

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICA NEEDS EXIMBANK

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1982

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, as the House debates the various budget resolutions before it, we must not be unmindful of the various programs and expenditures involved and the potentially negative effects of some budget resolutions. I refer to the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and the administration's efforts to scale back the Eximbank's lending authority. It is ironic that no budget outlays are involved and economic benefits are to be achieved if U.S. firms, aided by Exim, are more competitive in the world market.

Mr. Lee L. Morgan, chairman of the board, Caterpillar Tractor Co., and chairman of the Business Roundtable Task Force on International Trade and Investment, today addressed the National Press Club on trade and our export potential. He emphasized the importance of export financing in a highly competitive world economy when other countries are engaging in predatory financing and credit subsidies which are greatly undermining our industries' efforts to compete on an equal footing.

Mr. Morgan spoke of the many myths and lack of understanding surrounding the Eximbank, and called upon this Congress to have funding up to levels to enable our industries to compete more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, it is an excellent and timely message and one directly to the Congress.

REMARKS BY LEE L. MORGAN

Thank you for inviting me to speak about the competitiveness of U.S. exporters in the world marketplace. In the midst of a bad run of economic news here in the United States, it's especially appropriate that we look at how American business is faring in competition for international sales.

I'm pleased to be joined at this head table by representatives Michel and Bonker; by Bill Draper, of the Eximbank; by Jim Booe, of the Communications Workers of America; by Will Barry, representing the National Governors Association; and by Jack Steiner of Boeing.

The presence of these distinguished guests underscores their commitment to a strong U.S. exporting capability, and their willingness to work hard to achieve it. Their presence also shows that export promotion is a goal shared by Republicans and Democrats, State and Federal Government officials, and business and labor leaders.

Exporting, I'm sure you'll agree, is not about to replace sports or politics as a lead-

ing topic of conversation in the United States.

Americans are in favor of exporting as a general concept. It's just that relatively few know much about it . . . even though large numbers of Americans depend on exports for their jobs. Unfortunately, this relative lack of attention means that in policy level discussions here in Washington the export dimension often does not get the attention it deserves.

It is appreciation of the close link between jobs and exports, and the recognition that exports need to be placed higher on our Nation's priorities list, that led to formation of the coalition for employment through exports. This coalition includes State Governors and trade union leaders, along with large and small companies engaged in exporting.

The jobs-creating aspect of exporting is what I plan to focus on today. But I'll also discuss some of the realities of international competition for export sales. There are lots of aspects of U.S. Government policy that affect U.S. export performance. The use of economic sanctions as a tool of foreign policy, for example. Or the impact of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. But today I want to place particular emphasis on the crucial area of export financing.

Allow me to draw upon the experience of my own company to illustrate the important role of exports in helping to create jobs for Americans.

Caterpillar designs, manufactures, and markets products in two principal categories: earthmoving, construction, and materials handling machinery and equipment; and engines.

Caterpillar has been fortunate to enjoy a significant measure of worldwide success. For most of the past decade, our overseas business has equalled or exceeded our U.S. business. Last year, 57 percent of our sales were outside the United States. Some of those sales, of course, were of products manufactured abroad. But most came from the United States. In fact, nearly half of Caterpillar's total U.S. production in 1981 was exported . . . amounting to \$3.5 billion in U.S. exports.

We estimate that some 31,000 of Caterpillar's U.S. employees owed their jobs to exports last year. And the benefits didn't stop with our company or our employees. For each job at Caterpillar, it's estimated that two jobs are created with supplier firms that provide us with goods and services. So, in all, Caterpillar exports in 1981 created approximately 93,000 jobs for Americans.

We're proud of these figures. They're firm evidence that an American company . . . an American work force . . . can compete successfully in international markets.

But we want to do better . . . and we can do better. We think that annually there are billions of dollars of additional sales opportunities that Caterpillar and other American companies could and should be capturing. We're convinced that we could win more of that business under conditions of equal competition. But there's the rub: internationally, we're not competing on an equal basis, and the distortions to our international trading system are placing the

American exporter at a serious disadvantage.

Governments of other countries are supporting financing arrangements so attractive that American companies are losing out. Government-supported financing of international sales has become a major factor in determining who gets what business. The U.S. General Accounting Office recently surveyed 117 exporters who had applied to Eximbank for financing support, but were denied loans or did not use them. The survey shows these firms lost over \$2 billion worth of business to exporters from other nations with more competitive financing.

Traditional commercial factors such as quality, service, and price remain important; but a good financing package can, and often does, dominate a purchasing decision. It is crucial, then, that American exporters have available a financing facility on a par with facilities available to our foreign competitors. That is why the U.S. Export-Import Bank is so important to this Nation.

If Eximbank is so necessary and desirable, then why does it face such significant pressure to cut back its operations? Fundamentally, I believe, because it is the most misunderstood institution in the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, many people do not understand the positive aspects of the Eximbank's activities. For example, few people know that since its initial establishment, no taxpayer dollars have been appropriated to support the Eximbank. Few people know that the bank is a money-making proposition; so much so that it has paid back its \$1 billion original capitalization to the U.S. Treasury and has piled up \$2 billion in retained earnings to help see it through tough economic times, like the present.

You know, when viewed superficially, the Eximbank debate appears to pose a kind of ideological quandary for me, and for other business leaders. For years you've heard us appeal to Government to get out of our way, and let us compete. What we need—and we say it over and over—is less Government, not more . . . less Government spending, less Government regulation of the private sector, and less Government involvement in the marketplace. Let me strongly reassert those views today.

Exporters are not looking for a handout. We recognize and acknowledge that our Nation cannot and should not adopt a policy that calls for export credit subsidies over the longer-term. We agree with and wholeheartedly support the goal of multilaterally eliminating export credit subsidies as a competitive weapon. But we do not agree that a policy of unilateral export credit disarmament is the proper way to achieve that goal.

Let me explain what I mean by unilateral disarmament. I mean we cannot disarm our Eximbank—cutting back its programs—and expect other countries to negotiate with us on controlling export credits. Just last week the French indicated they are not prepared to approve the newly negotiated OECD agreement on export credits.

The United States will have little leverage in international negotiations if Eximbank is regarded as an insignificant factor in the

international marketplace. And frankly, I'm afraid we're reaching that point.

Let's consider why that's a problem. American exporters want to compete . . . and are ready to compete . . . on the basis of quality, service, price, and other commercial factors. Those are, on the whole, factors for which the private sector is responsible . . . over which we have some control.

But export financing supported by foreign governments on behalf of their national industries confronts us with a dilemma . . . A dilemma for which there is no adequate private-sector solution.

American companies, regardless of size, don't have the financial resources to compete against very substantial export credit subsidies from foreign governments. Those subsidies, along with a vast array of other export promotion devices like tax incentives and tariff concessions, are helping foreign companies win exports and export-based jobs away from the United States.

It's in this context that an effective U.S. Export-Import Bank is essential . . . A competitive bank can help stem the loss of export-based jobs to other countries. And an aggressive bank will encourage other countries to join the United States in serious efforts to control predatory export financing. Agreement is needed in this area if purchasing decisions in international trade are to be based more on commercial factors . . . and less on which Government offers the biggest financing subsidy.

Unfortunately, the experience of recent years indicates that an agreement on export financing will not be achieved easily.

