

Best regards,

MLJ.

ATLANTIC RICHFIELD'S ROBERT O. ANDERSON TO RECEIVE BOYS CLUBS OF AMERICA'S HIGHEST HONOR

NEW YORK.—Robert O. Anderson, Chairman of the Board of the Atlantic Richfield Company has been selected as the 1982 re-

cipient of the Herbert Hoover Humanitarian Award of Boys Clubs of America, it was announced here today by Boys Club National President Jeremiah Milbank.

The coveted Hoover Award, the highest volunteer award given by Boys Clubs of America, will be presented to Anderson at the youth organization's annual President's Dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria on May 19. Thornton W. Bradshaw, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of RCA, will serve as Dinner Chairman.

Other humanitarians who have received the Hoover Award include distinguished leaders such as the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, entertainer Bob Hope, J. Paul Lyet of the Sperry Corporation, Richard R. Shinn of Metropolitan Life, John E. Swearingen of Standard Oil Company (Indiana) and Charles L. Brown of A.T. & T.

Over the past 40 years, Anderson's business endeavors have included—in addition to the exploration, production, refining and marketing of oil—cattle raising and feeding operations, mining and milling, and general manufacturing. Elected to the Board of Directors of The Atlantic Refining Company (now Atlantic Richfield Company) in October 1963, he was named Chairman of the Company's Executive Committee in June 1964. On May 4, 1965 he was elected Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer.

Anderson is being honored for his vision of the future that "focuses on a commitment of the productive use of resources . . . a commitment that is evident in Atlantic Richfield's inspiring record of community service," according to Milbank. The award honors the memory of the 31st President of the United States, who served as BCA Chairman for 28 years and lead the effort to strengthen and expand the Boys Clubs of America Movement.

Today, career professionals and volunteers are providing educational, vocational and recreational programs on a daily basis in 1,000 Boys Club of America facilities. The Boys Clubs serve over one million youth in all 50 states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.●

## SPACE POLICY AS VIEWED BY THE AIAA

### HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics is a technical society representing over 30,000 aerospace engineers and workers and, in the past, representatives from the AIAA have testifed many times before our authorizing committees on space and aeronautics. In the May 1982 issue of "Astronautics and Aeronautics" appears the AIAA view on what should be our Nation's space policy. In light of the recent upsurge in interest in our space program, I would like to share the AIAA space policy with my colleagues.

SPACE POLICY: AN AIAA VIEW

PROLOGUE

The modern world is influenced in every sense by technology. Space activities require some of the most advanced technical innovations and offer some of the most significant beneficial returns. They have brought us much of our present microelectronics capability, as well as more accurate forecasting of weather and natural disasters, low-cost global communication and navigation, and the surveillance from space that is so essential to our national security. Space opens unbounded opportunities for expanding mankind's understanding and utilization of the resources of the universe, and for improving the quality of life.

The Apollo program, one of this nation's greatest technological achievements, was a true source of pride and national prestige to our citizens. Because it was a civil program, open to the world through television via satellite, its impact was even greater outside this country. Its benefits were extraordinary; they ranged far beyond most expectations.

Today, more than a decade later, the benefits of the Space Shuttle are beginning to accrue. Our challenge, therefore, is to frame space policies and goals that will continue a rational and orderly program of space activities.

THEME

President Reagan said in his inaugural address, "It is time for us to realize that we are too great a nation to limit ourselves to small dreams." He thereby enunciated the theme that our nation is embarked on "a new beginning" to revitalize its economy, strengthen its defense, improve its institutions, reassert technological leadership, and regain national self-esteem.

We believe that the continued exploration, utilization, and development of space is a necessary and integral part of that "new beginning." The AIAA therefore urges the administration to make a firm commitment to the principles enunciated in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and to U.S. preeminence in space activities. These principles form the cornerstone of the policies and goals we propose here.

POLICIES

It is national space policy to:

Maintain vital space operations in support of national security under all conditions.

Assure that space systems are used in the national interest, through maximizing the return on our past investments and developing promising new applications to keep the United States competitive with increasingly competent commercial space capabilities overseas.

Assure concerted and sustained space-program cooperation among the government, industry, and university communities, each fulfilling the role to which it is best suited.

Have the federal government continue to provide the primary support for space research, exploration, and the development of new and long-range technology, not only in its own laboratories, but also in those of the universities and industry.

Have the federal government encourage, by cooperation and appropriate incentives, entrepreneurial investment by the private sector in high-risk, high-payoff applied research and development and the applications of space systems and technology to the commercial marketplace.

Support and encourage international cooperation consistent with the above-stated economic and national security requirements, particularly in space science and exploration.

Protect the right to travel and operate in space so that the benefits of space accrue to all mankind equitably and economically in accord with the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, to which the United States is a party.

GOALS

The goals of the national space program are to:

Maintain coordinated and mutually supporting but separately administered civil and military space programs encompassing both long-term and short-term elements.

Continue a unified military space doctrine and architecture for maximum effectiveness in defense operations of the United States and its allies during periods of peace, crisis, or warfare, and assure enduring access to space systems by all military services and commands.

Sustain a federal program to achieve the practical utilization of Earth orbit through cooperative efforts with the private sector, including appropriate incentives and a careful balance of entrepreneurial risks and rewards.

Achieve routine access to space through continued commitment to an operational space transportation system sized to meet both current and projected needs for defense, commercial, science, and foreign users.

Reduce the cost and improve the efficiency of all space operations, particularly transportation, through maintaining an active and sustained program for development of advanced technology and giving attention to emerging problems such as geostationary orbit crowding and the proliferation of space debris.

Extend man's knowledge by systematically exploring the Earth, the Moon, and the solar system using unmanned spacecraft and by studying the universe beyond through the use of both unmanned and man-tended Earth-orbiting astronomical observatories.

Extend man's capability to live and work in space by developing the orbital facilities and support systems necessary for uninterrupted operations in Earth orbit.

ACTIONS

Initial actions to begin the process of accomplishing these goals are:

Make a firm commitment to a specific national space program plan for the next two decades, identifying schedule milestones for operation and expansion of the space transportation system, civil and military operations in Earth orbit, research and exploration, and development of the enabling space technologies.

Establish programs to develop and implement technologies not only to improve surveillance, navigation, and military communications functions, but also to support and assure survivability of U.S. satellites and military ground systems against hostile action.

Initiate vigorous programs in the enabling technologies that are essential to all space activities, particularly in propulsion, large space structures, power generation, life-support systems, and robotics, to support extended-duration space operations.

Expand and intensify present efforts to establish specific private-sector incentives for public-service and advanced-technology satellite communication services, Earth observation systems, research in space materials processing, and operation of prototype and demonstration commercial space manufacturing facilities.

Initiate procedures to determine the optimum operational mode for the space transportation system once it has been fully de-

veloped and demonstrated. Such a mode could involve a dedicated federal, semi-federal, or private organization or a restatement of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's charter to include such operation. Whatever approach is selected should not erode the important research, technology, and development efforts which are fundamental to all space achievements in the future.

Continue and expand the evolutionary development of a versatile operational space transportation system adequate to support projected traffic demand, incorporating elements to improve the efficiency and reduce the cost of carrying freight and personnel not only from the Earth into orbit but also between various Earth orbits and other trajectories.

Establish a specific plan for the next two decades to include a stable program for planetary exploration, investigation of comets and asteroids, reestablishment of lunar exploration activities, continued development of space-based platforms for scientific observation of the Earth, the Sun, the stars, and the universe, and integration of scientific studies wherever possible in spacecraft or space platforms launched primarily for other purposes.

Establish a resolute evolutionary program commitment for a manned space facility in low Earth orbit to serve as an opertional base for Shuttle Orbiters and other orbital transfer vehicles, an orbital storage, power, and servicing depot, a research laboratory, a construction center, an assembly station for higher Earth orbit missions and outbound deep space flights, a support facility for low-orbit free-flying satellites, and a staging area for constructing and servicing both commercial and public-service multi-purpose goestationary platforms.

By making such a firm commitment to a comprehensive space policy and a consistent action plan to implement its goals, the United States can continue to maintain a leading role in many of the space activites in which it has pioneered. Five hundred years after Columbus opened a path to the New World, we can ensure that U.S. leadership in the exploration and utilization of space will bring maximum returns from the "new world" of space to the nation's citizens and to all the peoples of the world.●

## THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS

### HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and bring attention to an essential part of California's heritage, the Christian Brothers. They have a tradition of quality in the production of premium wines, a dedication to the education of young men, a deep interest in the cultural expressions of the winemakers craft, and certainly wines with excellent reputations.

It was 100 years ago that the Christian Brothers began making wine in California for their own table, a few neighbors, and sacramental use. Since that era, the Christian brothers winemaking operations have grown to become the largest and most successful ever managed by a religious organization, and the Brothers now produce in excess of 3 million cases of premium wines and brandy annually which are available throughout the United States and in approximately 40 countries abroad.

With the recent trend of large outside interests acquiring more and more California wineries, the Christian Brothers now stand as the single largest independent premium wine producer in the Napa Valley with storage capacities at their Napa, St. Helena, and Reedley facilities of more than 12½ million gallons of wines and brandy.

Founded in Rheims, France in 1680 by St. Jean Baptiste de La Salle, the Christian Brothers are a teaching order of the Roman Catholic Church, who, as laymen, devote their talents to education. Today, there are about 12,000 brothers teaching over 700,000 students at 1,600 schools in 78 countries throughout the world. Proceeds from the Christian Brothers winemaking activities through the years have been used to support the 13 schools in their Western U.S. province. Specially trained brothers supervise all activities at their wineries, from the growing of the grapes to aging, blending, and bottling of all the Christian Brothers products.

Mont La Salle, 7 miles outside of Napa, is the headquarters for the Brothers' winemaking operations. Situated in the rolling Mayacamas mountain range, the property includes a stone winery dating back to 1903, aging cellars, a modern laboratory, bottling facilities, and a novitiate or monastery where young men are trained for the religious life. In addition, there is a boarding elementary school for some 100 boys and a Christian Brothers retirement home on the grounds. The Christian Brothers champagne and aging cellars, commonly referred to as "Greystone," is located just outside St. Helena and has been designated as a historic landmark by the State of California. Said to be the largest stone winery in the world, Greystone lies adjacent to 710 acres of prime vineyard acreage devoted to table wine grapes, and houses one of the largest collections of oak cooperage in the Western hemisphere.

A never-ending drive toward the development of extensive resources and capabilities is a hallmark of the Brothers' work in the world of premium wines. A seasoned technical staff of viticulturists, enologists, chemists, and microbiologists continually monitors the evolution of all Christian Brothers products from wine to bottle. Because the Brothers own vineyards in all three of Napa Valley's climatic regions, they have great flexibility in matching grape varieties to various soil conditions and microclimates within the valley. The many technical innovations which they have helped to pioneer in the Napa Valley are well known. These include vacuum filtration and the use of stainless steel for fermentation and finishing tanks, cold fermentation, sterile filtration, and bottom filling of wines in the bottle so as to better eliminate oxidation. Modern vineyard techniques which the Christian Brothers were among the first to utilize are: Planting of virus-free root stocks, sprinkler frost protection, metal grape stakes, and new trellis systems.

In retrospect, one of the Brothers' most significant accomplishments in the field of wines and spirits is their brandy, considered by many experts to be the definitive American brandy. It is reported that within the total brandy business, the percentage of Christian Brothers brandy sold is larger than that of any major brand of American whiskey, gin, vodka, or scotch in each respective class. A blend of five different brandies, the Christian Brothers brandy is distilled through an exclusive combination of continuous and pot-still processes. Developed by the Brothers, the continuous still in their Mount Tivy winery in Reedley is designed to eliminate certain objectionable fusel oils and higher esters. This distillation results in a finer, smoother brandy with none of the "hotness" often associated with cognacs. A special blend of brandies from this still is then combined with brandy which has been cooked in small quantities in large copper pots. Each pot processes no more than 100 barrels of brandy in a 24-hour period. This pot-stilled brandy provides the full body and rich aroma which have become the trademark of this popular brandy. Finally, the brandy is stored in 50-gallon white oak barrels to age for several years. It should be noted the Brothers' inventories of aging and full-aged brandies are the largest of any brandy producer.●

## CONCERNED WIVES FOR LAID OFF WORKERS, INC.

### HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I want to focus the spotlight on seven constituents of mine who have led the fight of bringing the plight of the unemployed American worker to the attention of the administration.

Three of these ladies, Mrs. Regina Hart, Mrs. Elsie Bogard, and Mrs. Pat Scharfenberg, all of Steubenville, Ohio, have organized a grassroots coalition called the "Concerned Wives for Laid Off Workers, Inc." as a result of their personal circumstances and the

circumstances of many other wives and husbands who are out of work due to unfair trade laws and high interest rates impacting heavily on the steel industry.

Through this coalition, over 225,000 letters have been signed by unemployed workers, and others in affected communities, and include many from 42 States across the country who have asked to join their efforts. These people have lost their jobs in the steel or related industries due to unfair U.S. trade policies which allow government subsidized foreign firms to unfairly compete with domestic firms.

On Thursday, May 13, these ladies appeared before the executive committee of the Congressional Steel Caucus to present a story of desparation, yet expressing a show of faith and compassion for our Nation and its working people.

Their testimony was articulate, frank, and candid in which they expressed an extensive knowledge of the causes of unemployment and what must be done to get Americans back to work.

These ladies pointed out that the domestic steel industry is working less than 50 percent capacity, with 120,000 steelworkers fully or partially unemployed, while foreign steel is accounting for nearly 25 percent of all steel in the United States. For every $1,000 invested in the steel industry, $465 tax dollars are generated. "None of us are advocating an isolationist trade policy, but quotas must be imposed and laws against illegal subsidation must be enforced," said Mrs. Hart, who was the spokeswoman for the group.

She further stated:

Many of the 225,000 signatures collected on these petitions are those of people who have defended this country and have helped guarantee the rights and freedoms we enjoy today. The working man is the backbone of this country and now the country is breaking him by taking away his job, his hope, and his self-esteem. For many of these people, their benefits have run out. There are no jobs. They have nowhere to turn to but the welfare lines or the cheese lines. But these people don't want welfare; they don't want cheese; they want a job. Those of us who have jobs and are able to pay our bills cannot completely understand the despair they live with daily. Congress can, however, provide them with hope and a sincere pledge to change the tide of unfair trade.

The President recently imposed a quota on sugar imports but the Congress must now do the same with steel and auto imports. In 1973, countervailing duties were imposed on Japanese auto imports; and in 1976, President Ford imposed quotas for three years on certain specialty steel items. Certainly, the Congress to take such statutory action is not without precedent.

It is time we again give the people of this nation something to hope for and in which to believe. Our factories cannot continue to remain idle. As President Reagan said, "The best social program is a job." I think it is time he put those words into action.●

## EXPERIMENTAL GROUP YOUNG PEOPLE'S THEATER

### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend an organization located within the Eighth California Congressional District for providing an extraordinary cultural service to the local community. This group is known affectionately in our community as EGYPT—an acronym for Experimental Group Young People's Theater. EGYPT is a community-based, nonprofit organization which is dedicated to developing the creative talents of our young people, and to enhancing the cultural lives of East Bay residents through innovative programs in the performing arts. The activities are offered to the community at a nominal fee, thereby providing opportunities in an area and to a community which has largely lacked effective access to cultural experience.

In past years, EGYPT was sustained through the generous support of private foundations, including the San Francisco Foundation, the W. A. Gerbode Foundation, the East Bay Community Foundation, the Alameda County neighborhood arts program and the Oakland parks and recreation program. Additionally, it received very valuable assistance from the CETA title VI program.

The founding director of EGYPT is Ms. Minnie Gibson, herself a talented performing artist, and above all, a person who has demonstrated a remarkable commitment to the cultural health and viability of the Oakland community. Ms. Gibson has expressed the aim of EGYPT as being "a forum for expression in the performing arts and an effort to provide a continuing service to those who wish to become professionals in this field." With so great a reservoir of generally undirected talent in our urban communities, and with so great a need for the cultural enrichment that improves immeasurably the quality of all our lives, we can only commend Ms. Gibson and EGYPT, and wish them outstanding future success.●

## THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF HADASSAH

### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Congress recently passed House Concurrent Resolution 309, a resolution congratulating Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, on its 70th anniversary. Tomorrow, May 20, there will be a ceremony at the White House commemorating this event. Noting this auspicious occasion, I would like to offer a few words of tribute to this commendable organization of American women.

Founded in 1912 by Jewish scholar and educator Henrietta Szold, Hadassah was created to provide preventive and curative health services in Palestine and to develop systematic Jewish education as a background for intelligent and creative Jewish living in America. Since its inception, Hadassah has expanded its scope considerably, and it has grown to a membership in excess of 370,000 with chapters in every State—making it one of the largest Jewish service organizations in the world.

Perhaps best known for its efforts in the field of medicine, Hadassah has long been a leader in healing, training, and research. It established the first schools of nursing, medicine, and dentistry in Jerusalem, and its contributions to the research and treatment of cancer have been highly significant. The Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem has been responsible for important advances in social medicine, public health, and pharmacy. In the more than one dozen trips I have made to Israel since 1967, I have been consistently impressed by the high quality of health care provided by the medical center—without discrimination—to all Israelis, Jews and Arabs alike.

Hadassah also provides special programs for young people, including educational opportunities. Since 1942, when Hadassah initiated its vocational educational program, it has developed creative approaches to secondary and postsecondary education that have set a high standard for others to follow. Hadassah established Jerusalem's first 2-year community college and operates the only nonpublic guidance center for scholars and other professionals in Israel.

Hadassah also has American and foreign affairs programs which offer the most complete and up-to-date information available on matters of interest to its members. Through its various publications, Hadassah provides accurate information needed to help members analyze vital current issues and to participate intelligently in public affairs as individual citizens. Nationally, Hadassah is a nongovernmental organization (NGO) of the United Nations, operating as a public relations arm of the U.N. Department of Public Information, and as an accredited observer to the U.S. Mission to the U.N.

As a women's organization devoted to service, Hadassah is an organization of Americans who are also deeply involved in their home communities.

Over the years of its existence, Hadassah has been highly successful in its mission to strengthen American democracy, in helping to create a better society and way of life, and in providing knowledgeable leadership for the American Jewish community.

Although I have only highlighted Hadassah's major activities and accomplishments, I can assure you that their list of contributions is without limit. I am delighted by the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 309, a most appropriate gesture of appreciation for this worthy organization's 70 years of outstanding achievements.●

## NAMIBIA'S STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES

### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body question the role of the U.S. Government in protecting our interests in Namibia. Today, I am inserting for the RECORD, an article which clearly explains the strategic importance of Namibia to the United States and the growing Soviet influence in this region.

This lucid description provides us with an outline of the Soviet operations in this country as they continue to pursue the spread of Communism in this region.

It is imperative that Members of this body become aware of the Kremlin's activities so that we can develop and implement an effective anti-Soviet, anticommunist foreign policy in this volatile area.

Again, I commend your attention to this article. It is important that we, and the U.S. taxpayers, realize the national security interest Americans have in keeping Namibia out of the hands of the Soviets.

SOVIET THREAT SEEN IN NAMIBIA

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—While some of their colleagues were junketing around the Caribbean last January, two Senate staff members were trekking through the bush in southwest Africa, riding on "mine-proof" vehicles and hunkering down in machine-gun nests.

The two men, Joel Lisker and Bert Milling, were checking out firsthand the guerrilla warfare that has torn Namibia for 15 years. They were gathering information and lining up witnesses for hearings this week by Sen. Jeremiah Denton's (R-Ala.) subcommittee on security and terrorism.

What led the two committee aides to forsake the comforts of Capitol Hill for the combat zone along the Angolan border was the growing concern in Congress over Soviet influence in the region. As to why the United States should worry about Russian intentions in Namibia, a top-secret CIA file on the country lists explicit reasons for concern.

Namibia, which is bigger than Texas but has a population smaller than Houston's, contains enormous quantities of uranium, diamonds, copper and other minerals. In fact, it has both the world's largest uranium mine and the largest diamond concession. Much of its mineral wealth is classified by the CIA as "strategic," meaning that the United States needs the minerals and doesn't have its own supply.

Though the Soviets are largely self-sufficient in these essential minerals, the CIA suspects the Kremlin wants to be able to deprive the West of these strategic minerals by controlling Namibia. Also, when coupled with Angola, Namibia would give the Soviets a strategic anchor in the South Atlantic.

That's why the United States worries about the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)—and why the Marxist guerrillas are covertly supported by the Soviet Union. According to the CIA, the Russians provide training, weapons and other necessities that have kept the insurgents in business over the years.

"Moscow remains SWAPO's main supporter," a recent secret CIA report states. "Although there are unconfirmed reports that SWAPO has expressed interest in reviving its old ties with Peking, the Chinese currently are not willing to do more than offer the insurgents moral support and quietly back the initiative of five Western powers to negotiate a settlement with South Africa."

Intelligence sources and secret reports examined by my associates Dale Van Atta and Joseph Spear detail the extent of the Kremlin's involvement with SWAPO. Here are the key bits of evidence.

SWAPO's present leader, Sam Nujoma, is virtually a Soviet puppet. Internal SWAPO documents indicate that Nujoma has to get Moscow's permission before dealing with his own subordinates.

Young Namibians are sometimes recruited into SWAPO with promises they will become doctors or teachers within six months. Instead, they are packed off to "engineering camps"—terrorist training centers in Angola and Zambia.

The most promising recruits are sent to advanced terrorist schools in East Germany and the Soviet Union. Aeroflot flies them from Luanda, Angola, to Moscow by way of Libya; sometimes the Namibians are provided with United Nations passports. In East Germany, they are told to pass themselves off as Ugandans.

SWAPO guerrillas are well equipped with Soviet rocket pistols, rifles and rocket launchers.

There is evidence that discipline is harsh in the guerrilla forces. One defector, who walked 150 to 200 miles to escape SWAPO's clutches, told of being forced to dig his own grave and lie in it when he was suspected of treachery. He was nearly buried alive before his fellow guerrillas finally believed his protestations of innocence. One method of public execution for defectors, the Senate staff members were told, is a dagger blow in the kidney for a slow and excruciating death.●

## BUDGET AMENDMENT SPONSORS

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the budget amendment printed today in the RECORD's list of amendments is being introduced under my name simply because my name comes first in the alphabet. The amendment is, however, the result of considerable effort by a group of five Republicans and five Democrats. For the record, I wish to spell out at this point the full list of Members responsible for this amendment.

In alphabetical order, the Republican drafters are: JIM JEFFORDS of Vermont; JIM LEACH of Iowa; JOEL PRITCHARD of Washington; CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER of Rhode Island; and TOM TAUKE of Iowa.

In alphabetical order, the Democratic drafters are: LES ASPIN of Wisconsin; RICHARD GEPHARDT of Missouri; NORMAN MINETA of California; LEON PANETTA of California; and TIM WIRTH of Colorado.●

## HONORING OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that during the month set aside to honor the senior citizens of this country, I should submit for the RECORD the report of the White House Conference on Aging, prepared by the delegate of the Fifth District of Maryland, Mr. Kenneth Goodger.

From November 30 to December 3, 1981, 2,200 delegates from all 50 States came to Washington to participate in the White House Conference on Aging. The conference is held every 10 years to examine issues important to the aging and to make recommendations for legislative and administrative action to improve the quality of life of older Americans.

As the representative from the Fifth District of Maryland, I nominated Kenneth Goodger from Hyattsville. He is a retired Federal employee and is active in the National Association for Retired Federal Employees. He did an outstanding job at the conference in representing the interests of people in the Fifth District, and I commend him for it. Ken has proven himself a truly dedicated man and represents the high caliber of men and women in my district who work on behalf of issues

of vital importance to our older citizens.

What follows are excerpts from the report Mr. Goodger prepared for me on the conference and I believe my colleagues in this House will find his candid observations of great interest.

It is extremely important that we continue to preserve the true spirit of the White House Conference. And what do we mean by the true spirit? We mean the positive, intellectual fervor of the Conference. We mean the continual struggle we all must make to attain dignity and respect for America's senior citizens. To be sure, senior citizens know about this struggle.

I attended the Conference as a delegate, recommended by Senator John Garrity to Congressman Steny Hoyer who formally nominated me last fall. As a delegate, I was actively involved in the tremendous struggle I mentioned earlier. This struggle involved intensive caucusing, negotiating and compromising on a number of vital issues. As a group, we worked with prominent academicians and the most powerful political figures of our land, including the President and Congressman Claude Pepper, in seeking ways to come to consensus on issues. Our goal was simple—we knew we had to barter for a better future for older Americans.

The climate of the 1981 Conference was radically different from that of 1971. The mood in 1971 was positive and hopeful, and appropriately so, for early in that decade we saw the enactment of Supplemental Security Income; five, ten and twenty percent increases in Social Security benefits; the enactment of a Cost of Living Adjustment; all necessary steps in helping older Americans maintain a minimum level of income security.

As the decade moved along, social services for the elderly were expanded and strengthened through Title XX of the Social Security Act, and through the Older Americans Act, including the establishment of the nutrition program. Federal programs of housing for the elderly were expanded and rental assistances were made available. Medicaid provided increasingly for the long-term care of the low-income disabled elderly. Almost 70 million Americans now receive $350 billion from taxpayers under "entitlement programs."

In 1971, the delegates to the White House Conference on Aging viewed their government as the appropriate instrument for assuring income and for providing health care and services that would enable them to live out their older years in dignity and security. The delegates in 1981 felt the same, but the times had changed.

The number of Americans reaching 65 years of age is growing. In the next decade alone, their numbers will increase from 26 million to 32 million. At the same time, Congress and the Administration are going on a spending diet for programs that aid seniors—cutting the budget and taxes while increasing defense spending.

Because of these deep concerns, the delegates of the 1981 Conference faced a difficult task. There were 14 committees at the Conference, dealing with the economy, and its implications for an aging population, health and wellness issues, family and community support systems, housing, education and training, private and public sector roles and opportunities, older Americans as a continuing resource, and the special needs of the growing numbers of older women in this country. From the work of these communities, the delegates carefully enacted 668 of the recommendations. It is imperative that we treat these considerations with respect, not only for their impact on us as individuals, but on their impact on the legislative bodies of this country. It should be noted that while a very important basic priority list was developed, all 668 recommendations are important and should not be overlooked as we tackle the more important ones.

Finally, the Conference established the following priorities:

Development of a national health policy for all Americans;

Preservation of current levels of funding for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security;

Opposition to a voluntary social insurance system, but expansion of Social Security to all gainfully employed persons;

Elimination of employment discrimination because of age and abolishment of mandatory retirement;

Development of a long-term, community-based health care;

General fund financing for Social Security, if deemed necessary by both the House and the Senate;

Assurance of appropriate and affordable housing;

Expansion of home health and in-home services, with tax incentives for home-care; and

Support for economic policies to control inflation.

In conclusion, we must be wary of proposals to manipulate important programs such as Social Security, in order to meet short-term budget goals. We have a sincere obligation to our older Americans, and we must not falter from living up to that obligation.●

## RESTORE FUNDING FOR THE U.S. FIRE ADMINISTRATION

### HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration has decided to eliminate funding for the U.S. Fire Administration, which was established to promote fire prevention and reduce the loss of life and property caused by fires.

Thousands of people are killed every year in fires and tens of thousands more are injured. In addition, scores of firefighters are killed each year in the line of duty. In recent years, these numbers have been declining, but the decline is largely due to the fire prevention efforts and improved firefighting methods promoted by the USFA.

Abolishing the USFA would be a serious mistake and a significant step backward in fire safety and prevention. The USFA has been a leading force in promoting fire safety education programs and arson prevention. It has played a significant role in the development of safer and greatly improved firefighting equipment for firefighters.

The administration's claim that State and local governments can take over the responsibilities of the USFA with increased assistance from the private sector is not realistic. The local fire departments, particularly the volunteer fire departments, lack the funding and other resources needed to undertake adequately the activities of the USFA. They also back the means for research, development, training, and nationwide exchange of information among local departments. Adequate funding for the USFA is needed to maintain the cooperative relationship which currently exists between the local, State, and national fire prevention agencies.

Unless we act soon, the valued and necessary services of the USFA will be cut off. I urge my colleagues to restore funding for this vital organization.●

## THE WORK FORCE OF THE FUTURE

### HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, more and more we are hearing about the need to invest in the greatest of our Nation's resources—human capital. The ironic fact is that at the same time that our country is experiencing the highest unemployment rate since the Depression, we are actually facing critical shortages of adequately trained workers in many industries.

Recently, an excellent column by Pat Choate and Noel Epstein described our requirements for a trained work force to fulfill the wide variety of occupations which are, and will continue to be, in great demand in this country. Fully 90 percent of the American work force in 1990 and more than 75 percent in the year 2000 will be composed of men and women who are working now. This means, therefore, that it is crucial that we not only train tomorrow's youth for jobs, but that we retrain the workers of today for the occupational job skills which will be necessary to meet the job requirements of the future.

As the Congress and the administration debate the national policy on employment and training, we cannot let ourselves get mired in discussions solely of: Dollars for the program; the proper balance between Government and business in providing training; the composition of private industry councils; et cetera. These are important issues, but of even greater importance is that we address ourselves to a job training policy which prepares Americans for the ever-changing work force of the future. It is an issue which demands our careful and immediate attention.

At this time I would like to insert for the RECORD the column by Pat Choate and Noel Epstein.

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1982]

WORKERS OF THE FUTURE, RETOOL! NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR JOBS

(By Pat Choate and Noel Epstein)

You can stop looking for one of those "new ideas" everybody seems to be hunting for in American politics. It's about to hit us over the head, whether we want it or not.

Right now the idea is trapped in a yawn of a phrase—"human capital"—but that should not deter any one from appreciating its power. What it means is that the prevailing wisdom is nonsense, that we certainly cannot revive our economy or our national defense merely by pumping more investment into microchips or megabombs, robots or rocketry.

Consider some simple facts of "human capital":

American productivity still relies as much, if not more, on people—you remember them—as on machines. Traditionally, about half of our productivity growth comes from increases in individuals' skills and knowledge.

Despite our lengthening unemployment lines, we are suffering from shortages of critical workers, from machinists to engineers. The result: bottlenecks, higher prices and lower quality in both domestic and defense products.

This problem will worsen dramatically in coming years when greatly accelerating technological change confronts a work force which, for the most part, could not find its way home in the Techno-Era around the corner.

We have no choice but to equip ourselves for the future that's upon us. We have to retrain the millions whose current jobs can be kissed goodbye and who will be needed for new work. We have to boost the skills of the still-employed and pound knowledge into millions of adults who are functionally illiterate. We have to ensure, once and for all, education, training and job opportunities for women, blacks and Hispanics, who will make up the overwhelming majority of new workers.

In short, we have to invest in people or we'll get precious little out of the machines. That fact has been dawning on many people.

MIT's Lester Thurow, an adviser to the Democratic National Committee: "The economy is not going to thrive unless there is a major effort to upgrade the American labor force from the top to the bottom."

The Pentagon's Defense Science Board: A "major contributor to the increased lead times and costs currently afflicting the defense community is a continuing shortage of skilled labor."

The House Wednesday Group, a caucus of moderate Republicans: An unreleased Army training study in 1977-78 "found that 17 percent of the tank commanders in Europe and 21 percent of those in the United States 'did not know where to aim when employing battlefield gunnery techniques.'" Similary, the survey uncovered men in charge of firing surface-to-air missiles who couldn't "differentiate between the silhouettes of Soviet and American planes."

The National Alliance for Business, on the need to train on-the-street youth, disproportionately black and Hispanic: "If you look out a decade at the demographics, it is clear that we will be doing all this out of economic necessity rather than out of any moral concern . . ." Forget justice; think profits.

Yet so far there has been little but rhetoric. That can't last—unless America wishes to sit back and watch its inevitable decline. Without serious action, that's what's ahead. Bet on it. The forces at work are unstoppable.

Start with the displaced workers from Akron or Detroit or other decaying cities who've begun their migratory treks for work elsewhere, reminding some Sun Belt folks of "The Grapes of Wrath." We can expect more warnings like the one issued recently by the Texas labor chieftain who told the cars and hitchhikers from Michigan and elsewhere to stay out, that "jobs are no longer available in Texas," that they are not wanted.

We can expect these episodes because the ranks of such modern-day Okies are going to expand as technology and foreign competition continue to do their nasty work—with the displaced largely unaware of and unprepared for the jobs for which they will be needed.

Management analyst Peter Drucker, for example, anticipates that through the 1980s and 1990s, 10 million to 15 million manufacturing jobs will disappear from the American landscape. Even if he is only half right—and some think he is entirely right—you can wave farewell to 5 million to 7.5 million manufacturing jobs, starting yesterday.

In other words, brace yourself: The economic, social and political panic created in 1980-81 by the loss of a mere 300,000 auto industry jobs will multiply 16 to 25 times—unless the dispossessed are redirected toward and retrained for new jobs.

That millions of new jobs are being created—in addition to the existing ones tragically going begging in hard times—there is no doubt. A survey last year by the American Electronics Association, for example, estimates that 671 of its member companies will create more than 140,000 paraprofessional spots (engineering aides, laser technicians, drafters, assemblers and the like) and over 113,000 professional places (chiefly engineers, computer analysts and programmers) by 1985.

The National Tooling and Machining Association projects a shortage in three years of more than 240,000 machinists, those people who make the tools and other devices needed to make everything else.

Millions of slots will emerge in the design, production, installation, operation and servicing of the robots that are going to populate American industry. While as recently as 1979 we had only 2,000 of these technological wonders, business leaders expect robot ranks to multiply a hundredfold—to at least 200,000—just eight years from now.

Other jobs will open in fiber optics, which has the capacity to revolutionize communications by making copper wire obsolete, and in genetic engineering, which, for starters, will change the face of agriculture and medicine. And this is to say little of the explosion of computer applications we can anticipate in the office as well as the home—in banking, insurance, health, education, communications and other service fields.

There will be far too many new spots, of course, for all to be filled by the displaced, even if they acquire the skills and knowledge to do so. But what seems little appreciated is that the Techno-Era's employees will have to come chiefly from the people already working, and that this will hold true for well into the next century. There simply isn't anybody else. Just as economic survival dictates technological advance, so demography is destiny.

What the demographers' population figures tell us is that with much of the post-World War II baby-boom generation now into its thirties, our labor force growth rate is slowing dramatically. In fact, unless we suddenly import large numbers of highly skilled individuals from abroad, more than 90 percent of the American work force in 1990 and more than 75 percent in the year 2000 will be composed of those working here now. The largest need, then, will be to train and retrain today's workers.

The figures also tell us that the ranks of young workers, aged 16 to 25, are shrinking—by about 16 percent in this decade—and that an increased portion of this smaller youth force will be black and Hispanic.

That means, for one thing, that it will be the military against business, the Joint Chiefs versus McDonald's, in a rivalry for the young. Something will have to give. More women in the military? A draft? More grandparents behind fast-food counters?

Martin Binkin, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution who specializes in military manpower issues, remarks: "The decline in the number of youths unquestionably is going to contribute to, and provide added pressure in, the debate on renewing conscription in coming years." According to The Wall Street Journal, Burger King has already begun recruiting employees among the elderly.

The increased portion of minorities among scarcer youth (and in the prime-age labor force as well because of retirement patterns and other factors) will produce another intriguing clash: prejudice versus pocketbooks. Will fear of deep American decline finally move us to do what speeches about dreams and justice have not? In the words of Robert B. Hill, former research director of the National Urban League:

"If America wants its Social Security checks to keep being paid in coming years, it had better ensure full opportunity and productivity for minorities and women."

Definitely women. The population tallies tell us that the primary source—indeed, two-thirds—of new workers in this decade will be women. While about half of adult women already work, we can reasonably expect that number to climb to 60 percent or above by 1990.

Will we at last break down job barriers against women? Will sufficient day care facilities finally be provided? More flexible work hours?

As the Bureau of Labor Statistics remarks in its understated manner: "Given that much of the increase in female labor force activity will probably come from mothers, employers may have to review their personnel practices (such as provision of day care) to attract these workers."

Okay, those are some of the inescapable needs ahead and the people available to meet them. What, specifically, will a national "human capital" drive require? How do we, for example, redirect and retrain millions of displaced workers?

It would be folly to do it by expanding the maze of 22 separate training programs already on the books—from Trade Adjustment Assistance to aid for redwood forest lumberjacks. That would just bury the effort beneath confusion, fragmentation, bureaucracy and the political pork barrel. What's needed is a single, fresh approach.

Try this one: an Individual Training Account (ITA), jointly funded by employer and employe, that guarantees retraining—and, if necessary, help with the movers—to any worker whose job goes poof. Say the

company and individual each put up $500 a year, up to a total over six years of $3,000 each, and that each would get back the cash plus interest if it is not used by retirement.

The money would finance retraining vouchers to be used, as with the GI Bill, at any institution the displaced worker chooses. Moreover, as with Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs), these Individual Training Accounts would inject an additional pool of capital for executives to finance more new technology and jobs. No bureaucracy. No money directly to vocational schools or businesses or other institutions. No overhead. A clean approach.

Before any workers are retrained, though, it would be nice if they knew where they were needed. Current federal job-vacancy information is so incomplete, untimely and unspecific as to be virtually useless. That's why the Houston papers are such big sellers in Detroit these days—for the help-wanted ads.

It's past time for Washington to collect useful information about job vacancies and to insist that the computerized job listings of each state finally be connected to each other, which, absurdly, they now are not.

What about immediate shortages of critical workers? Note that Atlantic Research Corp. of Alexandria is offering staff members a $1,000-a-head bonus to land new workers for hard-to-fill jobs, ranging from communications test equipment technicians to electronic engineers. More broadly, the National Science Foundation has forecast a 47 percent shortage of industrial engineers in this decade. In such areas as California's Silicon Valley, bidding wars for engineers, computer professionals and other skilled workers are so intense that they have spawned annual job turnover rates of 80 to 100 percent.

Clearly, Adam Smith's "invisible hand" has palsied: His "marketplace" is not filling these and other needs (shortages of machinists and engineers have been plaguing us for 10 or 15 years, with scarcely any relief from supply-and-demand curves). So, if you'll pardon the expression, we've got to give the marketplace another hand. We'll have to define more sharply our vital defense and domestic needs. We'll have to create special government and business fellowships to attract and hold on to top-quality teaching faculty, who are being lured away with fatter paychecks from industry. We'll have to give special cash breaks to draw qualified students to essential (and expensive) fields of study.

During World War II, the National Emergency Production Act financed the training of 7.5 million skilled workers, popularly symbolized by "Rosie the Riveter" at aircraft and shipbuilding yards. (Indeed, a large portion of today's skilled workers were trained then and are now in or heading toward retirement. To wit: Today's 300,000 machinists have an average age of 58.) There is nothing stopping us from meeting our less massive critical skills needs today—except our will to do so.

Next, how do we boost the skills of the still-employed, from clerical workers to the executives whose weak thinking and rotten management are heavily responsible for our current predicament? Much of this training task is now paid for by business, as it should be. The private sector, led by the largest corporations, shells out an estimated $30 billion annually to train workers. But smaller employers—who create most new jobs and hire the majority of American workers—are least able to foot these bills.

What's mainly needed is to help the smaller guys invest in people as much as in machines—while making sure taxpayers don't subsidize any corporation for doing what it should and would be paying for anyway. One possible approach: a training tax credit. It would apply only to training above and beyond what a business historically has done itself. (If you wonder how we keep the corporate folks honest, remember that they already report the highest training outlays possible to the Internal Revenue Service for tax-deduction purposes.)

In this way, only the training needed would be done. If the credit isn't used, there would be zero cost to taxpayers.

Finally, the issue of education, where we need an effort far exceeding our late-1950s response to the Soviet launching of Sputnik. We must, for one thing, develop students' critical thinking, their ability to analyze and organize and express information—the essence of the liberal arts. We obviously must also sharpen their knowledge of math, science and specific technologies. These are all areas in which students are not exactly excelling these days, to put it mildly.

As the National Assessment of Educational Progress reports, "The gap between the number of highly skilled workers needed and the number of students prepared for higher-level jobs is widening. Clearly we are not cultivating the raw materials, our future workers, who will be vital both for economic progress and ultimately for economic survival."

So what are we doing about this? With many large school systems in or near bankruptcy—particularly those with the heaviest concentrations of minority students—we're slashing national aid for the disadvantaged, for math, for science and for other education programs. It's as if we were bent on making sure that essential instruction disintegrates further. That's a sure-fire formula not only for American economic and defense erosion but for creating a large and brooding underclass, permanently locked out.

It's also a sure-fire formula for intensified decay of hard-hit cities, whose best single shot at rekindling economic growth lies in their human capital. The industrial Northeast, with its troubled metropolises from Chicago to New York, still has an immense advantage over others in its vast pool of skilled labor—if existing and future workers are educated and retrained for new jobs.

The education needs do not stop there. We have to attack the anti-blue-collar arrogance that discourages our children from learning skilled trades. We must overhaul a vocational education system that has failed miserably in important respects. William E. Hardman, executive vice president of the National Tooling and Machine Association, remarks:

"Many of our vocational schools have better equipment than contract tool shops—except they don't know what to do with it in most cases. . . . If our members had as much money as the vocational education system to spend on training for this purpose, we could no doubt end the skill shortage in four years and ensure that we never fall behind again."

Then we've got to reverse the decline in American teacher competence. Full fellowships to lure qualified students into teaching could be one step, intensive summer retraining institutes for today's teachers another. Retraining is essential, for example, if teachers are to teach the varied uses of computers; forget about having those shiny toys in schools if most teachers really don't know what to do with them, as is now the case.

All this by no means exhausts the issues wrapped up in the human capital agenda. But it should make one thing crystal clear: We are currently in the process of killing American hope for economic, defense and social renewal. One after another, we are cutting or ending programs that invest in people, from job training to public school assistance from day care to college aid to basic research monies. If that were not enough, we are not even seriously addressing such crucial problems as helping the displaced workers lost in the confusion of change.

The supply-side crowd obviously thinks that people don't count as much as machines. If that mindset continues, the historians can start writing their books about the decline of America.●

## ROMULUS JR. HIGH SCHOOL SYMPHONIC BAND

### HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to the recent accomplishments of the Romulus Junior High School Symphonic Band, in my congressional district of Michigan.

This outstanding band performed May 8 at the State Band Festival in Fraser, Mich., and received a first division superior rating. The coveted I rating places the Romulus band among the elite few class A junior high bands to achieve this distinction in Michigan.

Earlier, on March 13, the Romulus group received a first division rating at the District Band Festival held in Romulus. This qualified the young musicians for the State festival, competing at the class A junior high level.

Two of the four judges in the State festival accorded the Romulus Junior High School Symphonic Band an A in each of the five musical categories—tone, intonation, rhythm, technic and interruption—graded at the festival. One of the judges concluded his final remarks with "The entire community of Romulus can be proud of the performance of this band."

The bands were graded by three judges in the prepared music section, which includes a required composition, a march and a selected number, and then by another judge in the sight reading section, where two numbers are performed without practice.

The Romulus Junior High Band members, under the leadership of Band Director Richard Kruse, achieved their high performance goals despite the difficult economic times which have forced school consolidations, program cutbacks and some of their parents out of work. They have

received outstanding support from the Romulus Board of Education—Michael Woods, president, Theresa Kraft, vice president, Sandra Langley, secretary, Richard Campbell, treasurer, Dan Bates, trustee, JoAnn Marvicsin, trustee, and Kenneth Berlinn, trustee. The Central Office Administration also boosted the band and helped them achieve this award, including Dr. William Bedell, superintendent, Dr. Terrel LeCesne, assistant superintendent for personnel, and the Junior High School Administration, Nick Tottis, principal, and William McDonald, assistant principal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my public congratulations to the Romulus community and to this fine band and its leaders, and at this point insert, for the RECORD, the names of the band members who have brought positive recognition to this community:

Flute—Tina Gajgic, Kimberly Pappas, Mickey McDonald, Kimberly Winer, Jennifer Harriff, Katy Baker, Tina DuCheny, Valarie Sagert, Debbie Szente, Anna Hoffman, Stacey Shellman, Robin Brooks, Susan Fator.

Oboe—Kimberly Molitor.

Clarinet—Patti Lecroix, Mary Fletcher, Nicole O'Neal, Mary Silvey, Shannon Murray, Debbie Barr, Pam Witherow, Lorraine Zurawski, Tracie McGraw, Mike Hawkins, Tina Dillon, Louis Harris, Michele Ward, Brian Wood.

Alto Clarinet—Angela Katcher, Devin Doherty.

Bass Clarinet—Deanna Kushner, Kimberly Taylor.

Bassoon—Renee Scamp.

Alto Sax—Thomas Greenan, Mike Casto, Lynn Garcia, Ronald Underwood.

Tenor Sax—Matthew Deloge.

Baritone Sax—Kevin Allen.

Cornet—Michele Plonka, Glenn Smith, Angela Gaffka, Kim Polianchick, Kevin Tracy, Paula Wilson, Steve Chafins,Terry Faulkner, Allen Hall, Nathan Zabik, Jennifer Phillips, Kim Hood, Jackie Pochmara, Kim Burgess.

French Horn—Doug Adkins, Kathy Hood, Gina Williams, Kathy Jablonkay, David Quick.

Trombone—Allen Kenner, Lia Goree, Dawn Madison, Tammy Kerekes, Richard Davidson, Melinda Gilbert, David Biro, Julie Glotfelty, Rose Devita.

Baritone—Eric Talley, Robert Burkett, Robert Kobylas, Denise Domas.

Tuba—Michael Molenda, Patrick Stark, Michele Williams

Percussion—Mary McGrath, Patrick Rhodes, Antione Bosley, Jerry West, Greg Milatz.●

## STAND FIRM MR. PRESIDENT

### HON. HENRY HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the first round of what promises to be an emotional, protracted and difficult debate on the budget resolution, it is important to remind my colleagues of the President's words not long ago—words which, in turn, recall to mind the deplorable state of our economy just 2 years ago under a different administration.

It is difficult to understand our present economic predicament without some grasp of the economic environment that prevailed as the new administration began to assume authority.

The distinguished editor of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. Marvin Stone, recalls President Reagan's words in the May 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report, perhaps America's most respected weekly news magazine. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Stone's editorial—and I suggest that President Reagan and his supporters in Congress have good cause to stand firm.

Mr. Stone's editorial follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 24, 1982]

REAGAN: STUBBORN OR STEADFAST?

(By Marvin Stone)

The President is under heavy fire these days, not only from Democrats but also from some members of his own party who feel he is being bullheaded about his budget.

Mr. Reagan is holding out for less government. He remains convinced that this longing is shared by the vast majority of Americans who elected him by a landslide 19 months ago.

The President, it seems, has a longer memory than most politicians. This was evident the other day in a speech in Washington when he reminded fellow Republicans why, while foes call him stubborn, he remains determined to rein in the growth of federal spending and the mammoth bureaucracy it has spawned. From his speech:

"Let's go to the American people. Let's remind them of the economic mess we faced when we took office [in January, 1981]:

"Inflation in double digits . . . for two years in a row, back to back;

"First time in peacetime, interest rates that had hit, yes, 21.5 percent;

"Productivity and the rate of growth in the gross national product down for the third year in a row. . . .

"Let's remind them that in 1976 the inflation rate stood at 4.8 [percent]. By 1980, it was 2½ times as high—12.4.

"Let's remind them that in December of 1976 the prime rate . . . averaged 6.4 percent. By December, 1980 . . . it reached 21.5 percent, a 200 percent increase.

"Let's remind them that when we took office, unemployment had been climbing and business failures increasing.

"When the recession hit us, it was our legacy from the years of boom and bust, of erratic spending and monetary policy. . . .

"Let's point out that for all of this, there's been one overriding cause—we've said it before and let's say it again—government is too big and it spends too much money.

"In the last 10 years, federal spending tripled.

"In the last five years, federal taxes doubled, largely because of the growth of social programs. In 1950, social programs cost the taxpayers 12 billion dollars; in 1980, nearly 300 billion dollars—an increase of an incredible 2,300 percent. In that same period, prices rose by 278 percent. So real social spending was actually 5½ times higher than in 1950.

"By 1980, 1 out of every 3 American families was receiving federal assistance of one sort or another—1 out of every 3 families. The budget for the Department of Health and Human Services—250 billion dollars, roughly—the third-largest budget in the world, exceeded only by the total budgets of the Soviet Union and the United States.

"Take just one social program as an illustration: Sixteen years ago, we were spending 65 million dollars on food stamps—65 million dollars; in 1981, we spent 11.3 billion dollars. That's an increase of over 16,000 percent. . . .

"Now, include in this picture the interest payments on our tremendous federal debt that . . . reached more than a trillion dollars last year. The yearly interest payments are 100 billion dollars, and that's as much as the entire federal budget was just 20 years ago. . . .

"In fact, if you take the cost of automatic spending increases and entitlement programs, add them to the interest payments and the federal debt and the other uncontrollables, and it means that 70 percent of the entire federal budget is made up of items over which the Congress and the administration are supposed to have no control. I wonder how some of you in the private sector would feel if you were told to rescue a sinking business, but only on the condition that you could work with 30 percent of that business's budget and the other 70 percent was off limits.

"So I think you can begin to understand the difficulty of halting the kind of momentum built up by the federal spending juggernaut over the past few decades."

Facts and figures such as those make it easier to understand why Mr. Reagan is standing firm.●

## A TRIBUTE TO MR. SANFORD E. LYNE

### HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to commend the achievements of one of my constituents, Sanford E. Lyne, of Cambridge, Ohio.

Mr. Sanford "Sandy" Lyne has been teaching for 40 years. He began his teaching career with the Cambridge city schools in January of 1939 as an eighth grade teacher and football coach after receiving his bachelor's degree from Ohio State University in 1938. For the next 23 years he taught at the elementary, junior high, and senior high levels. During that time, he attended Rio Grande College, Ohio University, University of Dayton, and Montana State University. He completed his master's degree in 1960 from Ohio State University.

In 1962 he became assistant principal at Cambridge City High School and in 1965 he became principal; a position which he held until fall of 1972 when be became administrative assistant.

In 1975 Sandy became the junior high school principal and he will retire from that position at the end of this year. Mr. Lyne's basic educational philosophy is that each child is an individual and must be given wholesome educational experience and opportunities regardless of ability, race, customs, language, creed, or economic conditions. This philosophy has had a positive impact on all those students Mr. Lyne has taught and his presence will be missed.

I would like to thank Sandy Lyne for his dedication and hard work and wish him the very best in his retirement.●

## DOUBLE-PRONGED ATTACK ON THE WORLD TRADE FRONT IS COSTING U.S. JOBS

### HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion recently regarding the impact world trade is having on the employment situation in this Nation. At this time, the American labor force is suffering from a perverse application of the "trickle down" theory of economics. As foreign steel is dumped in the United States, demand for domestic steel already weakened due to slumping auto and home sales is further eroded. For each displaced steel industry job, numerous other jobs are lost in the coal industry which supplies the steel industry with low-sulfur metallurgical coal for coking purposes.

In the metallurgical coalfields of southern West Virginia, the "trickle down" effect of foreign steel dumping is now being harshly felt. Over the last few months, some 3,200 West Virginia coal miners have been laid off work with one major steel company alone finding it necessary to reduce its employment roles by 1,250 jobs out of its total labor force of 2,500. In a region where the coal industry plays a major role in the local economy, this is a formula for disaster. In McDowell County, for example, 73 percent of personal income comes from employment in the coal industry; in Logan County, this figure is 50 percent, and in Wyoming County, it is 70 percent.

These jobs are being lost due to a double-pronged attack on the world trade front: Increased foreign steel dumping and decreased demand for U.S. coal exports.

It is incumbent upon all the Congress to take steps to reduce the inadequacies of our present trade balance. Last week, members of the Steel Caucus took the first step toward alleviating what has turned into a trade war by introducing House Concurrent Resolution 342. The bottom line of this commendable legislative effort is that the trade laws must be enforced, and enforced strongly, in order to reduce this Nation's vulnerability to subsidized foreign steel dumping. This is not protectionist legislation, Mr. Speaker; it is equitable legislation seeking to rectify the misuse of this Nation's concept of free trade.

Our trade balance is also being violated by foreign consumers of coal in many instances who are not honoring their contracts with domestic producers. A contract is fine and well, but is a moot point when no ship calls at port.