The United States has tried to achieve such an agreement, employing a combination of exhortations and warnings. But so far, we've fallen short of reaching an effective and lasting solution.

One important reason, I believe, is that other countries have seen too many indications that the United States does not attach the same high priority to exporting that many of them do.

Other countries see export credit subsidies as creating foreign exchange earnings and jobs. So long as these gains appear to outweigh the costs involved, they're prepared to continue export credit subsidies, and resist any effective international agreement. We can change the equation for them by fighting back every time another country offers a financing package aimed at displacing U.S. exports and jobs.

In theory, that's what Eximbank's current policy of "selective competition" is intended to do. But Exim's authority and resources are so limited that the Bank has to put more emphasis on selecting than it does on competing.

That situation must be changed. In the longer run interest of achieving agreement on an end to predatory export financing, the United States needs to strengthen Eximbank . . . or other countries will continue to have no real reason to come to the negotiating table.

Various arguments have been put forth as to why the United States cannot or should not have a strong Eximbank . . . some based on misunderstandings about the Bank. I'd like to address some of those arguments and misunderstandings.

One is that Eximbank, like many Government programs, is just too expensive.

Earlier, I disputed this charge by noting that Eximbank has made money throughout its existence. There are few, if any, Government agencies that can boast such a record.

This year, for the first time in its history, Eximbank will lose money. Interest rates have soared and conditions in the money markets that permitted the Bank to make a profit in the past are now reversed. Currently, Exim is having to borrow at higher interest rates than those at which it must lend, if it's to compete with the export loan rates offered by other industrialized nations.

It's not really surprising, then, that there have been calls to cut back Eximbank's programs. But while calls for cuts in Eximbank's programs may not be surprising, neither are they logical. It is precisely during a period of economic uncertainty and high interest rates that we most need a strong Eximbank. And it is precisely in tough economic times that a viable financial or commercial institution should be able to draw on those resources it has accumulated over the profitable years.

There's a second misunderstanding about Exim that also deserves comment. That is the widely held impression that it benefits only a few big companies. Not true; last year Exim was used directly by more than 2,600 U.S. firms.

Eximbank has a variety of programs, some of which—like the discount loan program—were developed with small and medium exporters in mind. And even when Exim helps promote exports by large firms, thousands of other companies across America share in the benefits of those export contracts. I am referring, of course, to the suppliers, subcontracting and vendors to the exporters. Let me illustrate this point.

Caterpillar in 1981 bought goods and services from over 14,000 U.S. suppliers, located in all 48 contiguous States plus the District of Columbia. In a sense, we served as the export department for those companies, many of which are small businesses.

Boeing purchases commercial aircraft parts and equipment from some 4,000 suppliers, and Westinghouse estimates that about half the value of the goods manufactured for a typical 2,000-megawatt nuclear equipment export order comes from suppliers and subcontractors.

I won't deny that Caterpillar, Boeing, Westinghouse, and other large companies that are often associated with the Eximbank do benefit from that association. But I'm not embarrassed by that fact, since such companies account for a surprisingly large share of total U.S. exports. The point of these examples is that the Bank's positive impact is much broader than a few big companies.

Let's move beyond companies, to talk about people. A survey of U.S. manufacturers by the census bureau shows that each billion dollars worth of exports supports more than 30,000 jobs. (Caterpillar's own experience, incidentally, bears out the estimate.) The key point is that since all Eximbank funding supports U.S. production, the Bank has a sizable effect on American jobs.

American jobs . . . that's what this is all about: U.S. unemployment has reached its highest level since the depression of the 1930's. By the end of June, Caterpillar will have over 17,000 U.S. employees on indefinite layoff . . . the largest number of layoffs in our company's history.

In my view, one of the most important things Government can do to help restore economic health is to encourage job-creating, wealth-producing activity like exporting. To the extent Federal funding is involved in supporting Eximbank activities, it has a high payoff at a low cost.

There's a third misunderstanding I'd like to talk about. It relates to exporting generally . . . not just to Eximbank.

It's the belief that other countries are lined up eagerly waiting to buy American exports. So it doesn't really matter what we do in terms of public policy affecting exports. The United States can impose export controls or weaken Eximbank . . . and American exports will continue to sell themselves.

Well, it used to be the case that the United States could lock up international sales easily because of our technological edge. But that's no longer the case. Our foreign competitors have closed the gap in most areas where America once held technological superiority. Machinery and engines, steel mills, aircraft, nuclear and fossil-fueled powerplants are no longer the private technological turf of American manufacturers.

Now we find ourselves offering essentially competitive products, but with the export financing factor working against us. If we fail to rise to the export credit challenge, American exporters will find themselves replaced as the customary suppliers in important markets. And once you're out of an export market, it is very hard to regain your former position . . . much harder than in the case of domestic markets.

Let me provide some specific examples of the role competitive export financing can play and has played in regard to products now available from various countries.

An executive of Singapore Airlines has been quoted as saying the reason his firm exercised an option to buy four more Airbus A-300s from Europe—instead of buying from Boeing—is the \$40 million they would save with French financing.

In the case of a \$1 billion nuclear power project, the difference in financing costs between the lowest rates offered by foreign competition and those offered by the United States can mean as much as \$500 million over the life of the plant.

One of the clearest—and, from a U.S. perspective, worst—examples of the impact of competitive export financing is found in Caterpillar's own experience. A year or so ago we were bidding for the sale of 40 machines to a potential Latin American customer . . . machines Caterpillar built in two places: Illinois and the U.K.

Customarily, we source products sold in Latin America out of Illinois, and that was our intention in this case. That is, until financing became a factor. The buyer was aggressive in seeking financing . . . and arranged such favorable terms through the British export credit facility that he insisted our product be sourced from the U.K.

The impact: The buyer got his Caterpillar equipment; and we got the sale. But most of the jobs went to the U.K. instead of to the United States . . . purely and simply because our Eximbank could not, or would not, meet the terms offered by the British.

These examples illustrate why American exporters are so concerned about proposals that would cut the authorization level of Eximbank in fiscal 1983, at a time when the availability of funds from the financing facilities of other nations appears to be growing.

A host of solutions have been suggested to bring an end to the current international export credit war. I will mention only three because they fall within the framework of present institutions and policies.

First, we could get rid of our Eximbank and assume that the aggressive exporting

nations we compete against will also eliminate their banks. You know as well as I do that that's not going to happen.

Second, American manufacturers could start sourcing their export orders through manufacturing facilities located in countries that are eager to provide export financing. But American companies don't want to do that, and I'm sure that solution is not palatable to Government and labor leaders.

Or third . . . in the vernacular of Washington . . . we can "play hardball." The United States can put other nations on notice that we are going to match their export credit packages with competitive financing of our own. We can show them that our Eximbank is going to actively promote American exporters by assuring them they will get the financing they need, rather than withdrawing from the contest.

Some call this the "deep pocket" approach, based on the fact that America's capital resources are the largest in the world. We believe this deep pocket solution would provide the show of financial power and credibility our negotiators need to bring about more effective agreements on export loan interest rates and terms.

The place to start is with Eximbank's program authorization.

The realities of international competition would call for a substantial increase in the Eximbank authorization level. The realities of U.S. politics and fiscal policy, on the other hand, demand restraint. In the past, compromises have been achieved which preserved an appropriate balance between our commitment to a strong Eximbank and U.S. fiscal year. We believe it is incumbent on policymakers, both in the executive branch and Congress, to recognize the positive economic benefits—including jobs creation—that flow from Eximbank, and accord it appropriate priority in the budget setting process.

To complement adequate funding, other changes in Eximbank lending practices must be made. Too often, for example, the Bank's commitments are not timely. And the current practice of charging an up-front fee of two percent seriously undermines the value of Exim's support.

The U.S. Eximbank is just not competitive in many cases. Other OECD countries, by use of mixed credits and other financing tools, have been able to bring their effective rates to a level below that provided for in the international accord. The comparable U.S. rates are often several percentage points higher.

The Bank should have a broad range of programs that meet the needs of the diverse companies that make up America's export sector. In addition to the direct loan program, Exim should have strong programs in such areas as discount loans, guarantees, and insurance.

Congress must make it clear that Eximbank is not to be a passive partner in the world of international finance. In renewing Eximbank's charter, Congress should reconfirm the Bank's mandate to be an aggressive promoter of U.S. exports. Eximbank's role must be effectively integrated with the other export promotion activities of the U.S. Government.

A strong U.S. commitment to Eximbank would signal the rest of the world that we are serious about exporting . . . and about export financing competition. Other countries must know that we don't intend to stand idly by watching American jobs be snatched away as a result of their export credit subsidies. They must be put on notice

that if we're forced to play the export finance game, we'll play vigorously . . . and we'll win.

Caterpillar, and many of our associates in the business community, have consistently spoken out on behalf of both free trade and a reduced role for Government in the marketplace. We remain committed to those positions. We do not advocate strengthening Eximbank out of a desire to increase U.S. Government involvement in international trade. Rather, a stronger Eximbank now is the most effective way to help American firms compete on a fair basis in the international marketplace. And a strong Exim is a powerful incentive for other countries to agree to controls on predatory export financing.

We need such an Eximbank policy to encourage the vigorous growth of American exports . . . and, in the process, put a great many Americans back to work. I urge all of you to do your part to help achieve these goals.●

ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing the sixth annual "Very Special Arts Festival" which was hosted on May 1 by the Orange County Department of Education. The purposes of this unique event, held on behalf of 1,600 handicapped children and adults, are many: to showcase the talents of the handicapped in our community, to increase the number of handicapped individuals served by and through the arts and to develop a stronger sense of pride among those participating.

In addition to the remarkable number of disabled artists who participated in the festival, no less than 300 parents, teachers, staff and others volunteered their time and expertise to insure that this year's festival would be the most successful to date. Along with acknowledging the Orange County Department of Education for this success, I would like to mention the following cosponsors who lent their assistance. These include: the National Committee for the Arts for the Handicapped, the Friends of the Institute for the Study of the Severely Handicapped, the California Alliance for Arts Education, and the Council for Exceptional Children, Chapter 88.

Orange County was the first county in the State of California to host and coordinate such an event. It has since been joined by 19 other areas statewide. Still, the Orange County Festival remains one of the largest in the State.

As the Representative for the 38th Congressional District which encompasses 9 of Orange County's 26 cities, I wholeheartedly support the stated goals of the "Very Special Arts Festi-

val." Mr. Speaker, I again ask my colleagues to join me in commending the Orange County Department of Education, the festival cosponsors and the many participants for their commitment to the needs of handicapped persons in Orange County.●

HEALTH CARE FOR VETERANS IN SOUTH FLORIDA

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I am back in my congressional district, I make it a point to meet with as many groups and individuals as possible in order to learn more about their concerns and the problems they face.

On March 29, I met in our North Miami Beach district office with a group of veterans affiliated with the DAV. The had many complaints concerning the availability and quality of health care provided by the Veterans' Administration.

In response to their concerns, our office arranged a meeting in Washington of VA officials with members and staff of the south Florida congressional delegation. We discussed the most common complaints about health care registered by veterans in the Miami area, and I was pleased that in most instances the VA was making progress toward solving these problems.

There has been a tremendous increase in the number of veterans in Florida and this population is expected to grow even more in the years ahead as the huge number of World War II veterans require more services. It is crucial that the Veterans' Administration make every effort to keep us with the increased demands on its resources in south Florida, and the Congress should do all in its power to see that VA has the necessary funds to do its job well.

I also believe that a better dialog is needed between the veterans in our area and the local VA administrators. Our congressional district office will be looking into the possibility of setting up quarterly meetings of representatives from veterans' organizations, the VA and congressional offices. Such meetings held regularly in Miami could insure better communication between the VA and the veterans it serves.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a report on the meeting held in Washington on May 6, 1982.

The report which was written by our staff and reviewed and approved by the VA follows:

A meeting to discuss the problems faced by veterans seeking health care from the Veterans Administration in south Florida

was held on May 6, 1982, at 10:45 a.m. in Room H-139 of the Capitol.

In addition to Congressman Lehman and Congressman Mica, staff from the offices of Congressman Fascell, Pepper and Shaw were present. Mr. Steve Edmiston of the Washington Office of the DAV also attended. Representing the Veterans Administration were Dr. Earl Brown, Jr., Acting Assistant Deputy Chief Medical Director; Donald B. Thompson, Regional Director for the Southeastern Region; James S. Must, Deputy Regional Director for the Southeastern Region; William Ramsey, Legislative Affairs staff of the Department of Medicine and Surgery; Ralph Ibson, VA Office of General Counsel; and Robert "Corky" Coleman, VA Congressional Affairs.

A list of common complaints received by congressional offices served as the basis for discussion.

(1) The first problem discussed was the lack of resources to provide care for nonservice-connected veterans at the Miami VA Hospital. Of immediate concern to veterans was a notice which had been posted stating that nonservice-connected veterans and veterans with less than 50 percent service connection seeking care for an NSC condition could receive follow-up outpatient treatment following hospitalization for a period not to exceed three months, after which they would have to seek care elsewhere. Exceptions to this policy were made for World War I veterans, veterans whose disability was rated at 50 percent or more, and veterans receiving aid and attendance or housebound benefits.

The VA representatives stated categorically that such a policy was not in effect and that the Miami Medical Center had been directed not to post such a notice. While service-connected veterans do receive preference for their service-connected conditions and those who are rated 50 percent or more service-connected receive care for any condition, nonservice-connected veterans and those veterans who are rated less than 50 percent service-connected who seek care for NSC conditions continue to receive care at the Miami Medical Center within available resources and according to the legislated priorities for care.

The VA further recognizes that the veterans population in south Florida has growing medical needs that the facilities' current funding level cannot adequately handle. The VA has, therefore, added \$1 million and 13,500 outpatient staff visits to Miami's budget allocation beginning in fiscal year 1983. Twenty full-time employees are being added to the staff.

In addition, plans for facility expansion are being made. Outpatient services should be improved by the construction of a \$49 million Ambulatory Care and Spinal Cord Injury unit, the current outpatient clinic was designed to handle 135 patients per day. It now serves 850.

Expansion of the radiology department is included in Miami's Five-Year Facility Construction Plan. Presently, there are only nine X-ray rooms. This space is expected to be doubled when the expansion is completed.