The coal trade is also leveling off because competitors to U.S. coal exporters are providing foreign consumers with less expensive supplies. This became apparent when the political situation in Poland was quelled, and with the strong reentry of Australia and South Africa into the world coal trade. Since U.S. coal is already the highest priced on the market, primarily due to transportation costs, many foreign consumers seem to be finding a quick fix from our competitors. Yet, these competitors can never offer the same stability of supply as U.S. producers and sooner or later they will call upon this Nation again. Nonetheless, the intent of this country to play a major role in the world coal trade must be made loud and clear. For this reason, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 324, which expresses the intent of Congress that increased coal exports are in the national interest and must be accommodated through a national coal export policy.

The double-pronged attack on U.S. coal employment is being addressed by concerned Members, Mr. Speaker, through our efforts on both House Concurrent Resolution 342 and House Concurrent Resolution 324. These legislative initiatives serve as a clear signal that American jobs must be preserved.●

## REV. JOHN S. LUKSYS CELEBRATES 40th ANNIVERSARY

### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress, the outstanding achievements of Rev. John S. Luksys, who will be celebrating his 40th anniversary in the holy priesthood on May 30, 1982.

Father Luksys and his twin brother, the Reverend Stanley J. Luksys, pastor of Sts. Peter and Paul Church in Tamaqua, who is also celebrating his 40th anniversary in the priesthood, were ordained in 1942, by Dennis Cardinal Dougherty in Philadelphia. Father Luksys was then appointed assistant pastor of St. George Church in Shenandoah, where he served for 13 years until 1955. While at St. George's Church, Father Luksys initiated the founding of the Shenandoah Little League, started a parish Catholic Youth Organization and also was instrumental in opening a bowling alley for his community. He was awarded the "Man of the Year" plaque in 1955 by the Shenandoah Civic Association in recognition of his dedication to the people and for his many accomplishments. He is the only Catholic priest to ever have received this honor.

In later years, Rev. Luksys served as the chaplain of the Holmesburg State Prison, a home for the indigent and a house of correction. There he educated the convicts in his faith and under his spiritual guidance 40 prisoners asked to convert to his church. This most impressive accomplishment was acknowledged by the Archdiocese of Philadelphia and John Cardinal Krol personally visited the prison to administer the sacrament of confirmation to these men.

In 1970, Rev. Luksys was appointed pastor of St. Casimir's Church in Saint Clair and in 1972, he became the administrator and then pastor of the St. Francis of Assisi Church in Minersville, where he still serves today. During his 10 years in this position, he has accomplished the renovation of all parish properties, a new cafeteria has been built adjacent to the school, and perpetual care for the cemetery was initiated.

Rev. John S. Luksys, is an outstanding example of one who has given unceasingly of his efforts for the benefit of his church and community. We can all look to his accomplishments as an inspiration on how we can contribute to making this world of ours a better place ot live and grow. I know my colleagues will join me in wishing Rev. Luksys continued success in the future and will commend him on his 40th anniversary as a priest. I would also like to offer congratulations to Rev. Stanley J. Luksys on his 40th anniversary of ordination.●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was out of town on official business. Had I been here I would have voted for final passage of H.R. 6068, the Intelligence Authorization Act for 1983. I also would have voted against the Winn amendment to the National Science Foundation authorization for 1983. Thank you.●

## TABERNACLE BAPTIST CHURCH: A COMMITMENT TO HUMANITY

### HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1982 the Tabernacle Baptist Church will celebrate its 85th year anniversary as a religious fellowship. Organized in 1897, it is the second oldest missionary baptist church in the city of Los Angeles. Mr. Speaker, there is no possible way to measure the outstanding community service Tabernacle Baptist Church has brought to the Los Angeles area. The legacy of the Tabernacle Baptist Church is best epitomized in the words of Rev. Hartwell Simms, who inspired his following with these words:

We can't stop here. As long as there are lost souls to be won, as long as there are sick and aging people, as long as there are hungry people, as long as there is a society, there is still work to do. Mission, what are you doing? The need is there. Are you reaching out to touch somebody?

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues can find time to think about the words of Reverend Simms and the dedicated cause of his church. These are the people and the institutions, through their tireless efforts, who are promoting the quality of life for our citizens.●

## WASTE OIL RECOVERY

### HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the House Small Business Subcommittee on Energy, Environment and Safety, which I chair, held hearings on the subject of waste oil recovery.

Each year, this country uses approximately 3 billion gallons of motor oil and industrial lubricants. About half of that amount can be recovered and used a second time. However, a great deal of that waste oil instead is being discharged into the environment where it can create a variety of pollution and health problems.

Waste oil can be treated and used again as a lubricant. This is good, not only because it reduces environmental contamination and helps conserve petroleum, but also because the amount of virgin feedstock used in lubricant manufacturing is becoming less abundant.

Virtually all of the waste oil re-refiners in the United States are small businesses. Certainly, they are small by comparison with the integrated oil companies who have left this job for others to perform. Similarly, the independent lubricant manufacturers in this country are mostly small firms.

Historically, these groups have had some difficulty marketing lubricants made from recycled waste oil. The chief problem has been consumer acceptance of the product, based on a vague suspicion that the re-refined oil is in some way inferior to the virgin product. This is a difficult issue to resolve, because no standards exist that would allow simple analysis and comparison of re-refined petroleum products.

Recognizing the need for such standards and the fact that they can only come from the Government if they are to be credible and therefore useful, the Congress several years ago directed that the National Bureau of Standards should develop the tests and standards necessary for encouraging the recycling of waste oil in the United States. To the extent allowed by its limited resources, the re-refining industry has assessed itself and provided some funding and personnel to assist in this project.

It is my understanding that the administration has proposed terminating the National Bureau of Standards research on waste oil recovery at the end of this fiscal year. I believe this would be very unfortunate, as it would mean that several years of ongoing research would be ended just as we are reaching the point of having usable results.

I am told that there is no adequate substitute in the private sector for the work the Bureau is doing in this field. It is my understanding that the petroleum re-refining industry is counting on getting the results of the Bureau's project, in which they have participated. Thus, it would be a terrible waste of resources, both in the public and the private sectors, if we let the program be shut down just as it is about to yield productive results.

Both the Independent Lubricant Manufacturers Association and the Association of Petroleum Re-refiners have advised me of their concern over the proposed termination of the waste oil research work being done by the National Bureau of Standards.

John Fahey, president of the Independent Lubricant Manufacturers Association, recently wrote to me:

ILMA members have been waiting for several years for the development of test procedures by the Commerce Department's National Bureau of Standards that would determine whether re-refined lubricant base stocks are of sufficient quality, consistency, and additive response to produce a truly equivalent finished product. This standard setting for recycled oil was mandated by Section 383(c) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. * * *

ILMA is disappointed to learn that the Administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1983 terminates NBS' recycled oil program after September 30, 1982. The termination of this program would be a serious setback to efforts to encourage the greater recycling of used oils, particularly when NBS is nearing completion of its work. NBS officials have indicated that the recycled oil program could achieve its legislative mandate within two years and, possibly, by the end of fiscal year 1983. * * *.

The work remaining to be completed involves the application of NBS' recommended test procedures in a wide variety of actual uses. . . . The results from such field applications would not have any credibility without the reputation of NBS behind them.

In a similar vein, I have also been contacted by James A. McBain, the executive director of the Association of Petroleum Re-refiners. He states:

The NBS research in the area of base stock consistency and equivalency is of extreme importance to our industry and to the lubricating oil consuming public. As of the (proposed) date of termination of this project, the research will be about 75 percent complete.

This industry is compiled of small business which neither has the capital nor the technical sophistication to complete the work. When the program is terminated, the research will remain only 75 percent completed and, at best, will have only limited value.

And just yesterday, I was contacted by Paul Stringer, chairman of the Committee on Petroleum Products and Lubricants of the American Society for Testing Materials. He wanted me to know that ASTM, which is the private sector counterpart to the National Bureau of Standards, was concerned by the potential adverse effects of stopping the Bureau's used oil recycling research before its fruition.

Clearly, we should not let this valuable program be terminated before the results of their research is made available to industry in a usable form. I urge the administration to continue NBS recycled oil program beyond September 30, 1982.●

## CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE HARRISON H. GEROW, M.D., OF NEW JERSEY, ESTEEMED PHYSICIAN, OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY LEADER, AND GREAT AMERICAN

### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 21, the residents of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to an esteemed physician, outstanding community leader, and good friend, the Honorable Harrison H. Gerow, M.D., whose standards of excellence throughout his lifetime—and particularly his exemplary expertise and professional skills as a doctor of medi-

cine—have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

As Dr. Gerow retires from his high office of public trust as physician of the city of Clifton which he has held for the past quarter of a century, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in deep appreciation of all of his good works and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife, Mary; their daughters, Jacquelyn Moellers and June Ann Duzs; five grandsons, and other family members.

Mr. Speaker, as the physicians' Hippocratic Oath has served as an ideal for the professional attitude and ethics of Dr. Gerow—"for the benefit of my patients and abstain(ing) from whatever is deleterious and mischievous"—so has Dr. Gerow served as an ideal to all of us—"respected by all men, in all times."

Dr. Gerow has indeed earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us. Throughout his lifetime, he has forged ahead with endless energy, dedication, and sincerity of purpose in his quest to utilize his fullest talents in being of service to his fellowman.

He was born in Wilmington, Del., educated in Wilmington public schools, attended the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, and adopted the State of New Jersey as his home.

We applaud his knowledge, training, hard work, and personal commitment that has enabled him to achieve the fullest confidence and strongest support of the people of our community. He has been a physician for the Montclair Academy athletic program and for 19 years was with the athletic program of Clifton High School. He was also athletic physician for the borough of Elmwood Park, N.J.

Dr. Gerow has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic, charitable, and community improvement programs. During World War II, he was chairman of the USO program of East Paterson, N.J., and has been in the vanguard of the lifesaving efforts of the American Red Cross Blood Bank in Clifton, N.J. He is a member of the Volunteer Elmwood Park Department No. 1, New Jersey Arco (a narcotics drug abuse prevention and control group), Elks Sarasota, and Sarasota Yacht Club.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of life here in America and I am pleased to call your attention to Dr. Gerow's lifetime of outstanding public service. As he retires his official position as physician of the city of Clifton, N.J., I respectfully seek this national recognition of Dr. Gerow and all of his good works. We do indeed salute a distinguished citizen, good friend, and great American—the Honorable Harrison H. Gerow, M.D.—for his contribution to the quality of life for the people of our community, State, and Nation.●

## SELECT PANEL RECONVENED

### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that as part of Public Law 95-626, Congress established a select panel for the promotion of child health, to undertake a comprehensive review of the Nation's child health policies and programs. The panel completed its extensive work and submitted its four-volume report in December 1980. Those of us who have had occasion to utilize the panel's findings and analysis in our legislative deliberations have found the report to be invaluable, and the panel's recommendations to be a uniquely useful guide in addressing a wide spectrum of concerns related to child health.

Earlier this month, the panel reconvened, with the support of funds provided for this purpose by the W. T. Grant Foundation, to consider developments affecting child health that have occurred since the panel released its report. The members of the panel issued a statement which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues, particularly since the statement comes from a group with unique expertise and diverse backgrounds, including a former surgeon general of the United States, a large number of other prominent health professionals, as well as citizen representatives of considerable eminence.

The panel's statement follows:

Looking at current events in the light of the Panel's 18 months of hearings, fact-finding, deliberations and analysis, we conclude that the major changes in federal funding and program authority which have recently occurred or been proposed, clearly were made without any systematic assessment of their cumulative detrimental effects—now and in the future—on maternal and child health and on long-term public expenditures.

We are particularly alarmed at the cutbacks in support for services the Panel identified less than 2 years ago as of highest priority, because these services demonstrably contribute to improved health, greater productivity, and the security of the nation.

In our original report, we identified the following services as especially cost-effective and of highest priority, and recommended specific actions to expand their availability:

"Prenatal care (including nutrition), delivery, and postnatal care

"Comprehensive health care for children from birth through age 5 (including nutrition and immunizations)

"Family planning services."

Many of the recent and proposed cutbacks in public funding for these high priority health services will be penny wise but pound foolish, since they are likely to result in:

"Increased death, sickness and preventable suffering, especially among the children of the poor and near-poor;

"Increased public expenditures in the future, not only in the health and mental health system, but also in welfare and education;

"A less productive work force as today's children grow to adulthood."

Any retreat from the levels of public support that have been provided for these services is unconscionable. Present cutbacks already seriously damage a structure of essential services which has been painstakingly built over the years, and which has resulted in remarkable gains in child health.

After hearing a series of six reports on current developments, we are increasingly concerned about the interactive and cumulative effects on children and their families of the cutbacks and program changes not only in child health programs, but also in food stamps, nutrition, and public welfare programs. The AFDC changes alone have already resulted in the damaging loss of medical benefits for a large number of working AFDC mothers and their children.

The following are examples of specific developments that arouse our deep concern:

"The Title V Maternal and Child Health Block Grant—the only federal health program specifically for mothers and children—was one of the most severely cut federal health programs in the FY 1982 Budget Act and Continuing Resolution, and is threatened with further cuts. The current drastic reduction in federal funding is resulting in substantial decreases in highly effective preventive health services of the type which the Panel's report identified as particularly important in improving the health of mothers and children, and is occurring dispite the fact that many mothers and children did not have access to these essential health services even prior to the FY 1982 funding reduction.

Adequate nutrition has been consistently associated with better pregnancy outcomes, including a lower incidence of mental retardation, and the healthier growth of infants and children. Nevertheless, current proposals would cut WIC nutrition funds by approximately a third, directly resulting in an alarming reduction in the number of needy infants and pregnant and lactating women who could receive food supplements.

Recent and proposed changes in the Medicaid program, reducing eligibility both for those on welfare and the medically needy, requiring copayments from recipients, and the suspension of the EPSDT penalty regulations, have the effect of limiting the appropriate use of preventive and primary care for children and pregnant women, precisely the most cost-effective components of care.

Funding cutbacks are also decimating existing capacities to provide certain services which the Panel had found especially important but insufficiently available even before the current funding reductions. These include services for handicapped children, services for adolescents, genetic, mental health and psychosocial services, and services that promote access to care."

We wish to emphasize that our assessment of current developments is not partisan in intent, and to reaffirm the statement we made at the time our report was released: Our children's good health, competence and vigor are so central to the national interest that, whatever the differences among citi-

zens, legislators and administrators about the precise forms of required action, we can all unite on the need for action. We regard our report as a long-term prospectus for a sound investment in America's future. The very children who are dependent on us today will be the adults we will look to tomorrow to protect our natural environment, maintain our standard of living, keep our economy competitive with other nations, preserve our defense capabilities, and maintain our humanitarian values.

A list of Panel members, with their current affiliations, is attached.

MEMBERS OF THE SELECT PANEL FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHILD HEALTH

Jo Anne Brasel, M.D., professor of pediatrics and medicine, UCLA School of Medicine, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mitchell I. Ginsberg, professor, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York, N.Y.

Frank Hardart, Jr., M.D., obstetrician and gynecologist, New York, N.Y.

Benjamin W. Heineman, Jr., Esq., Califano, Ross & Heineman, Washington, D.C.

Roger C. Herdman, M.D., vice-president for Prof. Affairs, Sloan-Kettering Memorial Inst., New York, N.Y.

Nicholas Hobbs, professor of psychology, emeritus, Vanderbilt University, Inst. for Public Policy Stds., Nashville, Tenn.

George I. Lythcott, M.D., professor of pediatrics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

John C. MacQueen, M.D., professor of pediatrics, University of Iowa, (vice-chairman), Iowa City, Iowa.

Howard N. Newman, Esq., Memel, Jacobs, Pierno & Gersh, Washington, D.C.

Katherine B. Nuckols, Ph. D., F.A.A.N., professor of nursing, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

John L. Palmer, Ph. D., senior fellow, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Julius B. Richmond, M.D., professor of health policy, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Lisbeth B. Schorr, visiting professor of maternal and child health policy, University of North Carolina, Washington, D.C. (chairman).

Aaron Shirley, M.D., project director, Jackson-Hinds Comprehensive Health Center, Jackson, Miss.

Jeanne C. Sinkford, D.D.S., dean, School of Dentistry, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

George Tarjan, M.D., director, Mental Retardation Program and Child Psychiatry Division, UCLA School of Medicine.

Charlotte Wilen, president, continuum, Georgia Alliance for Human Development, Atlanta, Ga.●

## CONGRESSMAN MILLER HONORS RETIRING TEACHERS

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, three outstanding teachers will retire from the Martinez Unified School District at the end of this school year and I want to take this opportunity to salute them.

Lillian Thomas is retiring after teaching in the Martinez Unified School District for 25 years. While in Martinez, Mrs. Thomas has taught second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth grades at Martinez Elementary School. Prior to teaching in Martinez, she taught in Washington and Oregon.

Mr. Thomas enjoys numerous interests and hobbies, including traveling. She has traveled extensively through Egypt, Israel, Europe, Canada, and Mexico. She has visited all but six of our own United States. Mrs. Thomas and her husband, Edward, who is also retired from teaching, look forward to further travel in their shared retirement. They also look forward to spending time with their two daughters and four grandchildren.

Agnes Ariey is retiring after teaching for 25 years in the Martinez Unified School District. Mrs. Ariey, a native Californian, grew up in Port Costa and graduated from Alhambra High School in Martinez. She attended Holy Names College in Oakland, traveling by train from Martinez to Oakland and back each day. She was graduated from the College of Holy Names and received her teaching credential from the University of California in Berkeley. Prior to teaching in Martinez, Mrs. Ariey taught in Knightsen.

Mrs. Ariey is married to Andrew Ariey, an engineer for Pacific Gas & Electric. They have four daughters, all college graduates, and one grandson. Mrs. Ariey is looking forward to an active retirement.

Claudia Whitnah, a fourth grade teacher at Martinez Elementary School, is retiring after 35 years of teaching. Mrs. Whitnah, a native Californian, was born and educated in Berkeley. She attended the University of California in Berkeley and graduated from New York University. She began her teaching career in San Pablo, Calif., with a class of 75 students. Before coming to Martinez, Mrs. Whitnah taught in the Mt. Diablo School District and also taught special education for Contra Costa County. She taught at Montecito School in Martinez for 2 years and Martinez Elementary for 27 years. She has taught at all levels through eighth grade, including special classes in wood shop and music. Mrs. Whitnah has taught over 1,000 children in her 35 years of teaching, many of them children of former students. She plans an active retirement, continuing her studies and working on her music.

These three women have been inspiring educators and we will enjoy the benefits of their outstanding efforts for many years to come. Mr. Speaker, I know that you and my other colleagues join with me in saluting and commending Lillian Thomas, Agnes Ariey, and Claudia Whitnah, and wishing them the best for a long, well-deserved retirement.●

## W. CLEMENT STONE

### HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's great entrepreneurs and philanthropists, W. Clement Stone of Chicago, recently celebrated his 80th birthday. Mr. Stone is indeed an American success story—a true Horatio Alger of the 20th century—who started as a newsboy and built a great business empire. He is also one of the those rare individuals who possesses the ability to inspire others on to greatness, and has certainly done so as an author and a lecturer.

In honor of Mr. Stone's 80th birthday, I am pleased to include the following remarks from the Paul Harvey News broadcast of May 1.

I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Stone many, many more years of good health, success and fulfillment.

W. CLEMENT STONE LED SOCIAL REVOLUTION

For W. Clement Stone this is birthday number eighty and counting.

Look up W. Clement Stone in "Who's Who" or in a biographical dictionary and you're impressed with credentials . . .

Insurance executive of fabulous wealth, author, advisor to Presidents—that sort of thing.

But the Clem Stone I've been honored to know in his home and in my own—

Or when just the two of us were late hours in my light plane returning from a speaking engagement somewhere—

The other Clem Stone—

When he is not moving corporate mountains or inspiring enormous audiences or charming a boardroom or ramrodding a charity.

That Clem Stone is much more remarkable than the other one.

Our nation has spawned many rich men.

Our generation has witnessed several billionaires—

But Howard Hughes decayed in his cloister . . .

H. L. Hunt sought immortality futilely tilting with windmills . . .

J. Paul Getty's succession of wives could never relieve his loneliness . . .

John MacArthur settled for a coffee-shop forum and left his wealth to be administered in ways he never would.

Our generation has witnessed a procession of billionaires and only one happy one.

I don't mean ours to sound like a buddy-buddy friendship; for better or worse busy men sacrifice that degree of fraternity.

But we have been close enough so that every day I parrot some of his wisdom without even meaning to.

The secret of Clem Stone's success is no secret. He shouts it from platforms and pulpits, delights in sharing it with the most casual passerby.

It's as new as now and as old as Scripture . . . "As a man believeth in his heart . . ."

That is what he is.

Most anywhere I travel I meet somebody who credits his own success to something Clem Stone said or wrote.

Elected officials, corporate executives, very recently the CEO of a prospering chain of restaurants.

I know Mr. Stone hears from many others—not counting the countless he never knew were paying attention.

Angel and I, previously committed, cannot be present for our friend's birthday celebration—but he would understand about commitments.

I'd like to be there to hear the Captains and the Kings pay their respects and join the toasts of family and friends.

I've sent this greeting this way only because I feared that in their toasts and tributes all he's done might eclipse all that he's been.

For he has been the leader of a social revolution.

In a climate where bigness was suspect he altered that climate with persistent integrity and decency . . .

In an era when rich men begat mostly resentment, this one earned respect, inspired emulation . . .

And when money motivated many to all manner of excesses . . .

Clem Stone's sustaining love for his childhood sweetheart, Jessie . . . confounded the cynics.

Clem Stone—the newsboy who made of his newsstand—a skyscraper . . .

The young son of a widowed mother whose faith in God, his country and himself—in that order—was the foundation for an empire.

Yet, every step of the way up—he was climbing with one hand—and holding out the other to anybody with the gumption to follow.

Clem Stone, cherished friend, lead on!●

## TRIBUTE TO TWO PENNSYLVANIA EAGLE SCOUTS

### HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring two Boy Scouts from Luzerne County in the 11th District of Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent. These two Scouts, from Troop 281 of Dallas, Pa., have recently received the highest scouting award, the coveted Eagle Scout Award.

Kurt Fetterman, 16, the son of John and Elizabeth Fetterman, is a sophomore at Dallas Senior High School, where, in addition to his scouting activities, he is involved in soccer and in painting.

Stephen Strazdus, 15, the son of Richard and Barbara Strazdus, is active in sports and theater as a sophomore at Dallas Senior High School.

I commend the troop's Scout leader, Bob Vanderhook, for spurring these young men on to such outstanding achievements, and I join parents, friends and residents of Dallas in wishing these young men equal success in their future endeavors.●

## NEED FOR A NUCLEAR FREEZE

### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the issue of a mutual and verifiable nuclear freeze is one of the best examples we have had in a long time of the power of the American people to make their elected officials pay attention to their views.

By their widespread support for a freeze, the voters have compelled both the President and Congress to take a far more serious interest in arms reduction than was the case last year.

Some commentators have professed puzzlement at the support the freeze is receiving. A recent article by Boston Herald American columnist Peter Lucas may help them understand why the freeze has become unpopular. Mr. Lucas, in his straightforward style, articulates very concisely the reasons that the freeze petitions have met such a broad, popular response and I think his exposition should be shared with the Members.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Herald American, May 14, 1982]

SENATOR KENNEDY IS RIGHT ON NUCLEAR FREEZE ISSUE

(By Peter Lucas)

Ed Markey stole my line.

Before I could write it, the congressman from Malden, up front on the nuclear freeze issue, used it in the op-ed section of the Herald American Tuesday in a piece he did with Stuart Langton of Tufts University about nuclear disarmament possibly becoming the political issue of the 1980s.

The call for a nuclear freeze between the United States and the Soviet Union will be THE issue in the 1980s, particularly in the 1984 presidential campaign. It is an issue whose time has come.

For Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, up for reelection this year, and possibly considering another run for the presidency in 1984, the issue is a ready made one.

Although Kennedy may be vulnerable on issues that business leaders are interested in, he handles business questions by answering about what he has done to deregulate the airlines and the trucking industry.

But the business issues pale in comparison to the nuclear freeze issue. Kennedy, along with Oregon Sen. Mark Hatfield, Sen. Paul Tsongas, Markey and Republican U.S. Rep. Silvio Conte of Pittsfield, introduced a resolution in Congress two months ago to stop the nuclear arms race. And since then the issue has taken off.

"The Kennedy-Hatfield resolution," Kennedy said, "calls for an immediate, mutual and verifiable freeze on nuclear weapons between the United States and the Soviet Unio, followed by a major reduction in the nuclear arsenals on both sides. In the midst of this nuclear madness, it is time for all of us to stand up and say, enough is enough."

How can anybody in his right mind be in favor of building more nuclear bombs when both sides have more than enough to blow the place up and kill everybody?

"Together, the United States and the Soviet Union stockpile a total of 16,000 strategic nuclear warheads," Kennedy said, "with nearly four tons of T.N.T. for every man, woman and child presently living on this planet. Today, the earth itself is an endangered species."

Kennedy has a whole lot of credibility talking about the nuclear freeze.

Perhaps this is due in part to the dumb plans of the people around President Reagan to spend $4.2 billion for a civil defense plan to relocate some two-thirds of the people from the urban areas to remote areas in the event of a nuclear war.

"Recently, the administration has been asking more and more money for civil defense," Kennedy said. "They are discussing the evacuation of our major cities, which would give the Soviets many days of warning about a possible attack.

"What are the Russians supposed to think when their spy satellites see Route 128 clogged with cars crawling toward the Massachusetts Turnpike and heading toward Pittsfield and the Berkshires?"

Kennedy is right on the nuclear freeze issue.

I'm not going to be evacuated. I'm not going anywhere, but I am sticking around to cover the nuclear arms freeze issues or the end of the world, whichever comes first.●

## RABBI ERWIN ZIMET

### HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1982, Rabbi Erwin Zimet of Temple Beth-El in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., celebrated both his 70th birthday and his 35th year with the congregation as senior Rabbi.