(2) Veterans have also expressed concern about the lack of staff at the hospital. One congressional office had been told that the Miami hospital had fewer than 50 registered nurses. The VA representatives informed the congressmen and staff present at the meeting that in fact, 250 registered nurses were on duty at the Miami hospital. This is still less than the number needed to properly

staff the hospital and a national recruitment campaign will begin soon. The VA noted, however, that there had been some improvement in the last year as nationally the number of beds closed due to nurse shortages had been reduced by 23 percent.

(3) Veterans who go to the Miami Medical Center for outpatient care are forced to wait long hours. The VA stated that waits in Miami are above the national average. The average time for a nonservice-connected veteran to complete his visit is two hours, 47 minutes. Part of this problem is due to insufficient facilities and part of it is due to a large number of veterans who come into the clinic on a walk-in basis rather than arranging an appointment. The VA hopes that the planned expansion of facilities will relieve veterans of such lengthy waits.

Veterans have found that their telephone calls to the Miami hospital take an inordinately long time to be answered. This problem too should be resolved in the near future as Miami is at the top of the list for the installation of a new phone system in fiscal year 1983.

(4) Veterans have also complained of VA staff attitudes which are often described as rude or indifferent. The VA has taken steps to resolve this problem through special training courses emphasizing courtesy, interpersonal relationships and transcultural skills. VAMC Miami employees have received 9,100 hours of such training.

The improvement and expansion of the present facilities should also have some positive effect on staff attitudes as some of the pressures related to overcrowding will be relieved.

(5) Some veterans had also complained that they had difficulty communicating with foreign-born doctors. The VA has reviewed the staffing at the Miami hospital and reported that most of these doctors are American citizens, all of whom have demonstrated English proficiency and have completed the necessary training courses to qualify them to be licensed and practice medicine in this country. The VA also noted that 10-12 percent of the veteran population in the Miami area is bilingual and the presence of bilingual staff provides better service for these veterans.

(6) Florida has no long-term psychiatric facility, thus imposing additional hardship on many veterans and their families. The VA reported that a new addition which will include 200 long-term psychiatric beds is being planned for construction at Gainesville. Also the construction of a new spinal cord injury unit at Miami will enable the VA to establish 42 additional psychiatric beds at the Miami VAMC.

(7) A replacement computer system is needed to improve the hospital's efficiency. Such a system is especially needed in the areas of scheduling and record-keeping. The VA plans to have a new system in place in 1983.

(8) Veterans have expressed concern about the understaffing of the VA nursing home in Miami. The nursing home has 120 beds, but only 90 of them are available for patient care despite a lengthy waiting list of veterans who need such care. The situation is the result of understaffing. The VA stated that it had miscalculated the additional staffing requirements of the nursing home. Steps are being taken to increase funding and staffing so as to gain full use of this unit. The VA also stated that an additional 120-bed nursing home unit is being planned for construction at Miami to be completed in 1986.●

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE STATE
SENATOR EDWARD T.
CONROY, OF MARYLAND

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sorrow about the passing of a good friend and fellow Marylander, the late Senator Ed Conroy, who died of cancer at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Ed was a war hero who served in the Korean war with great honor and distinction. He lost an arm in combat and was decorated with the Silver Star, the Bronze Star Medal, and two Purple Hearts. He served in the Maryland General Assembly with distinction—as a delegate during 1963 to 1967; and then as a State senator until his death.

He was extremely active as a member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. Especially noteworthy were the positions he held as national commander of the DAV and State commander of the VFW.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Conroy was a great patriot who fought for American veterans, especially the disabled, and indeed for the constituents of Prince George's County that he represented. Ed was a skilled elected official and a good conservative Democrat. I have known him for a good many years and I have always respected his views and admired his tenacity to stand up for what he believed in. We will miss him in Maryland. I extend my heartfelt condolences to his wife, Mary, and his two sons, Edward, Jr., and Kevin.●

INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL
PROGRAMS OF THE CENSUS
BUREAU

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, last month, I had the opportunity of visiting the Census Bureau's international programs staff and was impressed at the wide range of work undertaken by that group. It ranges from providing technical statistical assistance to Third World countries to piecing together input-output tables of the Soviet economy.

I had the opportunity to meet and talk to a number of the training participants who come from all over the world to the Census Bureau for applied, hands-on training in statistics and data processing. This year there

were over 100 foreign participants in training. The training program has been in existence since the 1940's and over 4,000 students have been trained, many of them becoming chief statistical officers in their own governments. The program began with a strong emphasis on Latin America, but in the last few years, few Latin Americans have been able to attend because of the lack of financial assistance through U.S. fellowships and study grants.

Generally, U.S. support of fellowships and funds has been declining in recent years. The program at Census is a good example of how shortsighted budget cuts are in these areas. Without some form of financial assistance, many Third World technicians find it very difficult to come here for training. As a result, many go to the Soviet Union or to other Eastern bloc countries where they can receive training basically for free through the ruble contribution to the U.N.

It is a tribute to the quality of the Census Bureau's program that participants still come to the United States rather than to the Soviet Union. However, it is obvious that we must provide some funding to maintain our world leadership in this area. Without reliable statistics and trained people to produce them, we severely handicap our abilities to conduct business without greatest potential market—the world's developing countries.

At the specific urging of the chief statisticians of the Latin American countries, Census is proposing to start a school in Spanish to regain our prominence and influence in the statistical development of Latin America. I strongly endorse and support this proposal and urge the administration to make this part of the Caribbean basin initiative.

I also discovered that we presently have no mechanism for assisting China in its attempt to take a census successfully this July. The Foreign Assistance Act prohibits the U.S. Government from providing direct assistance to them. The Census Bureau has been approached various times informally by high level officials in the Chinese statistical agencies, asking Census to provide them with technical assistance. It is almost inconceivable that we would refuse assistance of this nature to China.

It is gratifying to see a program such as this one, where even in times of extreme budgetary constraints, a diligent and enthusiastic staff is accomplishing so much in fostering communication and understanding within a technical program designed to create self-sufficiency in the developing world.●

WE CAN DO IT

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, too often when times are rough it is easier to sit back and wait for things to get better than to do something about them. Fortunately, there are always those few who are not willing to put up with the status quo, who are willing to stick their necks out and help to improve the lot of their fellow Americans. I wish to share with my colleagues just such an initiative which took place in my district.

The Ohio Bank & Savings Co. of Findlay, Ohio, recently took a big step toward countering the oppressive interest rates that have taken such a toll on all Americans. It did this by setting aside \$2.5 million to be loaned to potential Findlay area homeowners at an annual percentage rate of 14.50 percent when there is a downpayment of 25 percent. This compares to the local annual percentage rate of 16.75 percent and the national average of 17.25 percent.

Although Findlay is a small city of 38,000, the bank noted that there were over 500 single family homes sitting on the market waiting to be sold. Something had to be done to help the area's slumping housing market, and Ohio Bank decided to do it by releasing the \$2.5 million at a reduced rate of interest.

Ohio Bank is going even one step further, however, by garnering support among State and Federal officials in an attempt to get more financial institutions involved in supporting their own communities in this type of lending situation. According to a recent news release:

The main thrust is not to call on the Federal Government first when in a troubled housing situation, but to try to work it out yourself, and with team work—"We Can Do It."

I commend the efforts of Ohio Bank and hope that similar financial institutions will follow its lead in a collective effort to help the Nation's housing industry.●

SUPPORT TITLE I FUNDING

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, we have made tremendous strides in recent years to open up our schools to disadvantaged children. I believe it is fundamentally important for this country to maintain its commitment to the special needs of those children.

One Federal program that has proved to be especially successful in serving those needs is title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides remedial education to millions of disadvantaged children.

Recent budget enactments, however, have whittled away at Federal support for this important program: The fiscal year 1981 appropriation of \$3.5 billion was rescinded last year to \$3.1 billion. Funds were reduced further under the fiscal year 1982 continuing resolution to \$2.88 billion. And now the administration proposes to further reduce these funds in fiscal year 1983 to \$1.9 billion.

I recently received a letter from Bonita Bradley, a parent and former high school teacher in Portland, Oreg., which describes how successful this program has been in one local school and why maintaining adequate title I funding is vital to both our children and to the future of this country.

I would like to share her letter with you.

TITLE I PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL,
WOODMERE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., April 28, 1982.

HON. RON WYDEN,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WYDEN. Basics in education are vitally important to the future success and happiness of our children. All children are not blessed with the innate ability to do well in reading and math nor are all children blessed with parents capable and/or willing to give them the help they need at home. Schools must fill in the gap. There is no other way.

Out of an enrollment of 220 children in grades K through 5th 96 students at our school, Woodmere, are involved in our Title I program which offers extra help each day in math and/or reading. Because of recent budget cuts we now have one full-time coordinator and only two six-hour aides instead of five full-time aides. Even with limited personnel, our children are receiving far more help in their 40 minutes per day in Title I on a one to ten basis than they could in a classroom of 28-32 students with one teacher trying to teach a multitude of subjects.

As an ex-high school teacher, I have seen first-hand how devastating an inability to read, write and spell above the second or third grade level can be to teenagers. These inadequacies could have been discovered and possibly conquered had those students had a Title I program available to them in grade school. I shudder to think about where they are now in this time of very high unemployment, especially among uneducated and unskilled workers.

We must, as parents, educators and concerned citizens, urge our elected representatives to do what is necessary to raise the standard of education in this country. In my opinion, the process must begin at the entry level, not in junior high or high school.

Please give careful consideration to continued federal funding of the Title I program.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely yours,

BONITA BRADLEY,
Chairperson. ●

LINDEN COUNCIL NO. 2859,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
MARK 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, recently this Chamber noted the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Knights of Columbus. In my own district in New Jersey, one of the local chapters of this fine organization, the Linden Council No. 2859, will also be marking a very significant event in the history of the chapter: The 40th anniversary of its founding June 5, 1982.

During its 40 years of existence, the Linden council has sponsored a host of community activities, including essay contests, clothing drives, and fund raisers for retarded children. The commitment and vast contributions of this local chapter exemplify the principles upon which it was founded: Unity, charity, fraternity, and patriotism.

The Knights of Columbus across the Nation have served our country and its communities with distinction, reinforcing those all-important principles of patriotism and pride upon which our democracy was founded.

The local initiative and dedication of chapters like the Linden council make this all possible, and it is with deep appreciation and respect that I commend to my colleagues in the Congress this chapter's many accomplishments. ●

THE DEATH OF INFANT DOE

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 26 of this year, I submitted for the RECORD the profound reflections of columnist George F. Will regarding the infanticide of "Infant Doe" that took place in the heartland of our country in Bloomington, Ind.

I would like to supplement Mr. Will's thoughtful and moving essay with an equally moving letter by James Bopp, Jr., an attorney in Terre Haute, Ind., who represented Bob and Shirley Wright in their attempt to adopt "Infant Doe" before he was left to starve to death. "Infant Doe" cried for 4 days before God took him home.

No one, Mr. Speaker, can come away from reading Jim Bopp's letter without asking whether, to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, the moral lights of

our civilization are not being blown out about us.

The article follows:

THE DEATH OF INFANT DOE

(By James Bopp, Jr.)

Infant Doe did not have to die. Ordinary medical treatment and care would have allowed Infant Doe the chance to live his life loved by his parents in a home surrounded by loving, caring people.

Infant Doe never had that chance. He was drugged almost from the moment he was born. One cannot help but wonder . . .

"Did he cry?"

"Did a kind nurse or doctor even place a pacifier in his mouth in an effort to comfort him?"

"Did he know the consolation of being held in someone's arms . . . or did he die alone?"

Inside the womb, his mother, whom we may never know, cared for him, felt his movements and had great hopes for him. But when he was born on Good Friday, April 9th, his parents were overwhelmed with grief, guilt, and hopelessness.

The joyously awaited experience turned into one of catastrophe and profound psychological threat. Infant Doe was born with Down's Syndrome, a condition with varying degrees of mental retardation.

But Infant Doe did not die from Down's Syndrome. Infant Doe died because his parents and his doctor refused to feed him and give him fluid to drink. Infant Doe died from starvation and dehydration.

This little baby suffered from a physical defect which sometimes accompanies Down's Syndrome. The esophagus and windpipe were joined. Feeding by mouth was impossible without surgical correction.

This physical defect is routinely repaired at Riley Children's Hospital in Indianapolis, only sixty miles away. Infant Doe could have been fed intravenously and the operation performed within twenty-four hours. This surgery is ordinary medical treatment with a relatively low complication rate. Infant Doe's prognosis was good.

Feeding by mouth was impossible without this surgery. But it was not this physical defect which killed Infant Doe. The parents, offered the choice by their physician between treatment and no treatment, refused medical care for their son.

The attending physician, the hospital, and several state court judges agreed. Infant Doe would receive no medical care, no food and no liquid.

It took six excruciatingly long days for little Infant Doe to die.

But not everyone agreed with this decision to condemn Infant Doe to death by starvation. A pediatrician, Dr. James Shaeffer, consulted by the parents on possible medical treatment, urged that the child's physical defect be repaired.

Any other child born with such a physical defect would have been rushed to surgery. Infant Doe, because he had Down's Syndrome, was not. Because of his handicap, the parents refused treatment and the judge ruled that the parents had the "right to choose" . . . the right to choose to starve their child until he died.

And there were others who did not agree with their choice.

Bob and Shirley Wright tried desperately to adopt Infant Doe. Bobbi, their three year old daughter, is afflicted with Down's Syn-

¹ Since writing this, I have learned that Infant Doe cried for 4 days.

drome. When she was born, they too were anguished. But Bobbi has provided them with all the joy—and heartache—of any normal child. Bob and Shirley were willing—no, deeply wanted—to adopt this tiny boy so that he too would know the joys—and sorrows—of life.

Barry Brown also did not agree.

As Prosecutor for Monroe County, Indiana, he filed suit to declare that Infant Doe was neglected, having had no food or drink for three days by then. He urged the court to allow that normal medical treatment and care be afforded Infant Doe. The judge denied this request.

The Indiana Supreme Court, two days later, refused to alter that decision.

Infant Doe had by then been without food and water for five days. Can we be forgiven if we try to blot from our minds the condition of his poor wasted little body?

The Indiana Supreme Court decision now made the unbelievable story public.

Phones began to ring. People throughout Indiana, and the country, were shocked and appalled as the story spread.

Calls to the Indiana Supreme Court expressed outrage. Calls to public officials of all kinds, including the governor, demanded that something be done. Calls to the prosecutor commended his actions and offered to adopt Infant Doe. I, too, was called. Concerned people throughout the state wanted to know what could be done. The reports were still very sketchy and incomplete.