Rabbi Zimet has devoted most of his life to making the congregation of Temple Beth-El feel like part of his family and in teaching the values of Judaism to those persons fortunate enough to have heard his sermons. Rabbi Zimet has been a constant source of knowledge and comfort for every member of his congregation and has achieved a stature in the local community unmatched by his peers.

I was personally unable to attend the tribute to Rabbi Zimet, but I share the entire congregation's gratitude for his contributions over the past 35 years. Although many changes have occurred in the city of Poughkeepsie over the past four decades, Rabbi Zimet has always been there to guide and counsel his congregation and the entire community. I have every reason to believe the city of Poughkeepsie will continue to benefit from Rabbi Zimet's contributions in the future.●

## ADMINISTRATION POLICIES HELP RICH GET RICHER

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of Americans now believe that the essential element of fairness is missing in the administration's economic program.

The administration's supply side economic plan is creating deep economic and social divisions in our society. There are more jobless Americans today than at any time since 1939. Real interest rates are now higher than they have been since 1932. Last year saw the lowest number of housing starts since 1940, and home resales are at their lowest level in 8 years. U.S. auto production is the lowest it has been since 1947. In just 1 week in May, 530 firms went bankrupt. This year's business and farm failures are at their highest level since the Great Depression. Each business closing adds to the 10 million unemployed Americans looking for work.

Yet many Americans are far removed from today's economic realities. The Philadelphia Inquirer article which follows this statement reports that the number of Americans with assets of $1 million or more grew by more than 55,000 last year, an 11-percent increase from 1980.

According to a 1982 study by the Congressional Budget Office, the administration's economic recovery program measurably helps the rich get richer while it penalizes low- and moderate-income households. For families earning less than $10,000 next year, the CBO report concludes that the administration's budget and tax cut program will reduce the family's net worth by $120. Yet CBO finds that the administration's program will award families earning $80,000 or more with an average $15,000 tax reduction.

This year over 35 percent of the administration's tax cut will go to less than 5 percent of the population, those earning over $50,000 a year. For my colleagues who wish to learn more about how some of these prosperous Americans are spending their tax bonanza, Mr. Speaker, I request that the following article be inserted in the RECORD.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 16, 1982]

### WHAT RECESSION? THE RICH ARE GETTING RICHER

(By Arthur Howe)

ASPEN, COLO.—Here in the valley of $1.5 million condominiums, $100-a-day ski lessons, $73 takeout Chinese dinners for four, and crocodile-skin cowboy boots for $750, is a sort of Disneyland for adults. No one, at least, quibbles over the price of things.

"Recession? The people who come here aren't really affected by it," local real estate broker Evan Boenning said. His company, along with the rest of the local merchants, innkeepers and restaurateurs, had a near-record winter season.

Far from the baleful lines of millions of jobless Americans are flourishing pockets of prosperity like Aspen, which are removed from the effects of a prolonged recession and economic confusion. They are supported by an expanding class of moneyed people—mostly nouveau riche, educated professionals and business executives. A minority of them were born to wealth. All are virtually untouched by the current economic downturn.

Similarly, those restaurants and resorts, real estate agents and automobile manufacturers that attend to the wishes of the rich—offering high-priced exotica from quail eggs to Maserati Quattroportes—are enjoying boom times.

Consider, for instance, Autohaus Atlantic, an Atlantic City, N.J., dealer of Mercedes-Benz automobiles. Manager William Hamar said the agency had trouble stocking enough 380 SECs and 300 turbo-diesels to meet demand.

"They're lining up for them," he said. "Customers come in here and spend 25, 35, 45 and 55 in cash." These are thousands of dollars.

At Cartier Inc. in New York, the demand is strong for jewelry—earrings, bracelets and necklaces with bright-hued stones, priced from $25,000 to $100,000—as well as art deco clocks at more than $90,000. Business is "doing very well," a spokesman said.

No price appears too high for those interested in prime real estate. Sotheby Parke Bernet Internationally Realty Corp., which offers a range of "distinctive" properties from $300,000 to $24 million, has reported that sales for the first three quarters of its 1982 fiscal year were running 45 percent ahead of last year. Said Samuel Beach, vice president for mid-Atlantic sales: "There's a lot of money out there."

Exactly who are these free spender?

"Primarily they are people who are tied to recession-proof businesses," involved in high technology, energy, financial services, engineering and certain manufacturing processes, said John K. Holland, assistant vice president of marketing for the United States Trust Co., a New York investment firm that has prepared a study describing the growing class of well-to-do Americans.

The study showed that, based on tax information from the IRS, the number of individuals with assets of $1 million or more grew by more than 55,000 last year, an 11 percent increase from 1980.

Recently released figures from the Commerce Department and Census Bureau support evidence of an expanding number of prosperous Americans as well as a growing number of people at the lower end of the income ladder.

In 1970, the bureau said, 14.8 percent of all families had incomes of $35,000 or more. In 1980, 19.5 percent of all families were in that category. Similarly, in 1980, 6.7 percent of all families had incomes of $50,000 or more, compared with 5.5 percent in 1970.

"Middle- and lower-income families have been hardest hit by the combination of inflation and high unemployment, while the wealthier people are better insulated from inflation and have benefited from high interest earnings and recent tax cuts," said Sandra Shaber, senior economist for Chase Econometrics in Bala Cynwyd, Pa.

Chase Econometrics projects that the gap between lower- and upper-income earners will continue to grow through the 1980s. The economic forecasting service said that as of 1980, some 948,000, or 1.6 percent, of the nation's 60.3 million families had an annual income of $75,000 or more. By 1985, that number is expected to grow to 4.9 million, or 7.6 percent of U.S. families. And in 1990 about 16.8 million families, or 23.8 percent, will have annual incomes of at least $75,000. Even allowing for the effect of inflation on incomes, the earnings of this elite group are expected to grow significantly in absolute terms in coming years.

One factor that will greatly affect the growth of affluence is the recent reversal of the progressive tax laws and federal programs aimed at income redistribution—a turnaround advanced largely by what critics have labeled President Reagan's "Beverly Hills budget."

Thanks to tax-reform legislation passed by Congress last year, wealthy Americans will benefit from a three-year, 25 percent tax cut and a reduction in the maximum income tax to 50 percent from 70 percent. The budget also offers significant cuts in capital gains taxes and the opportunity for those with discretionary cash to invest tax-free in all-savers certificates and Individual Retirement Accounts while at the same time enjoying substantial tax deductions.

Prolonged high interest rates, the bane of the middle and lower classes, work as something of a boon to the rich.

In fact, interest income from money market funds, bonds, certificates of deposit and other financial instruments whose return is linked to the high interests rates represents the fastest-growing segment of personal income, economists say. The Department of Commerce reports that such personal interest income enjoyed by those wealthy enough to invest grew from $300.9 million during the first quarter of 1981 to $338.5 million in the first quarter of 1982.

At the same time, evidence indicates that the wages of middle- and lower-income workers during the last decade, adjusted for inflation and expanded work force, declined by an annual average rate of 0.1 percent per year, according to economist Shaber. Moreover, for this class of individuals normally preoccupied by the cost of living, inflation hurt the most.

"Inflation hit the necessities—food, fuel and housing—much harder than the price of luxuries," Shaber said.

Thus, a sort of spending spree has developed for the well-to-do.

"People figure goods are a better way of using their greenbacks," said Fabian Linden, executive director of consumer research at the Conference Board, a New York business-research group. "It used to be that you let your money work for you. Now the attitude is instead of investing it, maybe buy a little more."

Nowhere, perhaps, is this attitude more prevalent than Aspen, the century-old Colorado mining town that now resembles a demi-Eden for the rich.

By day the slopes on the four mountains are crowded with suntanned skiers, many with $100 Sony Walkmans attached to their $600 Bogner reversible jumpsuits. Their equipment: $450 fiberglass skis and $250 plastic boots. So many skiers paid $22 a day for lift tickets this season that the Aspen Ski Corp., a division of Aetna Life Insurance Co. and 20th Century-Fox, is comparing sales last winter with the resort's record year in 1980.

Aspen's streets are filled with wealthy Texans, West Coast industrialists, Mexicans and Germans in mink parkas and accessories by Gucci. Many spend their days searching for jewelry, clothes and gifts in the refurbished, Victorian-era shops and boutiques that offer prices exceeding even those found in the shops of Los Angeles' famed shopping area for the stars, Rodeo Drive. At night, they press into the dozens of chic restaurants like the Ute City Bank, festooned with hanging plants and stained glass.

"The recession really doesn't mean much to these people," said Carol Kiesinger, a member of the Aspen Chamber of Commerce. "I've been going out at night with a millionaire friend from Cleveland to the good restaurants in town, and they're mobbed—I mean mobbed. The top, top real estate is still selling well, too. It's the moderately priced real estate, in the 300 to 400 [thousand dollar] range, that's a little slow."

Across the country, businesses offering exotic cars and boats report that sales are unchanged by the economy. Some, like Martin C. Keenan, president of Keenan Motors Inc., a Philadelphia Mercedes-Benz and Rolls-Royce dealer, say sales of Rolls-Royces, priced at $110,000 to $163,000, are running 50 percent ahead of last year.

"I am only two Rolls-Royces behind last year's entire sales," he said. "With our Mercedes, everything that comes in is almost pre-sold."

Philip Tegtmeier, sales manager for Algar Enterprises Inc., a Paoli-based dealer of Ferraris and Maseratis, priced between $41,000 and $65,000, said, "The activity, the traffic, the kind of buyer—they're still out there."

Art Willis, owner of Sailing Emporium, a Rock Hall, Md., marina, said demand was strong for luxury sailing boats—specifically Mariner 36s, at $120,000 each, Canadian Sailing Yachts at $90,000, and 38-foot Hoods for $140,000 to $160,000.

"We've had better sales this year than any other year. We can't get enough good quality boats" to meet demand, he said. "Right now we have deposits on boats that can't be built."

Likewise, the affluent appear not afraid to indulge their palates.

At the one-year-old Sutton Place Gourmet store in Washington, which bills itself as "the world's largest one-stop gourmet shop," sales are "still climbing," according to a public relations spokesman hired by the store. The fare includes Beluga Malossal (slightly salted) caviar, flown in fresh three times a week from Russia, at $199 for a 9-ounce jar, Moreau chocolates at $17.99 per 7-ounce jar, and leg of lion for $19.99 per pound.

"We have occasional calls for the lion, but mostly people want reindeer, hare and fowl," said Sutton Place's public relations representative Norm Atkins.

The taste for expensive goodies has proved a boon to most high-priced restaurants and to magazines like Bon Appetit, which has trebled its circulation in five years.

Godiva Candies, a Reading-based subsidiary of Campbell Soup Co. that makes Belgian-style molded chocolates selling for as much as $45 a pound, has seen its sales balloon by 900 percent over the past three years, according to Godiva executive Albert Pechenik. Godiva recently began marketing $5-a-pint ice cream and plans to open some 50 retail outlets in the next three years. French gourmet chef Paul Bocuse is under contract to develop a line of gourmet foods for the company.

Pechenik attributes his company's success, in the face of dozens of bankruptcies across the candy industry in recent years, to Godiva's adherence to quality.

"Those businesses who have paid attention to quality are thriving," he said. "The others, like Detroit, are not. What's happening now, I believe, is a day of reckoning.

Luxury real estate—from smogfree havens like Boca Raton, Fla., to roof-top Rittenhouse Square apartments—is selling briskly, too, report brokers.

Barbara Greenfield, an associate broker with the Greenfield Co. who specializes in Center City Philadelphia real estate priced above $200,000, said that last year she personally sold $7.3 million worth of real estate—"and that was supposed to be the worst year ever for real estate," she said. So far this year, her sales are "not far away" from last year's level.

Sotheby's International Real Estate division, which specializes in a line of "distinctive properties," reports that in some sectors of the luxury real estate market, there aren't enough properties to meet demand.

"Basically," said Sotheby's real estate president, Charles H. Seilheimer Jr., "the co-ops [cooperative apartments in New York city] going for one, two or three million—there are more people around to buy them than apartments to go around."

It is not surprising that publications catering to the interests of the upper crust are springing up across the country. Since December, Texas' sizable moneyed population has been able to compare notes in Ultra, a magazine that concerns itself with the "upbeat lifestyles of Texans," according to the managing editor.

Sprinkled among advertisements for Baccarat vases for $1,315 each and society photographs, Ultra offers articles about "Greek Island Hopping" and an "inside view" of the wife of the publication's founder, real estate mogul Harold Farb. In the March issue, a writer for Ultra wonders:

"Where are the linens and the music? Why is the food slapped on the plate rather than garnished? Where are the strawberries in December and the *huevos ranchereos* in June?"

Arizona has a similar publication, Elite. Its founder, Ellie Schultz, said it is aimed at those 71,000 states residents who earn more than $100,000 per year.

Finally, the flagship of the landed gentry, Town & Country magazine is enjoying the biggest financial boon in its 136-year-history. Ad revenues for the first half of the fiscal year are up 41 percent from the similar 1981 period, to $6.95 million. Circulation, which for decades hovered under 150,000 reached 310,000 during the first quater of 1982.

Said David A. McCann, publisher: "We're doing spectacularly well. For the first six months of this year and revenue has surpassed every full year's revenue from 1846 to 1979."

The periodical, which bills itself as "The Magazine of privileged information," has been undergoing something of an editorial metamorphosis in recent years. It now not only gives homage to the wealthy at international playgrounds, but also addresses some singular problems of the rich: health care money and social behavior.

"We use to be basically a magazine for dowagers and debutantes," McCann said. "We now address ourselves to people who have money and address them as honest-to-goodness people. In our opinion the rich are really no different from the general public—except, of course, that they have money."●

## A TRIBUTE TO DR. PATRICK MOGAN

### HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the extensive contributions of Dr. Patrick Mogan, the superintendent of public schools in Lowell, Mass.

After 35 years as a nationally renowned educator and city planner, Dr. Mogan will be retiring on June 30, 1982. Dr. Mogan, who received a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts in 1975, has also received honorary degrees from Amherst College and from the University of Lowell.

Dr. Mogan has served as the superintendent of public schools since 1977. However, that is only one of the many capacities from which he has contributed to the Lowell community. Dr. Mogan is recognized throughout eastern Massachusetts as being the individual most responsible for the rebirth of the city of Lowell. He was the initiator of the Lowell development plan, which developed into the Lowell State Heritage Park. He also instigated the Lowell National Historical Park project, and has continued to lend his support, expertise and influence to this project. Finally, he created the legislation which designated Lowell as the first national urban cultural park in the United States.

In addition to these contributions to the city of Lowell, Dr. Mogan developed the migrant project for Middlesex and Essex Counties, organized the National Teachers Corp., the Center for Human Development, and the Cultural Center of Lowell, and the city learning system for children.

Dr. Mogan has been cited by the U.S. Office of Education and the educational facilities laboratories of the Ford Foundation for the development of the "Everywhere School," a new concept for a community school. He has worked with the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs for the planning and implementation of an intercultural education program. And, Dr. Mogan has been a frequent contributor to national conferences on urban education and urban environmental planning.

On behalf of the city of Lowell, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and every individual who is concerned about the development of excellence in our public schools, I would like to

thank Dr. Patrick Mogan for his contributions.●

## GENE WILSON MARTIN

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, vocational excellence is essential to keeping a full, productive economy. It gives all of us pride to see people take the lead in their profession.

A profession that is being recognized more and more for its art and creative expression is the field of hair dressing. In Dallas, we take pride in recognizing Gene Wilson Martin when she won the world championship as creating the best in commercial hair style. This designation was the styling that would have the widest appeal among actual salon clients.

And even more, in the field where Gene was chosen the best, it provided the livable hair dressing which brings back the more involved feminine look.

Most people do not realize the time, work, and dedicated practice that goes into building a champion. Just a few years ago, Gene Wilson Martin was a U.S.A. team representative at the World Championship Hair Dressing Competition in Stuttgart, Germany. Her work has appeared in various international publications. She is president of a company which provides training programs for stylists. She manages her own shop and also keeps her two hands active and experienced with new challenging ideas.

I am proud of Gene Wilson Martin because she is a Texan. I am proud of her because she worked her way to the top to become champion at the World Hair Dressing Congress in London. Competition builds greatness. And competition stimulates creativity.●

## A BETTER ARMY

### HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial that appeared in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch about the encouraging progress being made to improve the capabilities of the U.S. Army under the able leadership of Secretary of the Army John O. Marsh, Jr.

Colleagues will recall that Secretary Marsh was my predecessor in office as the Representative of Virginia's Seventh Congressional District.

The text of the editorial is as follows:

A BETTER ARMY

When John O. Marsh, Jr. took over as secretary of the Army in 1981, he assumed responsibility for an organization that appeared to be suffering badly from a severe affliction of the "Three Ds": Declining enlistments, Deteriorating morale and Drug abuse. The Army seemed to be trapped in a spiritual Valley Forge, and many informed people worried about its ability to respond effectively to a major enemy assault.

Conditions are better today. Volunteerism is proving increasingly successful in producing the quality of recruits the Army needs to sustain its strength. Re-enlistments are up; morale is rising. Discipline is stronger and training is tougher. Drug abuse, a scourge that threatens every segment of American society, remains a serious problem but the Army is trying hard to combat it.

Mr. Marsh is not solely responsible for all of the improvements, of course, but he is entitled to a major share of the credit. The leadership of a man of his qualities seems to be exactly what the Army needs at this critical point. In this distinguished Virginian are combined characteristics that superbly qualify him for the post he occupies: an understanding of military science, a deep commitment to a strong national defense and a resolute dedication to the principles of efficient and economical management in governmental affairs.

Mr. Marsh honed his views on the whetstone of experience in conservation politics. For four terms he ably served Virginia's Seventh Congressional District in the House of Representatives, making a mark there as an effective—and conservative—member of the House Appropriations Committee. He served Vice President Gerald Ford as assistant for national security affairs and President Ford as a White House counselor with Cabinet rank. Meanwhile, he maintained his interest in military affairs, which began with his entry into the Army in 1944 and included service as an officer in the Army Reserve and in the Virginia National Guard.

Secretary Marsh knows that despite the United States' awesome nuclear strength—or perhaps because of the awesome nuclear strength that both the United States and Russia possess—this nation needs a strong conventional Army. And it is his aim, he assured us in a recent interview, to provide that kind of Army as economically as possible.

The American people should be immensely pleased with the progress he has made. Consider:

The educational level of recruits is rising. Fears that the Army is attracting mostly semiliterates who are barely able to decipher instructions for erecting a pup tent must give way to the reality that 80 percent of today's volunteers are high school graduates. The number of recruits in the Army's "mental category IV," the lowest classification it will accept, dropped from 52 percent in 1980 to 31 percent in 1982. Of course, a high school diploma does not guarantee intellectual duty but it must be accepted as presumptive evidence that the holder is capable of coping with the ordinary complexities an enlisted man is likely to face. During World War II, Mr. Marsh notes, no more than 38 percent of the Army's enlisted men were high school graduates.

Morale, discipline and training, all interrelated, are improving significantly. Several factors are responsible for this. Under Mr. Marsh's leadership, the Army is intensifying its efforts to raise the quality of life for soldiers—and their families—without turning them into fops. Soldiers stay together longer as units, and some, involved in an experimental program called COHORT (for cohesion, operational readiness and training), remain together throughout their first enlistments. Family needs and problems, especially housing, are receiving increasing attention from the Army leadership. Several changes, all designed to produce tougher and more disciplined troops, have been made in training methods and policies.

The National Guard and the Army Reserve are being strengthened. Secretary Marsh considers them to be essential segments in what he calls the "total Army," so he has been deeply interested in increasing their enlistments, strengthening their training and improving overall conditions. As of last October, the regular Army included 782,809 soldiers, the National Guard membership totaled 379,715 and the Army Reserve's strength stood at 220,364.

Mr. Marsh does not pretend that the Army has solved all of its problems. More improvements are needed, especially in the critical area of sustenance. The Army's ability to keep its units supplied with spare parts, fuel and ammunition is alarmingly limited by a number of deficiencies in its support system. He is concerned, too, about the drug problem. And he believes that the quality of housing for American military families in Europe is far too low.

But today's Army, he is convinced, is an army of "good, tough soldiers." He is determined to make it better and tougher, not to embellish his own reputation as a military administrator but to lessen the chances of war. The stronger the United States' conventional armed forces, the less tempting it will be for an adversary to engage in aggressive experiments that could escalate to nuclear warfare. To the extent that he can contribute to the development of a strong American Army, then, Secretary Marsh feels that he is reducing the chance of nuclear conflict. His contributions, so far, have been notable; we are glad he's there.●

## PASADENA JEWISH TEMPLE AND CENTER—RABBI MAURICE T. GALPERT SPECIAL ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS

### HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a special dual anniversary celebration involving the Pasadena Jewish Temple and Center and the its spiritual leader, Rabbi Maurice T. Galpert.

On Friday, June 4, the Pasadena Jewish Temple will commemmorate its 60th year of dedicated service to its members and its community. The Pasadena Jewish Temple is the oldest and most prestigious Jewish congregation in the San Gabriel Valley.

On the same day, the congregation will also celebrate and recognize Rabbi Galpert for 30 years of exemplary service and faithful devotion to his

creed, his congregation and his fellowman.

Both the man and the organization have contributed significantly to the harmony, growth and enlightment of our community and I wish both Rabbi Galpert and the Pasadena Jewish Temple and Center the same success in the future as they have experienced in the past.●

## SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

### HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) is the leading cause of death among young children between the ages of 1 and 12 months in the United States. SIDS tragically strikes children who appear to be perfectly healthy and developing normally.

Although the Federal Government has addressed the SIDS problem through the funding of research, it is obvious that assistance from private organizations is essential if SIDS is to be conquered in the forseeable future.

The National Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Foundation is such a private organization responding to the challenges posed in combating SIDS. The organization sponsors research to determine the origin of the disease, counsels families of SIDS victims, and serves to educate the interested public.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the New Jersey chapter of the NSID Foundation is now in the developmental stage of creating an Infant Apnea Evaluation Center which will identify and assist babies at high risk for the syndrome. They also hope to establish SIDS awareness centers throughout the State to help parents of SIDS victims in coping with this tragedy.

Over 113 junior women's clubs in New Jersey have demonstrated their support for this cause by participating in numerous volunteer projects for the past 2 years. Significant advancements have been made toward raising the $60,000 needed as seed money for the establishment of the Infant Apnea Evaluation Center at a New Jersey hospital. The efforts of these clubs have, indeed, been tireless and numerous.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will join me, on behalf of Congress, in extending a most heartfelt congratulations to the dedicated members of the New Jersey chapter of the National Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Foundation and the New Jersey women's clubs who have worked so diligently to eradicate this most dreaded disease.●

## THE FAIRNESS DOCTRINE

### HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to two recent articles concerning the importance of the Fairness Doctrine and access to the broadcast airwaves. The first appeared in Ralph Nader's newsletter, "Access," and the second was written by conservative columnist Patrick J. Buchanan. It is interesting to note that the Fairness Doctrine is strongly defended by both sides of the political spectrum. Perhaps the Reagan administration, which believes itself to be a recent victim of unfair broadcasting practices, will reconsider its opposition to this critical safeguard of the public interest.

PEOPLE LIKE US

First, President Reagan told the American people that he found "a valid reason" for the Fairness Doctrine. "I have no quarrel with both sides being presented," he told TV Guide.

No sooner had we passed this along to our readers (see Access 142) than the National Association of Broadcasters convened its annual soiree in Dallas. Propped about the hall were 3-by-5 foot blow-ups of a letter from President Reagan seemingly endorsing the NAB's "full First Amendment parity" theme ("parity," in NAB-speak, means "them that's got keeps, and us who ain't got keep quiet.")

And now, what to our wondering eyes should appear, but the President's spokesman, David Gergen, badgering CBS for an opportunity to respond on-the-air to Bill Moyers' hard-hitting documentary, "People Like Us," which aired April 21. "In the interest of fairness," Gergen told CBS.

"I believe the last time I looked that there was such a thing as the fairness doctrine," Gergen told reporters.

Indeed there is, Mr. Gergen. Now the White House (which gets more coverage than just about anything else) knows what it's like to feel so aggrieved by broadcast coverage of a controversial issue that it's compelled to ask for fairness.

Which prompts the question: "What about 'people like us?'" Perhaps the White House will take a second look at the Fairness Doctrine, which is as much a friend of the poor and powerless as it is a friend of corporations and Presidents.

[From the Washington Inquirer]

REAGANISM ADULTERATED

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

Mr. Reagan's men had best send a scouting party over to the FCC to check out the lieutenant they put in charge of that particular bureaucratic outpost. Because Mark Fowler, chairman—gunning for Libertarian of the Year—is about to give away the store.

Citing the late Justice William O. "Wild Bill" Douglas as his mentor, Fowler is preparing to unleash the national networks from all requirements of fairness and balance in news and commentary; to dismantle entirely the modest pollution control equipment that keeps the rawest sewage of the permissive society out of your living room.

The "fairness doctrine" that requires broadcasters to present both sides of controversial issues and the "equal time" provision for candidates should be scrapped as "censorship provisions" of federal law, says Fowler. For the FCC to threaten stations with loss of license for failing to comply is a "frightening specter . . . antithetical to our most precious freedom, speech itself.

"The simple fact is that no newspaper and no newsmagazine is subject to second guessing by a government agency when it comes to fairness . . . It's one thing for stations to follow principles like fairness or equal time. I call that not only sensible but good business. It's another when the government enforces these rules. I call that 'censorship.'"

Unsurprisingly, Fowler has been received by broadcasters with the enthusiasm a junior high principal might be accorded if he announced to the assembled student body that henceforth there would be no more "censorship," i.e., no more chaperones, on the school hayride.

But what Fowler is preaching is not Reaganism; it is ideological claptrap.

If Bill Moyers of CBS informs his evening news that the good guys in Central America are the left-wingers the United States always opposes, it is not a censorship of Moyers to require CBS also to air the administration point of view. How "frightening" a "specter" can the fairness doctrine be, when not a single radio or television station within memory has lost its license for the most egregious abuse?

And because the U.S. Supreme Court has declared "anything goes" in the printed word, producing a proliferation of dirt and filth unimagined a generation ago, is that solid precedent and sound argument for redirecting that sewer into the car radios and homes of the people who elected Mr. Reagan to curb cultural pollution?