By that time, I had been contacted by the Wrights. "Can we do anything?" They offered to adopt Infant Doe.

Six hours later I filed a petition with the Monroe County judge to appoint the Wrights guardians of Infant Doe. They promised to keep and care for him. Dr. Shaeffer would arrange medical care. The feeding of Infant Doe would begin. The Wrights would adopt him.

The hearing before the judge on the Wright's petition began at 5:00 P.M. A strained atmosphere enveloped the court as all but the judge, court personnel and lawyers were excluded.

The press—the people's eyes and ears—was ordered out.

The attorney for Infant Doe's parents defended their right to choose starvation for their tiny son. "But why not allow the Wrights to care for Infant Doe—to feed him, give him medical care?"

"Because," said the parents' lawyer, "Infant Doe is now 'in extremis' . . . There is no reason to change your order, Judge, since Infant Doe will die anyway."

And then the judge denied the Wright's petition to make Infant Doe their son.

The tiny baby had almost died that afternoon, after the judge had refused temporary feeding. Suffering from severe dehydration, pneumonia and weakened by starvation, Infant Doe stopped breathing. But, miraculously, his brave little heart began to beat again, and he resumed breathing.

Now only one chance remained . . . an appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

Even though Infant Doe's life was measured in only hours, the prosecutor prepared his appeal to the nation's highest court. The appeal had to be presented at 9:00 A.M. Friday, when the Supreme Court offices in Washington opened.

But before the attorneys arrived in Washington, D.C., Infant Doe was dead. Without food, drink, or medical care, the little boy had died at 10:03 P.M., only five hours after the Wrights had been denied the opportunity to adopt him as their third child.

The legal system failed Infant Doe. The parents, consumed by grief and anguish, chose death for their baby. They deserve our pity and sorrow for the burden they will carry.

The physician, however, should not have failed Infant Doe. Non-treatment is not treatment. Infant Doe was his patient. Doctors are trained to cure, not to kill.

Ominously, the courts also failed Infant Doe. Empowered by the Indiana legislature to protect the young and helpless, the courts ordered that no medical treatment or care be given to this helpless baby. The courts are intended to be the ultimate protectors of the neglected and abused. Instead, they refused to act as Infant Doe slowly starved to death.

I am sorrowed by Infant Doe's death to the bottom of my soul. But I must believe that everything has a purpose.

Infant Doe does not have to die in vain. He is the symbol of those we must protect. Everyone must be entitled to ordinary medical treatment and nourishment. A child must not be killed because he is handicapped.

We must insure that Infant Doe died so that others, who are now known only to god, will live.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE OHIO AGRICULTURAL RE-
SEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
CENTER

HON. RALPH REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center has played a major role in creating the success story of American agriculture and in so doing has established itself as one of Ohio's most valuable resources. Throughout its history it has rendered distinguished service not only to the citizens of Ohio, but provided new knowledge of far-reaching significance to the entire Nation as well as to the world; 1982 marks the 100th anniversary of the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, and I take this time to salute this great institution in this, its centennial year.

Since its establishment in 1982, the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center has grown from an original staff of 3 to over 800 scientists and researchers. Along the way, the center has become one of the best known institutions of its kind in the Nation and the world.

Over the past 100 years, OARDC research efforts have led to constant improvements and developments in new farming technologies and further resulted in tremendous increases in agricultural production. These contributions are well-documented in the press, scientific publications and history books. Ohio's agriculture in itself stands in testimony to the successful development of these new technologies.

Figures from the period from 1950 to 1980 alone bear witness to OARDC accomplishments. While Ohio corn acreage increased only 14 percent from 1950 to 1980, a 250-percent increase in per acre corn yields—from 45 to 113 bushels per acre—resulted in a statewide production increase of 268 million bushels during the same period. Soybean production in Ohio has increased from 20 million bushels in 1950 to 140 million bushels in 1980 as yield per acre grew from 18 bushels to 36.

Similar gains have been made in production yields for wheat, tomatoes, sugar beets and a variety of other crops. In addition, milk and livestock production have experienced dramatic increases, largely as a result of the new knowledge the OARDC has brought the Ohio's dairy and livestock producers.

On the international level, the OARDC has experienced similar successes. Programs developed at the center have significantly altered the economic outlook of much of the developing world.

While the OARDC has been very much involved in a number of international programs, two in particular can serve to illustrate the positive impact of the center's efforts. During its 15 years in India, the center saw that country move from a grain-deficient to a grain-exporting society, primarily due to the application of programs developed by the OARDC.

The OARDC experience in Brazil yielded similar results. During the 12 years of the center's involvement there, the country progressed from a developing to a developed nation.

The increased agricultural productivity achieved during that period played a major role in making such progress possible.

The importance of food at the international level cannot be overstated. As the world population explosion continues to outpace increases in world food production, food will take on an increasingly political role—both as a stabilizing force in crisis areas and as a means of leverage in international negotiations.

Oil-producing countries will take a back seat to food-producing nations at the international bargaining table and food will outweigh oil as a key factor in the global economy.

OARDC research will be instrumental in determining the role of the United States in this future scenario, and in assisting other nations to make their voices heard in the international dialog.

The overall impact of OARDC programs will be increasingly dramatic over the next 100 years—even more so than during its first century of service to the citizens of Ohio, the Nation, and the world.

I am confident that the OARDC will continue to develop new and improved

technologies that benefit both farmers and consumers. I know that the center is currently working with some 10,000 genotypes of soybeans, several of which will further increase productivity and result in further dramatic pay-offs for our economy in the years ahead. However, the yield implications of these new varieties are significant not only to Ohio's and the Nation's economies, but to the total protein supply throughout the world.

On a final note, I would like to mention the fact that 1982 also marks the retirement of Dr. Roy Kottman after 22 years of dedicated and inspirational service as Director of the OARDC. Under Dr. Kottman's guidance, the center has made outstanding contributions in the development of new agricultural technologies. Ohio's cash farm receipts have increased by more than \$3 billion. The leadership of Roy Kottman will be missed, but the tradition of service which he leaves behind will be carried on as the faculty and staff continue to serve with distinction during the center's second century.

I think it appropriate that I close with these words from Dr. Kottman:

What the future holds for the Nation's agriculture industry, its homes and families, and for the future development and wise management of its natural resources, cannot accurately be foretold. We may be certain, however, that progress made in each of these areas will be largely dependent on the quality and quantity of new knowledge developed through the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center.

Here is to the next 100 years.●

A QUESTION OF "EQUAL
JUSTICE UNDER LAW"

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Handicapped Infants Protection Act of 1982, which my colleagues, Representatives, CARL PERKINS, Democrat of Kentucky, JAMES JEFFORDS, Republican of Vermont, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, Democrat of California, ARLEN ERDAHL, Republican of Minnesota, PAUL SIMON, Democrat of Illinois, MILLICENT FENWICK, Republican of New Jersey, AUSTIN MURPHY, Democrat of Pennsylvania, MARGE ROUKEMA, Republican of New Jersey, DALE KILDEE, Democrat of Michigan, and HENRY J. HYDE, Republican of Illinois, are cosponsoring. The aim of our bill is not only to strengthen the remedies and protections that exist under current law but also to expand them and provide others that will insure equal justice under law for handicapped infants.