Let the "market mechanism" work, demands Fowler. Well, the market mechanism produced 42nd Street. Is the First Amendment an unfulfilled promise if I can't get the same peep shows and porno shop productions with a flick of the switch on my television set?

"It seems beyond reason," writes Marvin Stone of U.S. News, "that Mr. Reagan's appointee at the FCC is willing to tell TV-station owners they may keep their licenses no matter how irresponsibly they behave." Yet that is exactly what Fowler is telling them.

Eliminate equal time and the fairness doctrine and the nation's networks have been given unrestricted license to savage candidates they oppose, to silence opinions they detest, to shut off the microphones to Middle America. Did not the conservative movement suffer enough from such abuse of power in the Vietnam era, to preclude our being the ones responsible for legitimizing it?

How would the Right-to-Life Movement, so abhorred by the trendies who occupy the peaks of broadcasting, ever get a fair hearing? Yet here we have Reagan's appointee at the FCC telling us that for Reagan's friends to insist on a fair hearing for Reagan's positions—on economics, abortion or El Salvador—is a violation of the constitutional rights of Roone Arledge.

Fowler, who invokes the Founding Fathers, might do well to read one. Jefferson's model was not some Middle Eastern bazaar, but the town meeting, which he writes was "called to discuss . . . and to decide matters of public policy . . . Now, in that method of

political self-government, the point of ultimate interest is not the words of the speakers, but the minds of the hearers . . . What is essential is not that everyone shall speak, but that everything worth saying shall be said. To this end, for example, it may be arranged that each of the known conflicting points of view shall have, and shall be limited to, an assigned share of the time available. The vital point . . . is that no suggestion of policy shall be denied a hearing because it is on the one side of an issue than another."

When they labored for Ronald Reagon's revolution, how many conservatives thought they would be working to displace Thomas Jefferson—with "Wild Bill" Douglas?●

## MILDRED BOCK

### HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend to the House of Representatives one of the truly outstanding citizens of the Niles community today, Mrs. Mildred Bock.

Born August 31, 1915, Mrs. Bock has been a lifelong resident of the southwest Michigan community. From a very early age, Mildred has dilligently devoted her time, effort, and ideas to the educating and guiding of youth. In 1936, at the age of 21, she began her illustrious career in public education as a teacher in a two-room schoolhouse in Pokagon, Mich.

In that same year, she met and married her husband, Nicholas Bock. This union produced three children: Margaret, Jean and Nicholas, Jr. Mildred was a full-time housewife and mother until her children passed early childhood, at which time she returned to the profession that she loved dearly. She resumed her teaching career in Eureka, Mich., in the early 1950's. With unfaltering forthrightness and the stupendous ambition to present to her profession her best possible abilities, while holding her full-time teaching position and the ongoing job of raising a family, Millie, through night and summer courses was able to receive a bachelor or arts degree in 1961 and a master of arts in 1964.

Mrs. Bock taught in Eureka for 3 years until 1956 when she joined the Brandywine School District as a guidance counselor. For 29 years, the Niles community and the Brandywine School District has been accented by the invaluable contributions of Mildred Bock. The unprecedented influence she has bestowed upon the hundreds of students who have sought her caring guidance is evidenced by the many well-wishers who will be present to congratulate her on her many years of service.

Although this retirement is but a milestone in an acclaimed career in the field of education, I would like to extend my appreciation and felicitations for the outstanding service Mildred Bock has rendered to the Brandywine School District, the community of Niles, and to the State of Michigan.●

## AL KUMSKIS HONORED AS MAN OF THE YEAR

### HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to a man who has demonstrated through 50 years of public service what it means to be a caring and involved citizen. His energy and his talents have produced an incredible record of achievements and those of us privileged to know Mr. Al Kumskis are delighted that on May 22 he will receive the "Man of the Year" award at the Lithuanian Chamber of Commerce scholarship awards banquet. It is an honor well deserved.

The only difficulty in paying tribute to Mr. Kumskis is what to select from the multitude of activities and awards to talk about. He presently is the administrative aide for community relations for suburban towns, appointed by Sheriff Richard J. Elrod, and it is a position that reflects his skill with people and his organizational abilities. Through the years he has always managed to pull together the people and the plans necessary to stage events of great magnitude.

Mr. Kumskis began his work as a civil service employee with the park district as supervisor of recreation and was a general supervisor of special recreation activities and special events for 529 parks. He held a commendable service record of 45 years with the Chicago Park District. He staged such outstanding special events as the first annual all Chicago "Youth on Parade" day camp jamboree, involving 25,000 day campers, and supervised the first mentally retarded special olympic games, which included Canada and France and promoted the annual Mayor Richard J. Daley Chicago Youth Week Federation.

A former American Lithuanian newspaper publisher, Mr. Kumskis also was sports editor for the Lithuanian Daily Friend. This is not surprising considering his athletic background—high school and college football, baseball, and swimming. A gold medal winner in swimming and water polo and an organizer of the first olympic games, representation of outstanding American Lithuanian athlete in Lithuania. He is a former swimming coach and was athletic director for the Lithuanian Catholic grammar schools of Chicago.

That gives you a bit of a picture of Mr. Kumskis, but we have not even touched on his political work yet. To cite just a bit of it—he was endorsed by the late Mayor Daley for the 13th regular alderman in 1967, was an active member of the Palos Democratic Township Organization, a former precinct captain in three different wards, and served as deputy clerk of the criminal courts and deputy bailiff of municipal court.

He has been honored by receiving awards such as "Outstanding Park Supervisor," "Outstanding Youth Service" award from Illinois Park and Recreation Association and in 1971 he was awarded a citation as one of Chicago's 100 outstanding civic leaders of Chicagoland. He received a citation from Mayor Bilandic for the Senior Citizen's Hall of Fame. He has been a member of organizations such as the Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, the Holy Name Society and is an Illinois Athletic Club life member and past president of the Lithuanian National Alliance of America.

I think the message is clear. This man is exceptional. He has given of himself and the results have meant enjoyment for others, or good representation or shared wisdom. He has indeed been a "public servant." But I want to say that he also is a husband, father of four, and a good friend, a warm and loving human being. I know my colleagues join with me in congratulating Mr. Kumskis. The awards dinner will surely be a joyous evening of celebration and pride for his friends and family.●

## PIKESVILLE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TO VISIT OUR NATION'S CAPITOL

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 20, 1982, 55 young men and women from Pikesville Senior High School, Pikesville, Md., will journey to Washington for a first-hand look at their Nation's Capital.

These students, led by their teacher Mr. Jim Johns, and parents, will tour the Capitol, observe committee hearings, and will visit the Supreme Court and the Library of Congress.

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

Students visiting us Thursday:

Sally Abramson, Marty Baumohl, Marc Baylin, Stacy Blank, Robyn Brody, Penny Brown, Martha Burns, Julie Colton, Lauren David, Jon Efron, David Einhorn, Alicia Frank, Hal Friedlander, and Judy Goldman.

Julie Goldman, Adam Goldstein, David Goldstein, Harriette Golob, Daniel Goodman, Cheryl Gordon, Ellie Greenberg, Minna Greenspun, Howard Groh, Andrew Hameroff, Stephi Kalfon, Michele Katz, Scott Liberman, Richard Rapazzo, Melissa Sachs, and Susan Shaneybrook.

Peter Avery, Erin Bass, Craig Cippollini, Jodi Dagold, Jamie David, Betsy Fader, Larry Finglass, Michael Fraidin, Vladimir Gutin, Stephen Hofkin, and Eric Kaidanow.

Jennifer Levin, Stephen Levitt, Alyson Lichtenberg, Ricky Maltz, Robert Morrow, Sarah Noonberg, Tara Paige, Nancy Pickus, Stacy Seidman, Jason Shobin, Shari Solomon, Brian Timin, Jeffrey Vanderclute, and Amie Wolf.●

## REPRESENTATIVE GILMAN NAMED LEGISLATOR OF THE MONTH

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, our distinguished colleague, BENJAMIN GILMAN, who represents the 26th District of New York, was the recipient of the Population Action Council's Legislator of the Month award. Congressman GILMAN was recognized for his dedication to global humanitarian concerns and for his strong and continuing support toward the goal of stabilizing world population. The award was presented to Congressman GILMAN at United Nations Headquarters in New York before an audience of U.N. mission members, a wide spectrum of business and community leaders, and constituents from his home district. Participating in the ceremony was Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations, who paid a glowing tribute to Congressman GILMAN, a delegate to the U.N. General Assembly last fall.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR KIRKPATRICK

Representative GILMAN, while serving as a U.S. delegate to the U.N., made a constructive and reliable contribution to our work in the United Nations General Assembly. He was always available, understanding, and supportive of our problems and our work at the U.N.

I testified before Congress last week in relation to a number of aspects of funding of U.N. programs and in the course of the testimony I was asked to comment on the population program. I made clear that we were very wholeheartedly supporting the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. I, personally, am very enthusiastic about the work of UNFPA. It is one of the most important fields of successful activity in U.N. endeavors.

Anyone who has studied development particularly understands that we cannot hope to significantly contribute to the well being of people unless we help them cope with the population growth problem. To do less would be like pouring water into a bucket with a hole in the bottom.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE GILMAN

It is good to be back at the U.N. this morning. As a delegate to the U.N. General Assembly this past fall, and as a congressional advisor to the Law of the Sea Conference, I've had the opportunity to work shoulder-to-shoulder with many of our guests here this morning. I have come to recognize that theirs is far from an easy task, and that negotiations within the family of nations is not without frustration. Yet, the outcome of your endeavors, the results of your long, and often arduous negotiations, have a critical bearing on the future of all within the community of nations—a fact that, unfortunately, is all too often minimized. I commend all of you who labor here at the U.N. in behalf of promoting a positive interdependence among nations which seek to promote the complementary interests of nations.

I am especially pleased to accept this award because of the work being accomplished by the Population Action Council. We live in a world that is expected to grow by the rate of 100 million people a year by the end of this century. But, we don't inherit the future, we create it. By creating a network of people from all walks of life to make the population issue an international priority, the Population Action Council is at the cutting edge of the immense task of reducing global population growth and enhancing the quality of life for people everywhere.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and as a member of the Presidential Commission on World Hunger, I have come to recognize that any thoughtful analysis of the problem of global hunger and malnutrition would be incomplete without addressing the subject of excessive population growth.

Reasoned estimates indicate that between 400 million to possibly more than 1 billion people are plagued by hunger and malnutrition. Projections estimate that by the end of this century, another 1.5 billion people will be added to the world's population—with more than 90 percent of that increase in those nations most plagued by poverty and hunger.

Our Hunger Commission found that: "Population pressures not only limit the per capita availability of food, but also contribute in various ways to problems of malnutrition. For example, the cost of providing basic health services, safe drinking water, housing and education rises in relation to the number of citizens who must be served. If all these services must be financed from the public treasuries of very poor countries, the costs may rapidly become prohibitive. The ability of poor people to meet their own basic needs by raising their incomes is further undercut when rapid population growth outstrips the creation of new employment opportunities. A vicious cycle arises when population pressures, among other factors, force the next generation not only into the cities but also into less crowded rural areas with undesirable land. Efforts by migrants to farm this land without adequate inputs—such as fertilizer, water or training—will further undermine the land's long-term productive capacity."

The U.S. Agency for International Development, in its presentation to Congress this year, pointed out that "the demographic situation is serious, but not hopeless." Indeed, AID stated that "over the past decade, 30 developing countries have achieved birth rate reductions of between 15 percent and 47 percent . . . . Family planning programs work and are cost effective. AID's experience proves that a balanced program which provides family planning services and information, combined with strong community and family support for family planning is the most effective way of helping countries achieve the smaller families they desire."

As we recall also, President Reagan at the July 1981 Ottawa Summit reaffirmed U.S. support for world population programs. While the October 1981 Cancun Summit focused for the most part on agricultural development issues, leaders at that meeting identified reductions in population growth rates as a major development objective.

A coordinated international effort is a prime prerequisite to an effective and forward-looking population policy. In that regard, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities plays an integral role in promoting awareness of the social, economic, and environmental implications of population growth and in helping countries to develop and carry out strategies to deal with their population problems. Individual and collaborative efforts of nations to promote effective population programs can well benefit from the expertise and resources which the UNFPA has developed since its creation in 1967.

In closing, I would like to reassert and associate myself with the concerns raised by our previous speakers concerning the need to raise awareness about the issue of world population growth. As we well know, in the coming decades, we must concentrate on increasing crop production and significantly increasing access to food, if we are to alleviate the problem of global hunger. However, in a world threatened with the prospect of a population which will grow by almost 2 billion in the next 20 years, our efforts must be geared to recognizing that progress toward attaining our goal of resolving the hunger problem will be severely impeded if we address only casually the critical need of stabilizing world population.

I am honored to be here with you this morning, honored by this award, and look forward to working with you in the future to realizing these objectives.●

## DISTINGUISHED ALABAMIAN STEPS DOWN AS CHAIRMAN OF CSX CORP.

### HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1982, one of the most distinguished natives of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, Prime F. Osborn III, stepped down as chairman of the CSX Corp. It is the largest rail system in the United States and was formed by the merger of two great rail systems, the Chessie and the Family Lines (the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad and the Louisville & Nashville Railroad). This highly successful merger was the culmination of his long and distinguished career in railroading.

I am happy to note that Mr. Osborn is merely "stepping down" into what will be a very active retirement. He

will remain a member of the CSX board and will continue his active interest in the Boy Scouts, the Salvation Army and the Episcopal Church. Mr. Osborn's lifelong dedication to community service sets an example for us all and has won him many well deserved awards, including the William Booth Award from the Salvation Army, the Silver Buffalo Award from the Boy Scouts, and the Outstanding Jacksonville Citizen Award from the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce.

I am proud to claim Prime Osborn as at least a part-time constituent because he still maintains a farm in Greensboro, Ala., and, as a loyal alumnus of the University of Alabama, continues an active interest in the university. As one of his many friends, I wish him well as he enters a new and rewarding phase of his career.●

## LIBERAL DEMOCRATIC BUDGET IMPOSED ON CHAIRMAN

### HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, every moderate and conservative Democrat should be aware of how really bad the liberal Democratic budget is. The following remarks by Chairman JIM JONES in his hometown newspaper indicate the liberal bias of his Budget Committee colleagues and how destructive a budget they forced on him.

The chairman in his own words "had to go to the left." That does not require that moderate and conservative Democrats have to go to the left.

JONES SAYS HE RELUCTANTLY WENT ALONG WITH THE BUDGET PLAN

(By Mike Flanagan)

House Budget Committee Chairman Jim Jones said Monday the $780 billion budget he steered through committee last week lists too far to the left to suit him.

But political realities, and a belief that Congress must adopt a budget to prove to the country that the government can work, persuaded him to go along with his committee, Jones, a Tulsa Democrat, said.

"I had to go to the left," Jones said at a press conference at his local office. If he had the deciding vote on the budget, Jones added, he would junk the committee plan.

The House plan calls for outlays of $780 billion in fiscal 1983, $826 billion in '84 and $881 billion in '85.

Even by raising taxes $147 billion during the period and reducing President Ronald Reagan's military spending proposals by $47 billion, the House committee plan would produce hefty deficits.

In fiscal '83, the House plan would tolerate a deficit of $104 billion. It would lower the deficit to $73 billion in '84, and to $35 billion in '85.

Jones said he believes the proper budget lies somewhere between the plan drafted by the House committee and one drafted by the Senate Budget Committee.

While his House committee was pushing him left, the Senate committee was pushing its chairman, Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., to the right, Jones said.

"What I would hope to do is come back to the middle," Jones said.

The Senate committee's plan would raise taxes by only $95 billion over the three-year period and reduce Reagan's military spending proposals by only $22 billion.

But the Senate committee plan also would cut Social Security benefits by $40 billion during the three-year period—or raise unspecified taxes by $40 billion to match anticipated Social Security outlays.

Jones said last month in Tulsa that automatic increases in Social Security benefits must be checked to keep the retirement system solvent.

Jones said neither the House, the Senate nor the White House has enough votes to pass a budget plan, but that he hopes the House will approve its version before its Memorial Day recess.

He said he is considering offering amendments to make the House committee plan more attractive to the House at large, but that he is not ready to discuss details.

Even if the House does approve a budget, it is doubtful that it would be approved by the Senate, Jones said. That means that a final version would be written in by a conference committee.●

## HADASSAH 70th ANNIVERSARY

### HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization, on this, its 70th anniversary. Through seven decades, this organization has provided extensive education and health services to thousands of individuals in both the United States and Israel.

I am particularly proud of the accomplishments of the Hadassah chapter in my district of Sacramento, Calif. Since its founding by 20 charter members in 1931, the Sacramento Hadassah has grown to more than 600 women strong.

Members of the Hadassah are active in all aspects of community life: From civil service and local government, to education, medical services and teaching. Their volunteer work extends from assistance in local hospitals and nursing homes, to participation in the League of Women Voters and a host of other civic, cultural and religious activities.

This group of women is truly a major source of inspiration and service to Sacramento.

Once again, I congratulate this fine organization for its outstanding contributions at the local, national and international levels. I look forward with its members to many more years of humanitarian service.●

## HANDGUN BODYCOUNT

### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the handgun bodycount for the month of March was 591. Once again, I am saddened by the fact that my own State of Florida reported the highest number of deaths due to handguns; 108 persons were killed by handguns in Florida.

Handgun Control, Inc., which compiles the handgun bodycount, has taken special note of the fact that many of the victims during March were killed by friends and family members. Guns which we might presume were purchased for the purpose of protection from intruders were instead used to kill persons close to the killer. Often the end result is murder-suicide.

All too frequently, handguns become more of a threat to the owners and their families than a means of protection. Strong handgun control legislation may not put an end to all senseless killings, but it can greatly reduce the number of accidents and the number of deaths resulting from acts of rage.

The list follows:

HANDGUN BODYCOUNT—MARCH 1982

ALABAMA (3)

Eddie Lankford, Jo Ann Pennucci, unidentified male.

ALASKA (1)

Michael Corbeil.

ARIZONA (7)

Theresa Acuna, Carl Bartlett, Jay Cox, Suzanne England, Paul Fuller, Mildred Klingel, Gary Tibbett.

ARKANSAS (4)

James Hankins, Loren House, Florence Mauldin, Larry Volk.

CALIFORNIA (62)

Richard Allen, Tina Apodaca, Allen Arsenault, Daniel Avent, Weldon Bales, Jesus Baques, Adridge Brigham, Valerie Chacon, Bruce Chester, Sheriff's Deputy Coleman, David Colgan, James Conn, Deanna Cox, Donald Cox, Lisa Darling, Donald Davis, Melissa Davis, Michelle Davis, Ronald Foster, Daniel Franks, George Garcia, Ralph Garcia, Daniel Hernandez.

David Hernandez, James Higgins, Adnoica Holub, Jaun Jimenez, Roberto Jimenez, Michael Lara, Jr., Jose Mares, Jose Mariona, Calvin McBride, Lisa Miller, James Moucheron, Michael Mowry, Fred Myres, Theodore Nelson, George Pulido, Charles Reed, Dorthea Reed, Duane Richard, Orozco Sanchez, Eric Spears, Mark Stately, James Suggs, Marquis Sunday, Stacey Tanner, Mae Tate, Carla Trebon, Bertha Valenzuela, unidentified female, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male.

COLORADO (9)

Adelo Basaldura, Roger Colantonio, Donna Emery, Harry Hatten, Noel Karr, Wade Ketcham, Jesus Sanchez, Ronald Tompkins, Roland Wittkowski.

CONNECTICUT (5)

Alvaris Brown, Robert Guzowski, Adam Hamilton, Willie Harris, David Leong.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (2)

George Knights, Apoliano Perez.

FLORIDA (108)

Jeffery Adams, Stanley Bader, Johnny Barge, James Beaudry, Marvin Bell, Luis Cano, Gerald Cariota, Robert Carlos, Keith Cobb, Wilson Cortez, Michael David, Clinton Davis, Mark Delson, Norris Denson, Carol Didio, John Eckstein, Donald Elrath, Frank Esposito, Russell Faust, Willian Flanders, George Gallton, Albert Gilliam, Kenneth Glenn, Samuel Glogger, Sue Glogger.

Emma Gold, Jacob Gold, Bernice Goldberg, Michael Gondyes, Rene Gonzalez, Nathan Gordon, Karen Griffin, Sherrie Hancock, Jerald Hatfield, Barry Hersker, Gladys Hill, Frank Humenyi, Claude Johnson, Elizabeth Kapala, Peter Kapala, Leon Kearney, Edward Lacca, Benny Lacue, Edward Lalla, Sheldon Levy, Greta Lewis, Robert Lewis, Alvin Lyons, Wilfrido Mario.

Alberto Martinez, Lawrence Matthews, Charles Matus, James McAdams, Gary McKay, Gary Meeky, Eduardo Mendoza, George Michael, Angel Miret, Celestine Mitchell, Barron Mosely, Willie Nelson, Daniele Norris, Jerry Palmer, Beatrice Parker, Calvin Parker, Gregory Patterson, George Patty, Peter Pereira, Raul Polanco, Kenneth Price, Dirk Rayford, Livern Richardson, Earnest Robinson, Roberto Rodriguez, Polo Rojoz, Carol Rollins, Beverly Russo, James Scott.

Frank Senffner, Susan Silk, Gloria Simon, Rene Simon, Mark Sinclair, Orlando Sotolongo, Dereck Stebbing, James Steffani, Clarence Strong, Juan Tasgiano, Brian Tennis, John Thomas, Frederick Turner, Octavia Valencia, Rene Vargas, Joaquin Vasquez, Dewey Veach, Bernard Webster, Elizabeth White, Philip Zimmer, Haasan Zock, Heide Zock, Heriberto Zurbaranmaya, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male.

GEORGIA (7)

Stella Brown, Edward Jackson, Jerry Penny, Tyrone Ruth, Annette Stevens, unidentified male, unidentified male.

ILLINOIS (50)

Svetislov Bajovic, Jacob Bird, Daniel Born, Clifton Brakes, Lewis Bryant, Ernestine Bush, Ruby Butler, Richard Campbell, Toni Caposey, Arthur Carpenter, Lynn Conrady, Anthony Dills, Harold Eckhardt, Raymond Frazier, Edward French, Jr., Thorraine Gonyer, Byron Grooms.

Nicolas Guerrero, Cleave Herron, Christy Jackson, Donald Koss, James Mallard, LeRoy McCambry, Freddie Mendoza, Willie Odom, Luis Ortiz, Raymond Ostrowski, Alvin Peterson, Alexander Pratt, Arlene Price, Hector Rivera, Manuel Rodriquez, Anton Sabo, Fidel Sanchez, Paul Schomer, Henry Scott, Eddie Smith, Delia Sosa, Ruben Sosa, George Soteras, Antonio Villasana, Chad Vitello, Kenneth Williams, James Wimes, Natalie Woods, Alfred Young, Robert Young, Walter Zitko, unidentified male, unidentified male.

INDIANA (7)

Jeff Brown, John Buennage, Keith Johnson, Robert Lusk, John Neal, Keith Smith, Arthur Thomas.

KANSAS (7)

Waldo Emerson, Melvin Kollmann, Floyd Mitchell, Mike McKeown, nathaniel Nolen, Leon Smith, Judith Townshend.

KENTUCKY (2)

Delbert Hart, Julia Leet.

LOUISIANA (16)

Michael Blackwell, Wallace Brandon, Janice Bruce, Gracie Cooper, Melvin Cooper, Hazel Draughter, Lawrence Foreman, Maurine Foreman, Bryan Hepburn, Charles Hudson, Raymond Lewis, Curtis Manuel, Deborah Mutin, Joseph Poirrier, C. R. Roberts, Michael Zeller.

MARYLAND (21)

Robert Battle, Jr., Herman Christopher, Jr., Carl Clark, Ellen Day, (female) Flowers, John Henderson, Lawrence Henson, John Holt, Anthony Jones, Michael Jones, Marcie Newhall, Helen Perian, Joseph Robinson, Raphel Sampson, Carville Schisler, Carroll Scott, Kenneth Sicchilano, Virginia Sicchilano, Wendy Stark, Charles Steinberg, Sr., Susan Wray.

MASSACHUSETTS (7)

Dale Daniels, Lisa Daniels, Melinda Daniels, David Gouse, Edward Manley, Michael Marino, Anthony Taylor.

MICHIGAN (43)

Walter Bailey, Jr., Thomas Bak, William Bonin, Charles Bost, Jerome Bougard, James Bowman, George Braggs, Johnny Broaden, Michael Burnette, Gerald Chapman, Cynthia Christian, Woodrow Cole, Valerie Cox, Ronard Davis, Thomas Denton, Thomas Everson, Freddie Fulgham.

Richard Garrett, Paul Gilmore, Gerald Glenn, Renell Glenn, Ronald Glenn, Officer Wm. Green, Lee Griffin, Ruth Harvey, Terry Hayes, John Look Larry Mason, William Mason, Joseph McPherson, Michael Miles, Ronald Moore, Darryl Mustin, Clarence Neal, Sinclair Norris, Dale Patrick, Hubert Robbins, Carole Roketa, Andy Salkovic, Lawrence Singleton, Gary Stewart, Harvey Waters, Michael Walker.

MINNESOTA (7)

Donald Bullhead, James Cox, Derrio Green, Duane Lohmann, David Studler, Eric Spears, unidentified male.

MISSISSIPPI (1)

William Akers.

MISSOURI (19)

Willard Baker, Robert Becherer, Eddie Carthen, Jeffrey Davis, Ronald Davis, Waldo Emerson, Richard Glenn, Dr. Mary Groom, John Hathcock, Michael Harris, Ruby Johnson, Dale Jones, Valerie Mitchell, Karl Lohmar, Bettina Openlander, Phillip Sledge, Kevin Tillman, Jim Triplett, unidentified male.

MONTANA (1)

Curt Jacky.

NEBRASKA (1)

Laurence Winston.

NEVADA (4)

Lorraine Owens, Neil Owens, Clarence Piggott unidentified male.

NEW HAMPSHIRE (1)

Valerie Blair.

NEW JERSEY (12)

John Altman, Frances Bernett, Paul Boccia, Thomas Dunne, Delby Fernandez, James French, Diego Gierra, Max Goldberg, Iran Law, Andrew Saporito, Henry Smith, unidentified male.