Mr. Speaker, these words are inscribed over the front entrance of the Supreme Court building, which stands only a short walk from here. They should be for all of us a daily reminder of what we stand for as a nation. To deny any citizen his civil rights, especially his most basic civil right to life, or to allow him to receive unequal treatment before the law because of a handicap condition is totally foreign to the American character and completely out of step without declared national purpose.

This is why recent news stories about the "Bloomington Baby" and other cases in which handicapped infants have been allowed to die simply because they were handicapped have provoked a ground swell of outrage and cries of "infanticide" all across the country. The public outcry has been constant, and it is growing. It is clear that we cannot tolerate such injustice.

The Bloomington baby case involved the deliberate starvation of a newborn child afflicted with Down's Syndrome and a nonfunctioning esophagus apparently for no other reason than that he was severely handicapped. The child could have been fed intravenously pending routine surgery that could have corrected this digestive tract disorder to permit oral feeding. As the Washington Post (April 18) put it, this baby died "not because he couldn't sustain life without a million dollars worth of medical machinery, but because no one fed him."

Instead, a 6-pound baby boy struggled for life for a week before death by starvation. During the week, it was debated whether anyone had the right to overrule the parents' decision of sure death. After a hospital room hearing, the Indiana Supreme Court ruled that only the parents could make the life-or-death decision.

A baby is more than a mere possession of his or her parents. It is a life which society should protect.

The Bloomington baby case is not the first occurrence of infanticide in this country. Reports and reviews in newspapers and in various medical and legal journals suggest that we are already several years into the reality of this practice. Last year, Columnist Joan Beck, in discussing the Siamese twins case in Danville, Ill., reported—Chicago Tribune, May 22, 1981—that it "occurs in many hospitals, where the death of newborns with severe birth defects is often tacitly encouraged," and quoted University of Wisconsin Law Professor John A. Robertson as having said that the passive euthanasia of "defective newborns is a pervasive and widespread practice in pediatric nurseries, hospitals, and intensive care units across America, Europe and elsewhere." She also cited a report by doctors at the Yale-New Haven Medical Center, who acknowledged that "14 percent of deaths in

that hospital's special newborn unit were babies permitted to die because parents and physicians considered their lives not worth living."

The Stanford Law Review (February 1978) reported that every year thousands of parents in the United States make the decision to withhold or withdraw medical care from newborn infants. "If the parents decide to terminate treatment," this report said, "a court will review the decision. Procedural review by a court will safeguard the State's interest in the integrity of the decisionmaking process."

Such a decision should not be made on the basis of whether a child has a handicap. That would be discrimination, pure and simple—discrimination in its most extreme form. In the case of the Bloomington baby, it would appear that the safeguard of judicial review was woefully inadequate. Nor can we readily believe that in all the other documented cases, those infants whose lives were forfeited by parental decision suffered from incurable and untreatable conditions that made any effort to sustain their lives useless.

For too long we have left this issue unresolved. For too long we have allowed other priorities to demand our attention. We can no longer excuse ourselves by saying we did not know it was happening. We must face this reality that is in evidence all around us.

A handicap condition can be no justification for treating such infants any differently from other newborns. Some people claim that there are already sufficient remedies in the law to prevent this kind of thing from happening. But it is not evident from the facts that these remedies have been applied nor that they are adequate.

Most Americans look upon the courts as the final arbiters of justice. In this matter, however, the line between those who are to live and those who are to be allowed to die has become an ever-expanding gray area. It is for this reason that Congress must produce legislation that will make clear its intent that those remedies and protections that already exist will be enforced. Further, we should establish clear and firm laws to fully insure equal justice for all.

If parents are allowed to destroy their offspring at birth, will we someday say a child who is severely handicapped by an accident can also be killed? I do not believe we can risk leaving a door open to such an outlandish possibility, and I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this legislation.

Basically, what this bill does is to insure equal treatment for handicapped and nonhandicapped infants alike. It is not intended to require any extraordinary or prolonged medical care for infants, either handicapped or nonhandicapped, whose physical conditions are untreatable or incurable or

whose lives would not be prolonged beyond the immediate future.

What we are asking for is equal treatment for the handicapped child—treatment that would ordinarily be provided for any nonhandicapped infant in a similar physical condition.

The first part of this bill lays the foundation for what follows, citing, for example, that despite existing provisions of Federal law, handicapped infants have been without effective "remedy to protect their lives against attempts to cause their death through denial of nutritional sustenance or medical treatment routinely provided to other handicapped or nonhandicapped individuals."

"It is a fundamental principle of American law" the bill reads, "to affirm the value of all human life without regard to mental or physical disability."

"The death of handicapped individuals," it says, "through deliberate neglect is a matter of gravest national concern, demanding immediate action by Congress."

The bill would prohibit a handicapped infant from being deprived of nutrition necessary to sustain life or of medical treatment necessary to remedy a life-threatening medical condition, in cases where food or treatment would ordinarily be given to similarly situated nonhandicapped infants.

It would allow for a parent or guardian or, in case the parent or guardian of a handicapped infant fails to prevent such deprivation, a third party who is willing to provide for the welfare of the infant involved, to bring action in court.

There is also a requirement that the Secretary of Health and Human Services encourage those having knowledge of a violation of the rights of a handicapped infant to report it. In addition, the bill would require that information on public and private agencies and services that are available to provide assistance, support, and treatment for handicapped infants be provided to parents of handicapped newborns. This bill also provides for expedited legal processings and injunctive relief in such cases, as well as immunity for third parties who would report such incidents.

Under the provisions of this bill, any health-care facility found to be in violation of the above-mentioned prohibition will have its Federal financial assistance suspended. ●

IMPROVED INDEPENDENT
CONTRACTOR LEGISLATION

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, chaos will return to the world of independent contractors on July 1 unless we act prior to that date to clarify their tax status. In an attempt to avoid this unhappy outcome, I have introduced H.R. 6311 to resolve the conflict between millions of independent contractors and the Internal Revenue Service.

This bill is an outgrowth of H.R. 5723, which I introduced earlier this year and is very similar to S. 2369, which has been introduced by Senator DOLE and others in the Senate.

I think this bill is a step forward for everyone. It makes it fairly simple to determine who is an independent contractor by applying a short test. Those who set their own hours, determine their place of business and have a substantial personal investment, will generally pass this test. This will answer a question that has long been raised by workers in fields ranging from logging to real estate to door-to-door sales.

This legislation also recognizes the valid concern of the Internal Revenue Service, which wants to be sure it collects every dollar due it. By imposing new, stringent reporting requirements on the businesses independent contractors are affiliated with, it will present the IRS with data that will make efficient enforcement possible.