NEW MEXICO (9)

Patsy Crum, Thomas Hansaker, John Jones, Berna Moya, Bruce Maulden, Amanda Urban, Charles Wier, Roland Wittkowski, Hans Wohlfahrt.

NEW YORK (7)

George Hondros, James Matthews, Juan Rivera, Theodore Rodill, Santiago Valdez, unidentified female, unidentified male.

NORTH CAROLINA (18)

Ernest Barnhardt, Earl Britt, Ransom Connelly, Evelyn Evans, Albert Frazier, Freda Gandy, Walter Graves, Elinor Harrison, Gino Locklear, Michael Outing, Angela Propst, Rick Propst, James Silver, Nancy Taylor, Mary Thomas, Terry Tilley, Carolyn Wallace, Fred Wheeler.

OHIO (14)

Salim Abilmouna, Niarchos Brooks, Reginald Brooks, Vaughn Brooks, Elizabeth Brondes, Robert Bryan, Paula Cunningham, Charles Johnson, Harold Lee, Rocco Marinucci, Thomas Pugh, Hammond Russell, Lon White, Vaughn Woodland.

OKLAHOMA (1)

Glen Senters.

OREGON (3)

Patrick Harrington, Brian Kelson, Randall Stevens.

PENNSYLVANIA (19)

Mohammed Aslam, Mary Figueroa, Robert Gallagher, Jay Craig, Hohn Hilliard, Eugene Jefferson, Robert Johnson, Rocco Marinucci, Carl Mickles, John Murphy, William Parker, Francis Phillips, June Robinson, Barbara Robriguez, Joseph Robriquez, Peter Santangelo, Paul Yeakley, unidentified male.

RHODE ISLAND (1)

Kerry Vincent.

SOUTH CAROLINA (1)

Ouida Coker.

TENNESSEE (9)

Franklin England, William Herndon, Hazel Jordan, Clark Knighton, Paul Mount, Vincent Rizzo, Benjamin Shtatman, Marvin Thomas, David Ware.

TEXAS (78)

Kenneth Addington, Adolfo Agueros, Branda Ard, Brenda Baldez, Lillie Benton, Lisa Blackwell, Robert Boyd, Pedro Briones, Earl Brown, Sebero Bustos, David Callihan, Bobby Cessum, Tina Covington, Burton Dees, Miguel Escoto, Jerry Finney, Miguel Freeney, Artie Gilford, Anthony Guiliano, Anthony Gomez, Antonio Gomez, Elaine Goss, Jackie Greene, Joseph Grigaitis, Carolyn Gross, Robert Guidry, Joel Hackstedde, Jeffery Jordan, Jr., Robert Hill, Edalgo Hooper, Jr., Anthony Hughes, Charles Jackson, Johnny Jackson, Nolan Jackson, Jr., Erminio Jaimes, Harvey Johnson, Jeffery Jordan, Jr., Earl Joseph, Karen Joseph, Sheila Lewis, Roland Lopez, Dol Ly, E. L. Long, Margaret McEntire, Terry McGill, Myron McIntosh, Billy McMillan, Phyllis McMillian, Michael McNaull, Ismael Mendoza, Jose Navas, Harlon Nugent, James Raditke.

Robert Rasberry, Willie Ray, Minnie Robinson, Thomas Robinson, Gelaxio Robledo, Felix Romero, Lethea Smith, Howard Steele, Phil Steffler, Marvis Sutton, Betty Taylor, Glen Taylor, Tarbell Travis, Douglas Treadwell, Fernando Ugartel, Jose

Valdez, Jr., Harvey Walker, Jimmy Williams, Clara Winters, Abel Zapata, unidentified female, unidentified female, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male.

UTAH (3)

Buddy Booth, Jordan Rasmussen, Paul Saunders.

VIRGINIA (2)

Herman Berry, James Lamm, Jr.

WASHINGTON (9)

James Barbee, Wm. Bledsoe, Edward Getoor, Dixie Kassab, Brent Marshall, Ernesto Pino, Lisa Principe, Oscar VanHook, unidentified male.

WEST VIRGINIA (5)

Roxie Baker, Michael Davis, Chester Means, Stewart Moore, John Muncey.

WISCONSIN (2)

William Condon, Stevan Knopf.

WYOMING (3)

Gary Lewis, Richard Nickels, Jerry Salzman.

PREVIOUSLY UNREPORTED HANDGUN DEATHS—1982

*January*

CALIFORNIA

Nishan Bagdassarian.

FLORIDA

Albert Bromiky, John Banks, Angelyn Cipolla, Jorge Cruz, Michael Cullen, John Cutler, Obdulio Diaz, Sandra Eddleston, Pablo Garcia, Gabriel Gonzalez, Julio Hernandez, Danny Jones, Lawrence Kelly, Betty Marshall, Deborah McKinnon, Douglas Miller, Jose Obregon, Gail Pilgrim, Jorge Rios, Llewellyn Roberts, Richard Roper, George Schulman, William Shlvie, David Smith, Mario Thybulle, Carlos Valdes, James Williams, Jr., Norbert Wittner, Byron Yee.

MISSOURI

Beverly Wilson.

NEW JERSEY

Sharon Trussell.

NEW YORK

Ramon Fernandez, Eugene Mahoney.

TEXAS

Cindy Curtin.

*February*

CALIFORNIA

Lauren de Laet, Don MacVicars.

KENTUCKY

Edward Harper, Alice Harper.

MICHIGAN

George Haggart, family members.

NORTH CAROLINA

William Lucas

TENNESSEE

Rodney Long, William Tatum.

TEXAS

Estanislao Perez.

VIRGINIA

Paige Leonard.●

## DULLES EXPO '82

### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an upcoming event of local and national interest.

Washington's Dulles International Airport will celebrate its 20th anniversary year with Dulles Expo '82. This is an unusual aviation plus family-style festival set for June 26 and 27 at the spectacular Virginia facility to promote Dulles Airport, the beautiful terminal, and the metropolitan-area businesses which utilize the air transportation service at Dulles.

Here is a sampling of the planned events: Over 100 exhibits will be on display with demonstrations ranging from the Smithsonian Institution to Rolls-Royce to the U.S. Navy—all relating their kinship to Dulles via special demonstrations and unusual educational events. All 15 airlines serving Dulles will exhibit. Vintage barnstormers and the famed Concorde SST will showcase flight history. The world's largest transport carrier, the C5A, will be available for inspection, while a smaller "personal-size" 220-pound craft basks in its own glory.

The Dulles Mobilounges will be on exhibit, and short photo flights over the region also will be offered. Dulles promotional items, such as a specially created map of the Dulles area, will be available.

There will be an abundance of family festivities with a series of weekend-long musical events. World-renowned Irish fiddler Kevin Burke will be a main attraction at the 2-day festival which includes a varied program of traditional music with a high-quality flair. The Bluemont Concert Series has scheduled performers including folk dancers, cloggers, and well-known blues singer John Jackson who has performed at the White House.

During the Dulles Expo '82, one of Dulles' three runways will be turned into a parking lot for the weekend event in order to accommodate 8,000 cars. One spokesman for the festival has projected over 50,000 people will view the 100-plus exhibits. A constant stream of shuttle buses will transport visitors to the exhibit area. Special highway entrance and exit routes have been designated to facilitate the traffic flow and to speed visitors on their way.

Special shuttle service from Philadelphia to Dulles is planned by Ransome Airlines, using their 50-seat Dash-7 aircraft. Other commuter airlines also plan shuttle service into Dulles for the Expo.

Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce conceived the Expo idea, and is assisted by the Washington Dulles task force, as well as the Federal Aviation Administration and other organizations.

The Expo will provide an exciting family outing complete with food and fun, entertainment and education for anyone in the area on June 26 and June 27. The Expo will be open to the public, on Saturday, June 26, from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. and Sunday, June 27, from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. at no charge. More information on this can be obtained by calling (703) 777-2176.●

## ENTERPRISE ZONES

### HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, the administration's unveiling of its enterprise zone plan nearly 2 months ago has sparked a great deal of debate and discussion—mostly positive, mostly constructive. It has been a healthy process that is generating ideas that will be valuable for the Congress as it refines this plan into final legislative form.

From the outset, it is important to stress that the administration's bill (H.R. 6055) is not the final word, not the finished product. There is room for improvement and refinement. For instance, while I am a cosponsor of this bill, I believe some key elements could and should be added to improve its efficiency and effectiveness.

Enterprise zones should not be viewed as a panacea * * * but as a valuable new tool in promoting economic development. They must be a supplement to existing economic development tools, not a replacement.

There is broad-based support for the underlying concept of enterprise zones—the notion of targeting Federal tax incentives to identifiable distressed communities.

Ever since I began serving in Congress in 1975, I have been a vocal advocate of targeting Federal resources to areas of greatest need. That led me to introduce legislation—enacted in 1976—that enabled the U.S. Economic Development Administration—EDA as we know it—to target its resources to communities such as Buffalo. The Nowak amendment, which added long-term economic deterioration as a criterion for EDA's broad range of title IX assistance, has brought more than $6.5 million in aid to Erie County in recent years.

The bulk of that has been used by the Erie County Industrial Development Agency (ECIDA) for a revolving loan fund to assist in stimulating local

business expansions. This Federal seed money has resulted in the creation of more than 1,200 local jobs since 1979.

The administration's enterprise zone plan relies almost exclusively on the use of Federal tax incentives to stimulate job creation in economically distressed areas. I applaud the use of the Tax Code as an economic development tool.

My belief, however, is that it should not be an exclusive tool.

Tax incentives alone will not cure our urban ills.

As chairman of a House Small Business Subcommittee, I held hearings last fall on the broad subject of Job Creation and the Revitalization of Small Business. The overall conclusion was that we need to develop a well-balanced economic revitalization strategy for our Nation's distressed areas.

I would like to enumerate some of the items I believe should be considered for either addition to the administration's enterprise zone bill or to supplement it.

The bill needs to do more to help small and medium sized businesses. As it stands, the proposed tax incentives for these zones are heavily weighted toward healthy and established capital intensive concerns. Tax incentives alone are not as valuable to small businesses in the startup and development stage, when they have little or no profitability and thus derive no benefit from tax breaks.

Small and medium sized companies are the ones that create the most new jobs in this country. They are the kinds of companies we want in these enterprise zones. What they need is capital—seed capital and working capital—to grow and to succeed.

To its credit, the administration's bill includes provision for use of industrial development bonds in enterprise zones. These so-called IDB's have been used widely, wisely, and well on the Niagara Frontier. Especially in these times of high interest rates, IDB's are an irreplaceable source of capital for developing firms.

I strongly believe we must buttress the tax incentive and IDB elements in order for enterprise zones to realize their potential.

A bill I introduced in 1981—the Enterprise Development Act—proposed the use of EDA title IX authorities in these zones, to provide a source of sorely needed seed moneys. Our experience in Erie County has shown how valuable public seed money can be in attracting private dollars.

I also introduced a bill—that could be a valuable add-on to the enterprise zone package—that would enable small business investment companies—SBIC's—to provide much needed venture capital for firms located in these zones. Again, the mix of Small Business Administration loan moneys, coupled with private dollars, would be a source of invaluable seed money to supplement the tax incentives.

I also believe the enterprise zone bill should have a jobs training component. For one, I support a broadening of the private industry council concept, which has worked so well in our area. The key is cooperation of the public and private sectors in identifying specific job needs in the community and developing training programs to meet those identified needs.

While the enterprise zone bill offers tax credits for firms hiring disadvantaged workers, I believe there also should be additional tax credits offered to offset the high cost of specialized skills training. The tooling and machine industry, for example, testified before my subcommittee that today it already faces a shortage of 60,000 skilled workers.

To supplement the enterprise zones, we also need to continue such successful programs as the urban development action grants and the community development block grants. There remains a continued need for Federal assistance to insure that communities have an adequate infrastructure base.

Adequate water, sewer, highway, and public transportation networks are a prerequisite for attracting business investment. Despite the need for budgetary tightening, the Federal Government must not abandon its support role in this area.

That suggests a serious concern about the administration's enterprise zone approach. Local governments will have to make certain public improvements—whether it is new street lighting, improved roads, or new water/sewer lines—to help make these zones attractive and workable.

Who is going to pay for these zone-related public improvements? The administration's bill provides no direct Federal aid to help localities with this added burden. Some provision should be made in the final bill to help hard-pressed cities to meet this added responsibility, at least in the short term.

Another concern is the administration's inclusion of local incentives within zones as a major criterion in the package communities must submit for what will be in effect a nationwide competition for these limited zone designations. Older cities like Buffalo, with eroded tax bases and near constitutional property tax limits, would not be able to compete effectively against richer communities in the Sun Belt that can easier afford an immediate loss in tax revenues. Again, the final legislation must develop ways to make this competition fairer, and less costly to local and State taxpayers.

The prognosis on enacting enterprise zone legislation this year is murky. Hearings have been held in the Congress but the current budget impasse has stalled expedited consideration of enterprise zones.

That impasse includes differences of opinion on what taxes should or should not be raised and what tax cuts should or should not be delayed. Once that is resolved, the House Ways and Means Committee should be able to focus more steadily on enterprise zones.

In any event, the reception the concept has received indicates it is only a question of time and enterprise zone legislation will be enacted. I look forward to continue working with you and exchanging ideas as this process evolves—and as we on the Niagara Frontier seek to insure that we will be among the first 25 communities to benefit from this challenging program.●

## TRIBUTE TO NORTH SACRAMENTO AREA UNIT OF THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the North Sacramento area unit of the California Highway Patrol for being granted the commissioner's "Unit Citation" for its outstanding record during 1980 and 1981.

During this 2-year period, the North Sacramento area unit made 11,691 drunk driving arrests, more than were made by any other highway patrol unit in the State. Moreover, during 1980, more drivers were arrested for being under the influence of alcohol by this one unit than were arrested in 10 of our 50 States.

As a result of this exemplary record, there has been a 7-percent reduction in area DUI-related accidents in 1981 over 1980. Not only are our highways safer today because of the extraordinary efforts of this one highway patrol unit, but undoubtedly fewer people have perished senselessly at the hands of drunk drivers.

Nearly 70 persons each day—about 1 every 23 minutes—are killed in accidents involving drunk drivers, making it the Nation's leading cause of highway deaths and the No. 1 killer of people under 34. But through efforts such as those of the North Sacramento area unit, I am hopeful that we can begin to make strides in whittling down the number of intoxicated drivers on the roads.

The Congress, and State and local governments, however, must do their part to help keep drunk drivers off the roads once they are arrested by our law enforcement officers and convicted.

The Congress, for example, must adopt legislation authored by my good

friends and colleagues Congressman BARNES and Congressman HOWARD, and which I have cosponsored. This bill would provide "seed money" to assist and reward those States that take effective steps toward establishing comprehensive—and ultimately self-sufficient—programs aimed at deterring drunk driving, and assuring the swift arrest, conviction, punishment, and rehabilitation of the offender. The bill would involve no additional cost to the U.S. Treasury since the funds would simply be earmarked from the existing Highway Trust Fund.

I commend the North Sacramento Area California Highway Patrol for its outstanding performance and for its enormous and immeasurable contribution to the safety and well-being of the residents of Sacramento and the State of California. I only hope that the Congress can measure up to the high standards set by the highway patrol and act swiftly to pass the Barnes-Howard bill.●

## DEFICIT REDUCTIONS

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, May 19, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEFICIT REDUCTIONS

Even with all the attention in the news media paid to the federal budget, I am not sure that the difficulty of the budget problem is sufficiently understood. If the federal government continues its current policies and makes no changes in tax laws or spending policies, the projected 1983 deficit is $182 billion (three times what it was in 1980). We will receive $645 billion and spend $827 billion. Everyone agrees that such a deficit is intolerable, and that the consequences for the economy would be disastrous.

The question becomes, then, how the deficit can be reduced. There are three ways: raising taxes, cutting spending, or some combination of the two. Everyone's first choice, at least in the abstract, is to reduce spending.

Let's take a closer look at reducing the deficit by cutting spending. Here is a list of expenditures that are most unlikely to be cut significantly:

| | *Billions* |
|---|---|
| National defense | $224.2 |
| Social security and railroad retirement | 177.0 |
| Interest on the national debt | 108.55 |
| Federal civilian retirement | 21.55 |
| Unemployment compensation | 24.95 |
| Veterans' benefits | 14.6 |
| Federal payroll | 2.4 |
| Total | 573.25 |

That leaves $253.7 billion ($826.95 billion less $573.25 billion) in which to find spending cuts to reduce significantly the $182 billion deficit. A look at some of the remaining programs suggests how difficult the cutting is:

| | *Billions* |
|---|---|
| Medicare | $52.8 |
| Medicaid | 19.15 |
| Food stamps | 12.75 |
| Child nutrition | 3.6 |
| Supplemental security income and aid for families with dependent children | 16.3 |
| General revenue sharing | 4.6 |
| Guaranteed student loans | 3.7 |
| Social services (title XX) | 2.45 |
| Total | 115.35 |

If these programs were not cut, and if we abolished completely the remaining programs in education, job training, space, highway and mass transit, community development, and law enforcement, we would still have a deficit of $46.05 billion.

I do not suggest that no cuts be made in these programs; the difficulty in cutting them is in itself no argument not to cut. Nevertheless, they enjoy strong political support, and the costs for many of them are certain to increase; for example, rising health care costs will surely increase Medicaid and Medicare costs even with cutbacks and efficiencies. The rate of expansion in these programs needs to be better controlled, but political support simply does not exist for a fundamental retreat from them. Waste and fraud must always be attacked, but there is no reason to believe that tens of billions of dollars can be saved in this way. The growth in the federal budget has principally been in pensions, health care and defense, each of which is an important and strongly supported public responsibility.

Now let's look at the revenue side. Here are some of the proposals that are being discussed to increase revenue:

[In billions]

| | |
|---|---|
| 5 cents per gallon tax on gasoline | $2.9 |
| Corporate minimum tax | 2.3 |
| Repeal of safe-harbor leasing provisions | 2.9 |
| Tighter taxpayer compliance provisions | 4.5 |
| Accelerated corporate tax payments | 1.4 |
| $5 per barrel oil import fee | 8.6 |
| Individual minimum tax hike | .5 |
| Reduction in energy depletion allowance | 2.1 |
| Total | 25.2 |

If these proposals were enacted, there would still be a deficit of $156.8 billion. We could go further and eliminate the 1983 individual income tax reduction and cap the 1982 cut at $700 per person. This would provide $30.4 billion more in revenue. But even if all of these proposals were enacted the deficit would still be $126.4 billion.

It is, of course, highly unlikely that each of these proposed spending cuts and tax increases will be enacted. I am not saying they should be. The purpose of these calculations is simply to illustrate the difficulty of getting the deficit down. What they show is that only a combination of spending cuts and revenue increases can bring the deficits down to manageable levels over the next several years.

To achieve that goal requires substantial changes, all of them painful. No one is eager for them: Given the split control of the government between the political parties, my judgement is that we must lay aside partisan rhetoric and political posturing and fashion a bi-partisan solution. The political fact is that the Congress cannot do it without the President and the Democrats cannot do it without the Republicans, and vice versa. But the national interest is compelling: We must do it now.

(NOTE: Information for this newsletter was taken from a memorandum produced by the House Committee on the Budget.)●

## EXPORT TRADING COMPANY LEGISLATION TO RECEIVE FLOOR ACTION SOON

### HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today the Monopolies and Commercial Law Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held a markup on H.R. 1799, legislation that would foster the creation of export trading companies. I would like to commend my distinguished colleague, Chairman PETER RODINO, for acting on this most important piece of legislation.

The subcommittee adopted an amendment offered by my distinguished colleagues, Congressman WILLIAM HUGHES. The amendment provides for a simple, straigthforward certification procedure in which an exporter applies directly to the Attorney General for certification of export conduct. The Justice Department must render its decision within 60 days, with a provision for a 30-day extension to request additional information. Injured domestic persons are also guaranteed a single damage remedy. This prevents any abuse of the certification procedure by those who might wish to use a certificate as a basis for predatory practices directed at domestic competitors.

Again, I commend Chairman RODINO and Congressman HUGHES for moving ahead with this markup. Passage of H.R. 1799 is vital to our domestic economic growth and our status in the international marketplace.

This week is "World Trade Week." But the increased national attention to world trade this week must be converted into a year-round conviction that exporting is a key to a stronger U.S. economy. Secretary of Commerce Baldrige recently stated that:

As the world's greatest trader, the economic health of the United States is closely

tied to exporting. Exports create jobs. They support the value of the dollar. They blunt the thrust of inflation. They pay for critically needed resources and materials from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation has an enormous export potential that has not been tapped. Our small- and medium-sized companies simply do not export. They find the process confusing and frightening. They lack the expertise in language and law, the capital and the knowledge of overseas markets to be successful in export trade.

Export trading company legislation would allow the United States to generate this expertise. It would assist our domestic companies in finding their way through the thicket of regulations that may bar the door. In effect, this is a positive, aggressive approach to the problem of nontariff barriers, one that steers clear of protectionist legislation which carries the danger of retaliation and a full-scale trade war.

My distinguished colleague, Chairman FERNAND ST GERMAIN, is also holding hearings on H.R. 6016, the Bank Export Services Act. This bill allows for bank participation in export trading companies. Bank holding companies would be allowed to invest up to 5 percent of their consolidated capital and surplus, and Edge Act corporations up to 25 percent of their capital and surplus in export trading companies. The Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee will continue hearings on H.R. 6016 on Tuesday, May 25, with a markup scheduled soon thereafter. I commend Chairman ST GERMAIN for moving ahead with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Export Task Force, and with my very strong commitment to the promotion and expansion of American export trade, I am pleased that we are moving rapidly toward passage of export trading company legislation. Both the Banking and Judiciary Committees are nearing completion of hearings and markup, and the Foreign Affairs Committee passed out H.R. 1799 last month.

A private study conducted by Chase Econometrics estimated that by 1985, export trading companies would increase the gross national product by $27 to $55 billion, increase employment by 320,000 to 640,000 workers, and reduce the Federal deficit by $11 to $22 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to ignore legislation which has the potential for creating jobs and helping the country toward true economic recovery.●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, on part of Wednesday, May 12 and on Thursday, May 13, I was necessarily absent due to a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall No. 71, "yes"; rollcall No. 72, "no"; rollcall No. 73, "no"; rollcall No. 74, "yes"; rollcall No. 76, "yes"; rollcall No. 77, "no"; and rollcall No. 78, "yes."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

## THE PROPOSED IRS DEBT-EQUITY REGULATIONS: A FINANCIAL TIME BOMB FOR SMALL BUSINESS

### HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed IRS regulations, which define debt and equity capital for Federal Tax Code purposes, are financial time bomb, which could cause an explosion that will destroy much of the small business community as we know it.

The proposed regulations totally fly in the face of the current administration's promise to simplify Government regulations. As Jack S. Levin, senior partner in Kirkland & Ellis, and a nationally known tax attorney notes, the proposed regulations are over 40 pages' long, containing "a dazzling array of confusing and difficult to comprehend rules, subrules, exceptions, qualifications, definitions, safe harbors, and rules of convenience."

I would suggest to my colleagues that, if one of the leading experts in tax laws finds the proposed section 385 regulations confusing, it is more than reasonable to expect that they will present an obstacle absolutely insurmountable for most small businesses.

Small businesses, I would remind you, operate on the slimmest of margins, especially at the time of their formation, when the need for capital is greatest. Adding the expense of hiring the kind of expertise necessary merely to understand these proposed regulations, not to mention the expense necessary to comply with them as well, is an unconscionable additional burden to lay on our already beleaguered small business community.

The most critical effect, however, is the impact these regulations will have on the ability of small business to raise much needed capital. Let me once again quote Mr. Levin:

> To say that the proposed section 385 regulations are complex is an understatement. To say that they will impede the financing of America's business by professional venture capitalists and by the business' own shareholders is a gross understatement. If allowed to go into effect in their present form, the proposed regulations will undeniably impede the capital formation process for young, growing businesses and mature financially troubled businesses. The continued flow of capital to these businesses is essential to the renewed vitality of the American economy.

By the way, to those who might suspect that only big business or corporations would be hurt, Mr. Levin categorically notes that the promulgation of these regulations would "apply to every new and existing business that is attempting to raise additional capital."

I think it is time we stop and ask ourselves what tax law is for. To paraphrase scripture:

> The tax law is made for people; people are not made for the tax law.

Section 385 seems to have lost sight of this. The prevention of tax fraud and the clarification of tax policy for the taxpayer are legitimate ends of new regulations; the legalistic obfuscation of tax law to confound the taxpayer and to find clever new ways of confiscating our citizens' wealth for the feeding of an already overgrown Federal Establishment are totally illegitimate ends.

Walter B. Stults, president of the National Association of Small Business Companies (NASBIC), is equally emphatic. He calls the proposed regulations "an unmitigated disaster for small businesses." He goes on to drive home the point:

> They are incredibly complex and full of traps, and they show a complete disdain for the realities of how smaller firms are born and how they finance their growth. They will create huge unforeseen tax liabilities for thousands of unwary small firms.

Actually, they may show not so much "disdain," as they do ignorance. A Treasury official, who recently appeared before our Subcommittee on Tax, Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities, spent the bulk of his testimony trying to convince us that a controversial Treasury policy was good for small business. When he was asked how he would define small business, he said he could not do it and that, moreover, it probably could not be done.

The fact is that, although there are some gray areas in defining small business, there is absolutely no doubt that most of those so identified are small by any standard. The answer reflects what the Treasury Department, which operates at the highest levels of commerce and Government, really believes from the perspective of their ivory tower, so far removed from the real world of the individual taxpayer and small business community that they have no way to relate to that world. It

is an insensitivity that is all the more tragic because those who suffer from it are sincerely trying to do their job as they see it.

William D. Barth of Arthur Andersen & Co., whose efforts for small business have been noteworthy as among the most sensible, creative and effective, makes the following comments:

It is widely acknowledged that the primary impact of these rules would be on new and small firms, which have difficulty raising capital under ordinary conditions . . . the vast majority of ongoing businesses potentially affected by these rules are only dimly aware of their adverse impact. . . . Some business owners question the appropriateness of imposing regulations in this sensitive area at all . . . [but] With the goals of the legislation and small business considerations in the correct perspective, it might be possible to avoid unduly burdening the financing of legitimate new and small businesses to a large extent.

Mr. Barth also notes that on April 22, the advisory committee to the Senate Small Business Committee unanimously adopted a resolution calling for repeal of section 385; and, on April 29, the Small Business Administration advisory committee adopted a similar resolution.

He and Earl Brown, also of Arthur Andersen & Co., also conclude that the proposed regulations would "restrict risk-taking by entrepreneurs, friends, relatives, and outside sources of capital." This would, they note, "deny opportunity for small business" and, not incidentally, "dampen overall economic performance." We simply cannot stand by idly while a disaster of such proportions takes place, particularly when our bill can prevent it.

The bill which I and my colleagues are introducing today is a prudent one. It merely says that we will postpone the implementation of these regulations for 2 years, during which time a study will be made to determine their impact, on the business community as a whole and on small business in particular. As Mr. Levin notes, we have "reasonable guidance" already, based on common law well developed by the courts.

Far too often, we consider something a "good" law or a "good" regulation based on its technical precision, rather than on the nature of its effects on those who must live under it. The situation created by section 385 is a perfect example of why we must ask whether a law or regulation achieves correct objectives in the correct way as well as whether it is drafted correctly in a legal sense.

I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort by cosponsoring this measure in such numbers that its speedy passage will be assured and a great injustice avoided.●

## TRANSFERRING OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES AT GSA

### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned of a disturbing situation which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

While I have advocated a reexamination of the role of the Federal Government in our society to benefit those in need of services and those who pay for them, I believe any changes in Government policies require a great deal of compassion and consideration on the part of those responsible for implementing these policy changes, particularly when these changes involve personnel decisions.

That is why I was distressed to learn of recent actions at the General Services Administration which resulted in the transferring of 17 senior executives, 2 of whom were married to each other and who were transferred to 2 separate locations.

Because of the depth of my concern in this matter, and because of recent developments at the GSA, I have been prompted to send the following letter to Dr. Donald J. Devine, Director of the Office of Personnel Management, requesting an investigation into this matter. I hope this situation is resolved quickly to set an example that this administration considers the human element when developing policies for laws passed by this Congress. I am sure the intent of our legislation was to be of benefit to society, not to disrupt families.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, D.C., May 12, 1982.*

Dr. DONALD J. DEVINE,
*Director, Office of Personnel Management, Washington D.C.*

DEAR DR. DEVINE: I am concerned about the situation which has developed at the General Services Administration (GSA) involving the forced reassignment and pay cuts given a number of career SES members.

As you know, the SES system was established, in part, to provide management the flexibility to meet the needs of the agency by reassigning executives to where the greatest need exists. It was intended, however, that these reassignments be carried out in a manner which would promote efficiency and effectiveness of government operations—not hinder them.

In addition, the pay reduction provision of the SES statute was designed to reduce the pay levels of those whose work was not up to the fully satisfactory level. At GSA, for example, this provision was applied to reduce carreer executives pay levels on two weeks notice.

What concerns me most of all, however, is the fact that two of the SES reassignments would have the effect of splitting up a family. One spouse is being involuntarily reassigned to New York, the other to Philadelphia. I believe firmly that this Administration's philosophy and positions have been to strengthen the family unit, not place additional pressures on it by separating the spouses. This is especially true where, as here, there is a child involved.

Although the actions being taken at GSA and at other agencies which involve career members of the SES have, in most instances, met the minimum requirements of the law, they have not been humanely implemented.

I urge you to look into the GSA matter, and to advise me whether some modifications are appropriate which would meet the concerns I have outlined above.

At a time when we are seeking a more efficient and effective administration and management of government, we cannot afford to give our senior executives any less than fair and compassionate treatment.

I look forward to hearing from you in this regard.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
*Member of Congress.*●

## LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

### HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, I testified before the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies about an extremely popular and effective program, the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I touched specifically on the land acquisition program for protection of the Appalachian Trail and on the State grants portion of the fund. I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of this testimony for the benefit of my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JAMES JEFFORDS ON THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to come before this subcommittee today to talk about one of the most sucessful programs in the Interior Department—the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This government program is one of the few that can boast of a permanent legacy of benefits to all states in the country. Since its inception in 1965, it has aided close to 30,000 projects involving 14,000 communities.

The concept behind the fund has always been extremly sound. The idea that our nation should reinvest a portion of the proceeds from a nonrenewable resource—oil—to save resources that cannot be replaced—our land and water—is probably more important now than ever before. The need for preservation has never been greater and communities with and expanding need for public recreation are experiencing overcrowding and deterioration at existing facilities. Furthermore, revenues from off-shore oil have risen drastically with decontrol and increased drilling activity.

I would like to address two particular issues with respect to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. One is the state grants portion of the fund, which was zero funded

last year, and the Appalachian Trail Project, which is at a critical stage, particularly in my state of Vermont.

Mr. Chairman, the Applachian Trail is certainly one of our unique national treasures. Its 2,100 miles from Maine to Georgia link more than sixty public land areas in fourteen states. The trail is easily accessible to most major populations centers along the route. The Appalachian Trail Conference estimates that the trail accommodates 3 to 4 million visitors each year.

In 1978, the Congress responded to the need for additional protection of the Appalachian Trail corridor by authorizing funds for the purchase of lands or interests in lands along the trail. Public Law 95-248 also provided the right to exercise eminent domain.

Most of the work on a permanent route and a protection corridor has been completed and 713 of the 830 miles of trail in need of protection have entered the final stages of land acquisition. Of this total, 342 miles have been acquired and I am here today to urge this subcommittee to do whatever it can to expeditiously finish the job.

I am most familiar with the acquisition process in Vermont and I would like to share some of the history of that process because I think it illustrates the need for quick action on the entire project. Four years ago when the acquisition process entered its most recent phase, there was a great deal of opposition on the part of many Vermont landowners to sell their land. The admirable traditions of stubbornness and resistance to government intervention lead to a resistance to discuss the AT land acquisition process despite the statewide support for the viability of the trail.

To the credit of all of those involved in the project, notably the Appalachian Trail Conference, the Park Service, the State of Vermont's Environmental Conservation Agency, the Ottaquechee Land Trust and hiking groups, a series of meetings were held in the critical areas of the state and many of the problems and objections have been worked out. This is not to say that there is no opposition, but it is small and landowners now feel that they have a voice in the process and an opportunity to participate in determining what options will be used to protect the trail.

Those close to the process on both sides feel that the accomodation that has been reached in Vermont is nothing short of miraculous. This consensus will be threatened if adequate funds are not provided to allow land acquisition to proceed as quickly as possible. Delays could also increase the cost of AT protection as land values escalate. Furthermore, there are areas where development could occur in tracts slated for the corridor.

Mr. Chairman, the moneys spent on protecting the Appalachian trail throughout its length will be nearly meaningless unless we finish what we have started. In many areas, particularly in Vermont, parcels purchased by the Park Service are not connected with each other. They will be far less useful if land acquisition does not continue.

I would also like to call the Subcommittee's attention to the plight of the state grants portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. After a zero-funding in fiscal year 1982, I believe it would be a grave mistake to not fund this program in FY '83. We are reaching a point when there is almost no money left in the form of unobligated balances. It would indeed be tragic if we were to allow this program to disappear by letting the administrative machinery wither away due to a lack of funds. I know of no program that is more popular and more scandal-free than this one.

Even in my small state of Vermont, the Land and Water Conservation Fund's state side has had a hand in the development of 361 projects. While we have made a great deal of progress in protecting land and in providing recreational opportunities for our citizens, the pressures for continuing the program are greater than ever. The pressures of land and water development by the private sector are increasing and the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped to balance this activity with matching funds for resource protection.

Examples of the principles of balancing development are numerous. Municipal projects have provided recreation facilities and protected land from less desirable types of development. Several state projects have helped to create State Parks and Reserves that preserve wildlife habitats, rare plant species, and the views and lookouts of so many areas on our state. Such values are not only important to the aesthetic qualities of states like Vermont, but they are absolutely essential to their economic health. In Vermont, we have learned that environmental protection and a balanced approach to development are one of our best assets in trying to assure a good business climate in the long term.

Furthermore, as states like Vermont grow, the need for recreational opportunities increase, as does the competition for land and water resources. In addition to protecting precious resources such as prime farmland park areas, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped the state to take a more balanced approach to sorting out competing claims for the use of our rivers. The use of Vermont's rivers has increased in all areas, including recreation, hydroelectric development, snowmaking for ski areas, domestic water consumption and waste disposal.

In short, the state grants program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been an extremely important and popular form of federal revenue-sharing. It has helped to draw in states, local governments and private donations to protect and preserve what can be renewable resources if we treat them with respect—our land and water. Despite our goal of fiscal austerity, it seems reasonable that this Congress should appropriate some of the more than $10 billion that is expected to come from offshore oil revenues. I urge the Subcommittee to inject new life into the Land and Water Conservation Fund.●

## INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENT TO RESTORE COLA TO RETIREES

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced an amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 345, which revises the congressional budget for fiscal year 1983. The purpose of my amendment is to restore the full cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to Federal civilian and military retirees. If this amendment does not pass, 1.7 million civilian retirees and 1.2 million military retirees will have their COLA capped at 4 percent, although it is projected to reach 6.6 percent next year.

Federal retirees are the only group that will be denied the full COLA. The injustice of excluding this one group is obvious and insupportable. Relegating Federal employees to the status of second class citizens will do nothing but indicate to them that their employer feels that they are less deserving than any other group. Is this what Congress really wants to do? I know that I appreciate the dedication and hard work of Federal employees, and I have no intention of telling them that they have not been appreciated.

Further, capping the COLA will have serious repercussions on the entire Federal employment system. The promise of the Federal pension program is one of the biggest magnets pulling people into Federal employ. Without it, many qualified, talented, and dedicated individuals will be forced into the private sector where pay and working conditions are far better. Does Congress really intend to drive the country's best people out of public service?

Recent congressional actions have done nothing but undermine confidence in the Federal Government's ability and willingness to deliver what it promised. Last year, Federal retirees lost the twice annual COLA. This year, there are attempts to cap, or even freeze it. Any smart Federal employee will think twice about sticking around to see what next year will bring.

A cap on the COLA is particularly unfair to the Federal retiree who no longer has the option of looking for another job, or who has lost the promise of bonuses, promotions, and improved economic conditions. Retirees are stuck with a fixed amount of income which they budget carefully to make ends meet. Despite what anyone else says, capping the COLA is the same thing as cutting benefits. And cutting the income of dependent people is cruel and outrageously unreasonable.

By tampering with the COLA, Congress does nothing but stab itself in the foot. The proposed cap is unjust, harmful to the elderly, counterproductive, and unnecessary. I hope that my amendment will be supported.●

## MSGR. WALTER P. ARTIOLI AND REV. BENEDICT P. MILITELLO CELEBRATE ANNIVERSARIES

### HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 23, 1982 the people of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Church in Jersey City are having a unique celebration.

This fine church, which is located in the Marion section of our community, is celebrating the anniversaries of two of their great spiritual leaders. On this day, Rev. Msgr. Walter P. Artioli, pastor emeritus of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church will mark the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, on May 21, 1932. Also, on this occasion, the current pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, Rev. Benedict P. Militello will celebrate the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood, which occurred on May 25, 1957. Both of these men are extraordinary individuals.

Monsignor Artioli retired as pastor in 1969. Born in New York in 1906 he moved to Jersey City at an early age where he graduated from Dickinson High School. He was ordained after attending Seton Hall University and Immaculate Conception Seminary. His first assignment was as assistant pastor of St. Lucy's Church for 2 years.

In 1934 he became administrator of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church and was made pastor in 1936.

After his retirement he served as chaplain at Holy Rosary Academy in Union City for 3 years.

During his tenure at Mount Carmel the church debt was erased in 1947, and ground breaking for a new school took place during January 1954. He was elevated to Very Reverend Monsignor during 1954. He laid the cornerstone for the new day care nursery on Garrison Avenue on May 21, 1954, and the new school and recreation center on July 16, 1955, during the golden anniversary celebration of the founding of the parish, which began in April 1905.

September 1955 was a great day in Mount Carmel Church history as its school accepted students for the first four grades in the new school with Filippini Sisters in attendance.

A brief review of Mount Carmel parish reveals the following:

Beginning in 1905 when Rev. Ernest Montelecone purchased a former Baptist Church on the corner of Broadway and Giles Avenue and transformed it into a Roman Catholic Church, where the first solemn Mass was celebrated in 1905.

On June 16, 1917, Rev. Julius Moscati was the pastor and he built a new rectory, which was dedicated April 25, 1917.

On November 14, 1926, the new church was built and Rev. Hercules Di Primio was assigned as first assistant to Father Moscati.

On January 17 of the next year the Sisters of St. Elizabeth came to the new convent and operated the kindergarten school.

On May 2, 1934, after the death of father Moscati, Rev. Walter P. Artioli was named administrator by His Excellency Thomas P. Walsh.

On December 24, 1936, Father Artioli was officially appointed pastor of the church which saw Rev. Eugene Fanelli assigned as an assistant in May of 1940.

Following the death of father Di Primio, Rev. Robert P. Garner was assigned to the parish. Father Garner was elevated to the position of Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Newark where he now serves.

In 1950 Rev. Salvatore Citarelli became assistance pastor and in 1954 the groundbreaking for the new school took place.

Father Benedict P. Militello, known affectionately as "Father Ben" was also born in Jersey City in the Marion section. He has the distinct honor of being pastor of the chucrh he served as an altar boy.

After attending Seton Hall University, and Immaculate Conception Seminary he was ordained to the priesthood on May 25, 1957, where he was assigned as assistant pastor of St. Anthony's Church in North Vale. Other assignments include St. Joseph's Church and St. Anne's Church in Jersey City.

He became pastor of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Church on May 9, 1981.

These tributes by the devoted parishioners of Mount Carmel parish indeed reflect the love they have for their beautiful edifice with its stately arch and steeple, made up of a neighborhood with groups of friendly people.

Mount Carmel parish has served thousands of families whose parents and grandparents, in many cases, migrated from Italy in search of economic opportunity and religious freedom. Mount Carmel Church was indeed a haven for these newcomers, with a language barrier, seeking to establish themselves in their new land, while proudly maintaining their traditions and cultures.

Many of Mount Carmel's early parishioners helped build the church while they were raising their families. They are among Jersey City's finest citizens who have answered the calls of America time and time again during periods of war and peace.

Mount Carmel Church has stood like a beacon to its parishioners. Their devotion to the church and the Sabbath is echoed in the words of Henry Ward Beecher:

> A world without a Sabbath would be like a man without a smile, like a summer without flowers, and like a homestead without a garden. It is the joyous day of the whole week.

The contributions of the parishioners of Mount Carmel Church and these two men of God is best reflected in remarks by Pope John Paul II on his Battery Park, N.Y., visit of October 1979 when in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty he said:

> It will always remain one of the glorious achievements of this nation that, when people looked toward America, they received together with freedom also a chance for their own advancement. This tradition must be honored also today. The freedom that was gained, must be ratified each day by the firm rejection of whatever wounds, weakens or dishonors human life. And so I appeal to all who love freedom and justice to give a chance to all in need, to the poor and the powerless. Break open the hopeless cycles of poverty and ignorance that are still the lot of too many of our brothers and sisters; the hopeless cycles of prejudices that linger on despite enormous progress toward effective equality in education and employment; the cycles of despair in which are imprisoned all those that lack decent food, shelter or employment; the cycles of underdevelopment that are the consequences of international mechanisms that subordinate the human existence to the domination of partially conceived economic progress; and finally the inhuman cycles of war that springs from the violations of man's fundamental rights and produces still graver violation of them.
>
> Freedom in justice will bring a new dawn of hope for the present generation as it has done before; for the homeless, for the unemployed, for the aging, for the sick and handicapped, for the migrants and the undocumented workers, for all who hunger for human dignity in this land and in the world.

At Sunday evening's reception in the church hall more than 800 friends and parishioners will join heart and hand with our guests of honor, breaking bread in celebration.

I am sure my colleagues share their joy.●

## THE PROFESSIONAL HOWLERS

### HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, after spending my first few months as a Member of Congress, I was appalled at the attitude of many who came to see me. "Yes," they would say, "we agree with you that massive Federal spending is inflationary; it produces high interest rates, unemployment and has been responsible for our Nation's economic ills for decades. We want you to cut the budget. But—don't cut my program."

I have heard this refrain from so many that I am thinking of getting a sculpture for my desktop—a pair of outstretched hands. I will put a little metal plate on it, and every time somebody comes in singing the old familiar "gimme" song, I will have their name engraved on the plate.

Better make that a very large metal plate.

Joan Beck knows what I am talking about. Her March 3, 1982, column for the Philadelphia Inquirer is a classic. Now, I do not say I agree with every last thing in it, but it is a biting critique of a very pervasive attitude.

BUDGET HAS A LITTLE FOR EVERYONE

(By Joan Beck)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY RELIEF TAX ACT OF 1982

### HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Tax, Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities, I have conducted a multitude of hearings regarding the capital formation and financing needs of small business. All of these hearings have been based on the premise that the future vitality and economic growth of the U.S. economy is dependent on small business. In particular, a study conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology indicates that two-thirds of all net new jobs created between 1969 and 1976, were created by firms of fewer than 20 employees and about 80 percent were created by firms with 100 or fewer employees.[1] A National Science Foundation study also concludes that small business is about 4 times as innovative as medium-sized firms and about 24 times as innovative as the largest firms.

In recognition of the important role small business plays in innovation and job creation and with the objective of insuring that role, I am introducing today H.R. 6429, the Small Business Regulatory Relief Tax Act of 1982. Joining me in introducing this most important piece of legislation are the ranking minority member of my subcommittee, DAN MARRIOTT; the Small Business Committee chairman, PARREN MITCHELL; the ranking minority member of the Small Business Committee, JOE MCDADE; two members of the Ways and Means Committee, HENSON MOORE and PHIL CRANE; Small Business Subcommittee chairman, JOHN LAFALCE; and MARGARET HECKLER.

GENERAL PURPOSE OF BILL

H.R. 6429 delays the effective date of the so-called debt-equity Federal tax regulations from July 1, 1982, to July 1, 1984. The bill also requires that the General Accounting Office, in consultation with the Department of the Treasury and Small Business Administration, prepare a study for submittal to Congress by January 1, 1984, as to the impact of Internal Revenue Code section 385 and its underlying regulations on small business.

CRITERIA IN ANALYZING SMALL BUSINESS AND TAX LEGISLATION

In each of the subcommittee hearings that I have conducted during the past 3½ years, I have tried to analyze small business legislation based on three criteria. These criteria are regulatory impact, the need for simplification, and the prospects for increasing capital formation and investment. Accordingly, it is based upon these criteria that I would direct the General Accounting Office to analyze the impact of section 385 and its underlying regulations on small business.

[1] For a further discussion of the role of small business in job creation, see the report on "Job Creation and The Revitalization of Small Business," by the House Small Business Subcommittee on Tax, Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities (Rept. No. 97-434).

DO THE DEBT-EQUITY TAX REGULATIONS FULFILL THESE CRITERIA?

Internal Revenue Code section 385, which was enacted into law in 1969, provides the Department of the Treasury with broad authority to prescribe regulations as to whether an obligation of a business is to be treated as stock or indebtedness.

This is a distinction which is most important to small and closely held businesses. To the extent an individual makes a loan to his business, it is possible under certain circumstances that the loan would be reclassified as stock. A reclassification of the loan into stock would, thus, result in the interest paid by the corporation not to be deductible. Instead, the interest payments by the firm would be treated as dividends on preferred stock. Since the payment of dividends are not deductible for tax purposes, the reclassification of a loan into stock can clearly have a dramatic impact on the cash flow of a business.

Section 385 was enacted into law at a time when Congress and the Nation were concerned about the increase in conglomerate mergers and corporate acquisitions. One of the prime concerns with respect to conglomerate mergers in 1969 was the increased use of debt to finance business acquisitions.

The rationale for section 385 came from the April 22, 1969, testimony of Edwin S. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Treasury for Tax Policy, before the House Ways and Means Committee.[2] After detailing the concern about the wave of corporate acquisitions taking place in the late sixties, he stated:

In our tax structure, an interest deduction is properly disallowed only if the underlying obligation constitutes equity rather than debt. The Treasury is presently seeking to develop rules or a regulation that will aid in distinguishing debt from equity and disallow the interest deduction where the interest payments represent in substance a return on equity.

Section 385 originated from the desire of the Treasury Department to have a broad grant of authority for determining the deductibility of interest, whether it be a corporate acquisition or otherwise. Cohen admitted this much when he stated that:

These rules would apply whether the instrument comes into existence in an acquisition, in recapitalization, or in any other manner, and whether the company is closely held or publicly held.

It took the Treasury Department 11 years to release its first draft of the debt-equity regulations. The original 1980 draft was found to be so complicated that the Treasury was ultimately forced to release two further drafts of the regulations.

In addressing the regulations' complexity, James McCarthy, vice president of the tax services group of General Business Services, Inc.,[3] recently stated:

There is no way the owner of a very small business, many of which are unincorporated, will be able to cope with these regulations, nor will the persons that these owners often look to for help (small bookkeeping or accounting firms) be of assistance.

Besides the issue as to its complexity, I am also concerned with the possible impact that the regulations will have on small business capital formation. In particular, there is a strong possibility that the debt-equity tax regulations will impede the flow of venture capital to high technology and growth firms. This is significant given the fact that these firms are often the most innovative and greatest contributors to the Nation's employment rolls.

THE NEED FOR AN INDEPENDENT STUDY TO REVIEW TAX POLICY QUESTIONS

I believe that hasty implementation of the section 385 regulations on July 1 would only serve to thwart the current congressional attitude of reducing regulatory impact and statutory complexity. For this reason, H.R. 6429 would require the General Accounting Office to analyze the various tax policy questions regarding the regulations and their impact on small business capital formation.

If the Nation has been without the so-called debt-equity regulations for 13 years, I believe we can live without them temporarily for another 2 years. It is possible that Congress might even find 13 years of judicial decisions; for example case law, sufficient to handle the debt-equity dilemma.●

## BUDGET ALTERNATIVE

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage that if in a group of 100 economists you can get 3 to agree, you have a consensus. We have a very broad consensus in the economic community today that we will not be able to have a sustained economic recovery without lowering interest rates and that there will be no dramatic lowering of interest rates until we get the deficits down. That is why this budget resolution is so crucial to the country's well-being.

But the President's proposal, Senator DOMENICI's proposal, Congressman MICHEL's proposal, the gypsy moth proposal, and even the House Budget Committee proposal call for continuing high deficits and no significant departure from the economic game plan which has brought us to the disastrous economic situation we now find ourselves in. The fact is, we need a tight fiscal policy and a loose monetary policy and we are looking at five proposals, all of which give us a different variation of a loose fiscal policy which everyone concedes will lead to tight money and weak and brief periods of recovery followed by deep and lengthy recessions.

Of the five proposals only the House Budget Committee's makes any effort to deal with the pain and misery which this tight money recession is bringing or the rapid decline in public investment in our Nation's infrastructure, physical, social, and scientific and that effort can at best be described as marginal.

That is why we have today asked the Rules Committee to make in order a substitute that offers the only real hope of releasing this tight money trap in which our economy is ensnared. We would offer lower deficits in each of the next 3 years with a balanced budget by 1985. These numbers are based on the CBO baseline of spending used in the summit meetings and the same economic assumptions used by both House and Senate Budget Committees.

We would provide for a new tax law replacing the second and third years of the so-called Economic Recovery Tax Act. Under the new tax law, tax cuts which would take effect on July 1 would give some taxpayers, particularly low-income families, a bigger tax cut than they would have received in either 1982 or 1983. Higher income families would get a tax cut but not as large as the one which the President's plan would allow. The safe harbor leasing provision of ERTA is substantially reformed and targeted to distressed industries. The accelerated cost recovery provision in the Tax Code is left largely in place but the so-called faster acceleration is repealed and businesses will no longer be allowed to depreciate the portion of the cost of any investment for which they have already received a tax credit.

Substantial additional revenues will be raised from closing such loopholes as the foreign oil tax credit and intangible drilling costs.

In defense, we will provide both civilian and uniformed personnel with a 5-percent increase, larger than that allowed by either the Senate or the House committee. We will provide 7 percent real growth for the nonpay portion of the Defense Department. In total outlays, defense will grow by $66 billion between now and fiscal 1985 under this budget. This is $40 billion less than the President requested and about $10 billion less than the House

[2] Testimony of Edwin S. Cohen on the administration's Interim Program of Tax Reform and Tax Relief. For a reprint of Cohen's testimony, see "Taxes," vol. 47, No. 6, June 1969, p. 325.

[3] General Business Services, Inc., is the largest consulting firm in the United States providing tax and financial services to small business.

committee would allow, but it still provides for 7 percent real growth.

In our resolution, we provide for an immediate economic stimulus program to put people back to work. In addition to what is in the committee package, we provide $1 billion for minimum wage jobs for unemployed workers who have exhausted unemployment benefits that would be run under national contracts in much the same manner as the older workers program. We also provide $1 billion in immediate aid to local governments for maintenance and repair of local facilities to be targeted toward communities with the highest unemployment levels. In addition, we will be creating 360,000 summer youth jobs and 400,000 work-study positions in colleges and universities to try to keep young people in school even if their families are facing economic difficulties. There will be additional funds for bridge repair and sewage treatment construction. We will accelerate the purchase of needed buses under the urban mass transit capital grants. In total we will create more than 1 million jobs beginning this summer. These are for the most part one-time expenditures to ease the pain and counter the recession.

We will also begin expanded efforts in improving our education and science base. A new program aimed at tightening academic standards in high schools will begin in 1983 and be expanded by 1985. We will greatly expand efforts at training industrial engineers, all of which are in critical short supply, a shortage that will impede the economic recovery and reduce our capacity to compete abroad. We will increase research grants and the National Science Foundation and at the National Institutes of Health.

We will prevent some of the erosion in the real dollar size of domestic discretionary programs by permitting 5 percent cost-of-living adjustment in 1984 and again in 1985. That combined with the initiatives described above will result in domestic spending staying at approximately the same level in real terms as it was in fiscal 1982 following adoption of the Reagan cuts. All other alternatives call for further real dollar cuts of $15 to $20 billion.●

## A LIFETIME OF SERVICE

### HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 19, 1982*

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, the true test of an American citizen is service to his fellow man. Public service in this Nation has reached lofty levels throughout its history. Whether those public servants are soldiers on the lines of defense or individuals conducting the daily operations of our Government, the efforts they make are valuable to the functioning of this democracy.

There are those who have given of themselves, dedicated themselves to a lifetime of service to their fellow citizens. U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND is one such person. His long and unmatched record of public service will stand for decades to come as a high-water mark for those who follow in Government administration.

I want to take this opportunity to bring to your attention an event which occurred recently at which Senator THURMOND was honored for his lifelong service. The remarks made during that ceremony follow:

REMARKS BY MR. JOHN LUMPKIN, VICE PRESIDENT, BROOKGREEN GARDENS

Mr. President, my fellow trustees, my fellow South Carolinians, ladies and gentlemen who visit us from all over this nation and all over this world, it is my happy privilege to present to you this afternoon a distinguished man, a great American, a great South Carolinian, who it has been privilege to know for at least 45 years.

Our senior Senator Strom Thurmond is the story of South Carolina. School teacher, brilliant lawyer, judge, governor of our State, and for the past 27 years serving with great distinction as our senior United States Senator. Friday past, Caroline Lumpkin and I had the privilege of attending the very moving ceremony when the auditorium at the University of South Carolina Law School was dedicated in his name and a bust was unveiled. Both of us were moved by the occasion because it is scant recognition of one of the great Americans of our time, a legendary figure.

As all of you know, next to the President of the United States, President Reagan, Strom Thurmond is the most powerful man in America, serving as President Pro Tempore of the Senate and as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that powerful Committee in the Senate. Some of you may remember this quotation from Kipling, which I paraphrased to describe in some measure our distinguished visitor: "If you can move with crowds and keep your virtue, and walk with kings and don't lose the common touch, you are Strom Thurmond." It is my great honor and happy privilege to present to you—I am just sorry that Nancy, his lovely wife, and his great children could not be here today—our Senior Senator, The Honorable Strom Thurmond.

RESPONSE BY SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tarbox, Mr. Noble, Mrs. Dunwiddie, Mr. John Lumpkin, I wish to thank you for that flattering introduction, which I do not deserve. I wish to ask Mr. Lee Letts to stand. He is the second South Carolinian to have sculpture here and the only one from this area, the Grand Strand. I commend him.

Congratulations to you, Mr. Alex Quattlebaum, Mr. Bob Coker, and other members of the Board of Trustees of Brookgreen Gardens.

Ladies and gentlemen, I feel honored that Mr. Tarbox and the Trustees wanted me to appear here this evening, and I want to thank all of you for coming. I hope I get a better reception than I did the last time I ran for the Senate. I was in the upper part of the State and spoke one night. The next morning I was walking down the street and a young, eighteen year-old boy came up and said, "Is this Senator Thurmond?" I said, "Yes, it is." He said, "I heard you speak last night." I replied, "Well, I hope you enjoyed it." He said, "Senator, that is the sorriest speech I have ever heard." I remarked, "Well, I will try to do better next time." As we walked down the street, my friend, who was introducing me to the people along the sidewalk, turned and said, "Senator, do not be concerned about what that young man said. No one pays any attention to him; do not let it bother you. He is the town idiot. Why, he only repeats what he has heard others say."

I am so pleased to see such a large crowd here. I wish every South Carolinian and every American could come to this beautiful spot. I have never seen a more beautiful place in my life than exists right here at Brookgreen Gardens. If it was for sale and I had the money of John Lumpkin, I would try to purchase every part of it.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to be with you today in this serene and attractive place—Brookgreen Gardens. It is an honor to have been selected to receive this impressive medallion, which is an original design by Karen Worth, who has created commemorative medals for such events as the wedding of Prince Charles and Princess Diana.

Your selection of me to receive this medallion for public services rendered is deeply appreciated. There can be no higher honor than the one bestowed upon me by the people of South Carolina—namely, the privilege of representing them in public office. Throughout my life, I have attempted to live by the principle of helping others. Nothing gives me greater satisfaction than beneficial public service.

When I think about South Carolina, two qualities come to mind—its renowned beauty, and its reputation for producing dedicated public servants.

Public service—the quality which you single out in bestowing this award—is a distinguishing characteristic that has long been the hallmark of South Carolinians. The history or our State is filled with numerous examples of those who have given unselfishly of themselves in service to others. Men like John C. Calhoun and James F. Byrnes, for instance, have exemplified that spirit of public service which reflects a true commitment to working for the benefit of mankind. They, and other great South Carolinians, have made a significant contribution to our State and Nation.

Brookgreen Gardens has acknowledged the importance of public service for several years, as others before me have received the same award with which I am being honored today. Equally important is Brookgreen Gardens' recognition and commitment to the other quality of South Carolina—beauty.

I am convinced that South Carolina is the most beautiful State in the Nation. The combination of plants and animals native to our State, along with other fauna and flora which are characteristic of the South, make a significant display in this garden. Few places in our State, and even our Country, can compare with the collection of over 1,600 species of rare plant life in Brookgreen Gardens.

Not only does Brookgreen Gardens emphasize the preservation of natural beauty, but it is dedicated to the promotion of man-made beauty, the beauty of art.

This outdoor museum of over 400 pieces of American sculpture illustrates the ability of man to create a thing of beauty in a way that compliments the beauty of nature.

As the peak of spring draws near, I am remined of these words written by a poet:

That God once loved a garden,
We learn in Holy writ.
And seeing gardens in the spring,
I well can credit it.

This poem could have very well been written about Brookgreen Gardens in its floral splendor. We should take the time to appreciate the riches of nature and the richness of man's creative powers of art.

We, and future generations, can visit Brookgreen Gardens to marvel at the products of man's artistic creativity as they stand among the picturesque setting of God's own artwork—creation itself.

To the Huntington family, the Board of Trustees, and all those who share their vision to preserve the beauty of South Carolina at Brookgreen Gardens, I commend you for your remarkable efforts. You have proven that art and nature are precious entities worthy preservation, and I know that the countless hours of hard work in making Brookgreen Gardens what it is today will be appreciated by generations of South Carolinians and guests to our State.

It is my sincere hope that Brookgreen Gardens will continue to stress the importance of public service, as well as natural and manmade beauty. May we appreciate, protect, and perpetuate those qualities that make South Carolina the choice State in the Nation.

Thank you for coming on this occasion, and be assured that I shall always cherish this unique medal in recognition of public service benefiting my State and Country.

---

ADDRESS BY DR. HENRY LUMPKIN, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

A SHORT HISTORICAL STUDY OF WACCAMAW NECK

Senator Thurmond, Dr. Nobel, Mr. Quattlebaum, Mrs. Charlotte Dunwiddie, Mr. Tarbox, my brother, John Lumpkin, Distinguished Friends of Brookgreen Gardens:

I am deeply honored to be your speaker today.

As we come together here at Brookgreen Gardens I think the most important historical fact to remember is that Waccamaw Neck has been inhabited by men and women continuously from 10,000 B.C. (Possibly 12,000 B.C.) to the present day. The earliest migrants from Asia who crossed the land and ice bridge where the Bering Straits now run probably came to North America at the end of the last glacial epoch when the vast ice masses had begun slowely to melt, but before the glaciers retreated, the seas rose, and the ancient passage way was covered by the waters. This would have been approximately between 14,000 to 16,000 B.C. and how long it took a wandering hunting, fishing people without any mode of transportation except their feet to travel across an entire continent to the shores of the Atlantic, we just don't know. We do know that by 10,000 B.C. they most certainly had reached the east coast here in South Carolina. As a matter of fact various groups of what we know as the American Indian had travelled all the way in the same time period to Terral del Fuego, the southernmost tip of South America, one of the greatest and most extensive folk migrations in human history.

Who these first primitive shadowy people of this archaic period of migration were, we cannot really tell. They left fragmentary evidence only, identified by carbon dating or comparative manual work, a piece of pottery crudely formed, a flint spearhead found on the bottom of Winyah Bay by diver archaelogists. The hunter must have lost it when the bay was still a marshy plain before the glaciers finally retreated, the sea came in, and the five ancient rivers: Santee, Pee Dee, Sampit, Black and Waccamaw formed the bay as we know it today.

We have discovered considerably more about their first successors, the so called people of the Woodland culture which lasted approximately from 500 B.C. to 900 A.D. Whether these Woodland Folk found an empty land, wiped out or drove away their more primitive predecessors or merely absorbed them (which seems likely) cannot, of course, be stated. The Woodland tribes had developed a more advanced culture pattern, possibly with semi-permanent settlements along Waccamaw Neck. My friend Professor Robert Stephenson, of the Institute for Archaeology at the University of South Carolina, tells me that literally scores of shell middens may be found along Waccamaw Neck, where the Indians feasted on the plentiful oysters and clams, depositing the empty shells in mounds to commemorate for posterity their gluttony or, at least, their taste for good seafood, a pleasant vice shared by most of the modern inhabitants of this area.

The neck is not geologically endowed with rock formations. Few flint implements are discovered from this period, and we may guess that they pointed their spears and arrows with bone or possibly shark's teeth (as the Polynesians did). What flint arrow or spearheads survive from both periods, archaic and woodland, undoubtedly point to trade with upcountry tribes, a fascinating aspect of very early human commerce in North America.

We are not sure that these people with their limited numbers made war on each other or neighboring folk, certainly not organized war in our sense. War unhappily is a product of civilization, since it predicates weapons designed specificially for war, war plans, a military organization with a command hierarchy, and a logistical supply concept. These only can be evolved and produced by a culturally advanced people, but primitive man goes to battle and fights with whatever hunting weapons he possesses. Heads may be bashed with a crude wooden club quite successfully whether that club was meant to be a weapon or not. The Woodland people of Waccamaw Neck undoubtedly went to battle with each other and resisted fiercely the more evolved tribal types pressing upon them from the West.

The latter came over the mountains in the last great wave of Indian migration before the coming of the white man. This was in about 800 A.D. and these were the people the Spaniards, English and Huguenot French found when they first came to South Carolina and Waccamaw Neck in the 16th and 17th centuries. The tribes on the Neck and its general area were mostly Siouan related linguistically to the Dakotah of our North and West and mortal enemies of the Iroquoian Cherokees who held the Western mountains and the Muskogean folk, Yemassees and the powerful Creeks whose lands lay to the South and West.

These Siouan Waccamaws, Peedees, Sewees, Santees, Sampas or Sampits, Weenees and Winyahs (your rivers and the great bay bear their names still) with their inland cousins the Catawbas were a settled, farming folk. They had only one domesticated animal, the dog, before the white man came, but they planted corn, beans, pumpkins, gourds and squash and harvested the wild fruits of field and forest.

From the reports of early Spanish and English observers the tribes on Waccamaw Neck lived in fairly large communal houses made of pine logs planted upright and covered with reed matting. Some of the settlements were stockaded for defense. There were several such villages on Waccamaw Neck according to contemporary reports, and one may imagine the life in the forest and wild savannahs, the hunters bringing in game: deer, turkey and black bear, the women draped in grey moss, tending the fish weirs, bringing in crabs, oysters and clams from the creeks or marshes and grinding corn in rude mortars while the little brown children played as all children do among the houses.

This is how the Spaniards found them when the first high pooped, square sailed caravels sailing from Hispaniola or Cuba on tentative exploration and slaving voyages in 1521 entered the bay they called The Bay of St. John the Baptist—the modern Winyah Bay. It is very probable that here on the lower Waccamaw Neck across Winyah Bay from Georgetown the Licentiate Lucas Vazquez d'Ayllon with a grant from the Emperor Charles V established in August of 1526 the first Spanish settlement north of the Caribbean and named it San Miguel De Gualdape in the land the Spanish called Chicora.

There were six ships and 600 people in the expedition including several Dominican friars (three are mentioned by name) some women and apparently a handful of black slaves—the first of these people to come to Waccamaw Neck. There also were 89 horses, a few probably destined to be ancestors of the little marsh tackeys which still roam in small numbers in areas of the Low Country today.

The Spaniards with commendable industry built houses of wood, erected a defensive stockade and even, it would seem, built a church, again a "first," the first house of Christian worship on Waccamaw Neck. One of the ships having been lost crossing the bar at the entrance to the bay, the Spanish settlers cut down local trees, sawed planks, laid the keel and built a ship to replace the one shattered in the bar. This is the first instance we know of ship building by Europeans in South Carolina.

It was August, and hot as only South Carolina can be in that month. A scourge of fever hit the settlement (probably malaria brought by the expedition itself and transmitted enthusiastically by the local anopheles). Many died including the leader d'Ayllon who according to the sources, repented of his sins, received the sacraments, and passed away with great dignity and courage on St. Lukes Day, 18 October 1526. As in most Spanish colonies jealousy, treasons and rebellion followed the death of a strong leader. The local Indians, infuriated by the harsh treatment meted out to them by the Spaniards as pagan idolaters, rose and killed several of the settlers, who disheartened, with many seriously ill, abandoned St. Miguel in 1527 and sailed for Hispaniola. The first European attempt to establish a permanent base in South Carolina had failed.

It is interesting to note in passing that U.S. 17, on which you came to Brookgreen Gardens, is the old Kings Highway of eighteenth century days and the general route of

the ancient Indian trail that ran between the several villages on Waccamaw Neck.

In 1711 the Lords Proprietors of the new English colony, placed in Carolina in defiance of the Spanish threat from Florida, set up ten baronies of 12,000 acres each. Remember that South Carolina is the only British Royal colony with a titled aristocracy: Landgrave, Cacique and Baron, depending on land tenure. One barony called Hobcaw, which meant in the local Indian language "Between the Rivers," fell by lot to John Lord Carteret, later elevated to be Earl Granville. Hobcaw comprised all the lands of the lower Waccamaw Neck. Later, with the change from a proprietory to a royal government in South Carolina, Waccamaw Neck was divided up into areas of private ownership, long narrow plantations stretching from the river to the sea. One early plantation called Armordale traditionally received that name from a piece of Spanish armor found on the property, probably originally encasing the bones of some poor devil of d' Aylon's colony, dead from fever, mutiny or Indian arrow and buried in his war gear.

Rice, the famous "Seed from Madagascar," first planted in South Carolina by Dr. Henry Woodward in 1686, came to Waccamaw Neck in the early 18th century and rice planting changed the entire economy of the South Carolina Low Country. Waccamaw Neck was in the very center of the rice producing territory and the land was owned by some of the great families of the colony and later the state.

Allston (both single and double L), Heriot, LaBruce, Waties, Weston, Jordan, Pawley, Tucker, Nesbit, Magill, Dunkin, Ward, Hasell, Willet and many others. Some of their descendants are sitting here today. The Spaniards had built the first church, but the Anglicans came and stayed. All Saints Waccamaw, still an active parish right now, originally of the Church Established by Law under the Bishop of London, was founded on 23 May, 1767.

Since Waccamaw Neck is a natural cul de sac and thus a tactical trap, there were no engagements of any size in the area during the Revolutionary War. Men of Waccamaw Neck, however, rode with Francis Marion, the Swamp Fox, part of that devoted band of desperate, ragged partisans without pay, proper weapons or logistical support, striking out from swamp, savannah or forest with savage courage, keeping the Revolutionary war alive in the South when hope seemed dead and the cause lost. Marion and his second in command, Peter Horry, drew supplies from Waccamaw Neck sent by friendly plantation owners, so did the British, and patrols fanned out along the neck to protect the valuable rice crop and keep it for the Royal forces in Georgetown and Charleston. After the British evacuated Georgetown on 6 June 1781, Nathanael Greene and his army, moving down the state from battle to battle toward Charleston, also used Waccamaw Neck as an essential supply area.

At the battle of Breach Inlet in 1776 where Colonel William "Danger" Thomson turned back Sir Henry Clinton's attempt to out-flank William Moultries' position at Fort Sullivan by an amphibious assault from the Isle of Palms across the inlet, Captain John Allston commanded at Breach Inlet a unit of 50 Peedee, Waccamaw, Cheraw and Catawba Indian riflemen called the Raccoon or Foot River Company: the last appearance in battle of the red warriors of Waccamaw Neck.

By 1850 there were 35 rice plantations along the eastern shore of the Waccamaw River. Four of these: Laurel Hill, Springfield, Brookgreen and The Oaks form the present Brookgreen Gardens. These decades prior to the War between the States were the hey day of the rice culture and Waccamaw Neck with its many great plantations and wealthy owners maintained that life at its best. Then came the war and with it everything changed.

The state of South Carolina was divided into ten military districts, each district to furnish two regiments and Georgetown, Horry, Marion, Williamsburg Counties and part of Charleston County made up the 10th District. On Waccamaw Neck, Captain Thomas Daggett was in command of the Waccamaw Light Artillery which manned guns at Forts Randall and Ward. In an amusing footnote Plowden Weston of Waccamaw Neck who had replaced Richard Greene White as the captain of the Georgetown Rife Guards a Company of the 10th regiment (White had been promoted to Major) followed his colonel Arthur Middleton Manigault to repel a reported Union landing on Waccamaw Neck from the blockading ships. There proved to be no landing but on the return march Plowden Weston entertained his entire company of 150 men and officers at Hagley Plantation on Waccamaw Neck with a full, seated four course dinner complete with silver, crystal and the best wines from the plantation cellar, served with ceremony by the family servitors, a fitting commentary on the almost feudal magnificence of life on Waccamaw Neck rice plantations.

The Union Naval blockade closed around the coasts of the Confederacy and Federal War vessels patrolled the waters of lower Winyah Bay. Some even made daring incursions into the bay. On December 24/25 the U.S.S. *Gem of the Sea* pursued a British schooner, *Prince of Wales*, into North Inlet, hulling her several times with long range gun fire. The schooner captain abandoned his ship after setting fire to it, and the Federals sent a naval boarding party in long boats to capture the schooner. Captain John Hyrne Tucker bringing his company at double time from Waccamaw Neck drove off the boarders with concentrated rifle fire.

There were other minor victories and defeats in the waters around the neck and on the neck itself. Finally Battery White was constructed on Mayrants Bluff, 20 feet above the water and armed with three old rifled 32 pounders and eight smaller guns. While the new fort successfully covered the main channel and blockade runners still slipped through, it only was effective against wooden warships. Its few guns were no match for the new Federal ironclads. However, behind the valiant but inadequate protection of Battery White, a few rice plantations still made crops to feed the hungry Confederacy.

On 23 November 1864 all Confederate troops still in the Georgetown area were ordered south to defend Charleston against an expected heavy attack. Only Battery White was left to guard Waccamaw Neck and Winyah Bay and Captain Franz Melchers, its Commander, was given orders to fight to the last. if the fort must be lost the guns were to be spiked and all powder supplies removed. The fort garrison then would retreat to Mount Pleasant near Charleston.

On 23 February 1865 Union naval units, the U.S.S. *Pawnee* and U.S.S. *Mingoe* steamed up Winyah Bay. They sent in landing forces which occupied Battery White abandoned by its defenders. Captain Melchers, faithful to his orders, had spiked all guns and removed the powder supply. Georgetown was occupied, after a brief resistance by a few Confederate cavalry soldiers, and the town surrendered on 25 February 1985. Resistance on Waccamaw Neck and the Georgetown area was over. On 27 February Columbia and Charleston both fell to Union attack and the war in South Carolina effectively was ended.

One last act of Confederate defiance occurred in Winyah Bay. On 1 March 1985 just after the Navy had transferred command of the Georgetown area to the Union Army, Admiral Dahlgren's flag, the U.S.S. *Harvest Moon* with the admiral aboard, struck a confederate mine while steaming down the bay and sank in five minutes in two and a half fathoms of water.

Rice planting began again in Waccamaw Neck after the war, but by the end of the century competition from new fields in Louisiana, Texas and Arkansas, the afforestation of the upcountry with its accompanying fresh water floods down the rivers and a series of disastrous hurricanes between 1893 and 1911 together killed the rice culture of Waccamaw Neck and all of low country South Carolina.

The land today has gone back in many areas to its original forest and probably looks much as it did when the Waccamaw hunters roamed its woods and marshes. My brothers and I have hunted and fished this general area for many years. When you move through the forested lands and paddle the salt creeks and rivers you almost can feel the presence of all the people who have known and lived on Waccamaw Neck and in the Winyah Bay country for 12 or 14 millennia. This is a land where history lives in the past and the future. These beautiful gardens are part of that history. This is a beloved country, beloved by many people for many, many centuries. We are very fortunate to be here today.●

## 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, May 20, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

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

*Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax bills, S. 1485, S. 2075, S. 2424, and S. 2425.
2221 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the Consumer Price Index figures for the month of April.
2154 Rayburn Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agriculture Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of the Federal crop insurance program of the Department of Agriculture.
324 Russell Building

Conferees
On H.R. 4717, amending the effective date provisions of section 402(b)(3) of the Windfall Profit Tax Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-223) to further defer the effective date of certain provisions providing for the recognition as income of LIFO inventory amounts.
H-208, Capitol

Judiciary
Courts Subcommittee
Business meeting, to markup S. 1531, providing greater discretion to the U.S. Supreme Court in selecting cases it will review, S. 1532, entitling defendants and Government attorneys in criminal cases, or parties in civil cases, to conduct the examination of prospective jurors, and other pending legislation.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold hearings on energy resiliency, focusing on strengthening and developing the strategic petroleum reserves.
3302 Dirksen Building

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed committee amendments to S. 508, Airport and Airway System Development Act of 1981 (pending on Senate Calendar), extending the funding level through fiscal year 1987 for airport improvement and development programs.
235 Russell Building

Finance
Energy and Agricultural Taxation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1713, providing an exemption for farmers from capital gains taxation on the income received from the sale of easement rights, provided the funds are rolled over into the purchase of new farmland or used for capital improvements in the existing farm.
2221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 2167 and S. 2517, bills providing economic relief to American industries and companies injured by foreign products being dumped or sold on the American market at less than fair value.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Forestry, Water Resources, and Environment Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1187, transferring authority to conduct national forest system boundary surveys from the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, to the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
324 Russell Building

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Selective Service System, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Veterans' Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency.
1224 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1885, to place electric utilities, including members of registered holding company systems, on the same basis as nonutilities to encourage their investment in cogeneration and small power production facilities, focusing on committee amendments thereto, relating to avoided costs and interconnection provisions of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (Public Law 95-617).
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Finance
To hold hearings on the administration's New Federalism proposal.
2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Closed briefing on the administration's preparations for the Versailles Economic Summit (June 4-6, 1982).
S-116, Capitol

Select on Intelligence
Closed briefing on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

MAY 25

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

9:15 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 Federal Trade Commission.
S-146, Capitol

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

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1224 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2414, extending Federal Maritime Commission jurisdiction to intermodal shipments of cargo to and from the United States transported through Canadian ports, and requiring the filing of tariffs for such shipments.
235 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on social security disability terminations, focusing on the Social Security Administration's decision to accelerate the required review of disability eligibility, the continuing deficiencies in the system, and the resulting impact on claimants.
1318 Dirksen Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to resume markup of S. 1182, improving the administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by removing certain inequities, reducing incentives for fraud and abuse, and assuring immediate compensation benefits and competent medical treatment for injured employees, and to begin markup of S. 1889, authorizing funds for the establishment of a national institution to promote international peace and resolution of international conflict.
4232 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To resume hearings on a proposed resolution of regulations and/or rules changes needed to implement television and/or radio coverage of the Senate.
301 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the chemical and meteorological effects of acid deposition.
4200 Dirksen Building

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

tember 30, 1982, and fiscal year 1983 for the Board for International Broadcasting.
S-116, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Regional and Community Development Subcommittee
Business meeting, to markup S. 2144, authorizing funds for the Appalachian Regional Commission.
4200 Dirksen Building.

MAY 26

9:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2531 and S. 2532, bills providing for capital assistance to insure the long-term viability of certain financial institutions engaged in mortgage lending.
5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1562, establishing a national policy to promote and consolidate Arctic research programs.
3302 Dirksen Building

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

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of D. Bruce Merrifield, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.
235 Russell Building

Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1043, prohibiting the drugging or numbing of racehorses and related practices.
5110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the alleged abuse of juveniles in certain State-operated care facilities.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 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

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings on certain alleged mismanagement practices within the Department of Energy.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
2228 Dirksen Building

*Select Committee to Study Law Enforcement Undercover Activities Of Components of The Department of Justice
To hold an organizational business meeting.
301 Russell Building

MAY 27

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 contributions to international organizations of the Department of State, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 2531 and S. 2532, bills providing for capital assistance to insure the long-term viability of certain financial institutions engaged in mortgage lending.
5302 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the alleged abuse of juveniles in certain State-operated care facilities.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1964 and S. 1965, bills designating certain wilderness areas in the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, S. 2021, providing for the disposal and acquisition of certain Federal lands in New Mexico, and S. 2405, providing for certain lands in New Mexico to be included in the Cibola National Forest System and into the existing Sandia Wilderness.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings to examine chemical and meteorological effects of acid deposition.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To continue hearings on certain alleged mismanagement practices within the Department of Energy.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
To hold hearings on the nomination of John N. McMahon, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.
5110 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the United Nations, focusing on voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs.
1223 Dirksen Building

JUNE 8

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To resume 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

Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings on S. 1844, to facilitate the development of interstate coal pipeline distribution systems by granting the Federal power of eminent domain to those interstate pipelines which are determined to be in the national interest.
3110 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.
1318 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

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To resume 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

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the employee retirement income security program (ERISA).
4232 Dirksen Building

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

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

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.
1318 Dirksen Building

JUNE 14

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2469, providing for improved international telecommunications.
235 Russell Building

JUNE 15

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2469, providing for improved international telecommunications.
235 Russell Building

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

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

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1983 for the Agency for International Development, focusing on the trade and development program, international disaster assistance, and American schools and hospitals abroad program.
S-146, Capitol

JUNE 16

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on Federal Government cargo preference.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Environmental and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (Super Fund).
4200 Dirksen Building

JUNE 17

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2469, providing for improved international telecommunications.
235 Russell Building

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

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

JUNE 23

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the National Materials and Minerals Policy Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-479).
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on indirect cost and contract provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93-638).
6226 Dirksen Building

JUNE 24

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