It is my hope that we will consider this legislation before the current moratorium on enforcement rolls around on July 1. Missing this deadline will unnecessarily extend a debate that has already gone on too long. ●

HEAR US: NUCLEAR WAR HURTS
TOO MUCH

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, this month, throughout the city of Washington, billboards bearing a simple, yet irrefutable, message will be appearing on rooftops, at busy intersections, and near shopping malls. The billboards carry an urgent plea for the exercise of commonsense here in Congress and in the White House. The message—eloquent in its simplicity—reads, "Hear Us: Nuclear War Hurts Too Much." This billboard campaign is not the product of a radical underground movement, nor is it the fashioning of a wealthy social activist; rather, the campaign was designed and paid for by

hundreds of families from Kalamazoo, Mich.—families understandably frightened by the madness of the accelerating nuclear arms race and the blindness with which we approach the brink of nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, defense strategists within the present administration have taken the position that the United States is in immediate and present danger because of an imaginary "window of vulnerability." It is perhaps the supreme irony that the very military buildup designed to reduce American vulnerability is having the unintended consequence of making Americans feel more vulnerable than ever—because they sense the irrationality of the Pentagon cry for more and more nuclear weaponry. They understand that the end product of this senseless spending spree is not greater security but a greater chance of a nuclear holocaust.

To put the issue of the nuclear deterrent in perspective, it should be noted that even if the Soviet Union launched a first strike against the United States—a strike so extraordinarily successful that it totally eliminated our land-based nuclear force, our airborne nuclear fleet, and all the nuclear submarines that are in port at any one time—there would remain at sea at least 20 nuclear submarines, each carrying 16 missiles, each missile carrying 8 to 10 nuclear warheads, each warhead having an explosive power, on the average, 7 times that of the bomb that fell on Hiroshima. These 20 subs alone would be sufficient to destroy every major industrial, defense, and population center in the Soviet Union three times over. Indeed, just one of our nuclear subs contains more explosive power than all of the munitions combined that exploded in World War II.

The horror of nuclear holocaust is universally acknowledged. Today, the United States and the Soviet Union possess 50,000 nuclear weapons. These weapons have, collectively, an explosive yield 1.6 million times that of the bomb that fell on Hiroshima. In half an hour, a fraction of these weapons can destroy all cities in the northern hemisphere. Yet, over the next decade, the United States and the Soviet Union plan to build over 20,000 more nuclear warheads. Such developments will only increase superpower tension, lower the threshold for a nuclear response in times of crisis, and increase the likelihood of a nuclear accident.

As the maddening pace of the nuclear arms race escalates, the threat of nuclear war grows ever greater. Advancing nuclear weapons technology has reduced the warning time of a nuclear attack from 10 hours to 8 minutes—8 minutes during which the President of the United States or the President of the Soviet Union would

be forced to make a decision that could unalterably change the destiny of an entire planet. The likelihood is that one side would be suddenly gripped by a "use them or lose them" psychology. Fearing that its nuclear missiles might be destroyed by the other side, the United States and the Soviet Union could be pulled into a disastrous nuclear "high-noon."

There would be some comfort in believing—as some have suggested—that we could insulate ourselves from the devastation of a nuclear attack by promoting a vigorous civil defense program; unfortunately, there exists no conceivable civil defense against a 20-megaton bomb. Civil defense would be ineffective in saving the lives of the inhabitants of civil defense shelters in cities under attack. A bomb dropped on an American city would create a fireball with temperatures reaching 20,000 degrees Fahrenheit, vaporizing everything within a several mile radius and leaving a crater several hundred feet deep. A very large number of those sheltered at a distance would eventually succumb to a lack of uncontaminated food and water, or be subject to lethal radiation. Medical care for the millions of victims with severe burns, traumatic injuries, and radiation sickness would be virtually impossible, because most medical facilities would either be destroyed by the initial bomb blast or rendered useless as a result of the spread of radiation. The simple and frightening truth is that we cannot survive a nuclear war.

It is a truth that has moved many of us here in Congress, and millions throughout the country, to call for a bilateral freeze on the development, testing, and deployment of nuclear arms. Throughout the country, voices have been raised in urgent chorus, asking national policymakers to "hear us: nuclear war hurts too much."

A nuclear freeze would not only reduce tensions between the giant military powers and increase our own national security, but it would also release resources which could be used to meet pressing human needs—needs which have been tragically ignored and which grow more urgent with each passing day.

Unless we reverse our decision to participate in a nuclear arms race of indeterminable length and magnitude, we will—over the next 5 years—spend over \$1.6 trillion on defense alone. If we were to spend that sum at the rate of \$1 million per day, 365 days a year, it would take over 4,000 years to exhaust the war chest. Put another way, over the course of the next 5 years, we will be spending on the average, \$830 million a day on defense. What the administration's nuclear procurement program represents—in economic terms—is nothing more than a tremendous diversion of critical resources of

capital and human skills away from areas of genuine need, both within and outside of the defense budget. It should be noted that a recent Pentagon disclosure indicates that the real cost of the planned 5-year \$1.6 trillion defense buildup may have been underestimated by \$750 billion.

Study after study has concluded that our most pressing military need is not the purchase of increasingly costly and sophisticated nuclear weaponry; rather, our needs are in the conventional forces area—in the improvement of the morale and competence of our personnel, in the provision and maintenance of conventional equipment, in the adequacy of basic logistical support. Yet, as the country gears up for a massive nuclear buildup, it is these elements of our military preparedness—elements essential to real national security—that are by and large ignored.

Moreover, the implications that massive defense expenditures hold for any semblance of economic recovery are staggering. Last fall, the Pentagon asked such luminaries as the Nobel laureate Lawrence Klein, Otto Eckstein, and Michael Evans, along with forecasting firms such as Chase Econometrics and Merrill Lynch Economics, to examine the impacts of rising military expenditures. Their conclusion: "Large increases in the defense budget will lead to greater deficit spending." And with tax reductions exceeding cuts in social spending, the defense increases will push the Federal budget even further into the red—meaning ongoing high interest rates and new inflationary pressure.

Mr. Speaker, the decision whether to continue the nuclear arms race or pursue a bilateral nuclear freeze is as important as any we face, and may be as basic as the choice between life and death. My Kalamazoo constituents who have erected the billboards that now appear throughout this city know this very well, and they are to be commended for taking this creative approach to highlighting, for all of us, the urgency of this decision. Let us hope that their warning and their appeal will be heeded.●

GREENE COUNTY TO RECEIVE NEW INDUSTRIAL PLANT

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today a significant event that recently occurred in Greene County, Ala., one of the counties I am privileged to represent.

Our Nation is now experiencing one of its worst economic recessions. This is not a recent phenomenon for Green

County. It has suffered for many years with chronic unemployment and economic stagnation. Transfer payments average over \$400 per person in the county. It is the poorest county in Alabama, and one of the most economically deprived in the Nation.

Even in the face of today's economic problems, the future of Greene County is beginning to look brighter. A pulp and paper company just recently purchased 600 acres of land in the county. Although at this time a date for development of this site and the industrial plant has not been announced, the cost of the facility is projected to be about \$300 million. The proposed industrial complex will create 800 to 1,000 new jobs during construction and more than 500 permanent jobs when the plant is in actual operation.

The new industrial plant will be located in the county-owned Crossroads of America Industrial Park which is located on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. One of the principal reasons for locating the plant there, according to company officials, was access to the economical cost of transportation provided by the Tenn-Tom. An additional 1,200 acres are available for industrial development along the waterway at the industrial park, which should generate another 800 to 1,000 new permanent jobs when fully developed.

The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is now approaching 70 percent completion. Its navigation features are nearly 80 percent completed. About 130 miles of the 234-mile waterway are now open to limited navigation, including that portion of the waterway in my district.

So far, nearly 5 million bushels of soybeans and wheat have been shipped from west Alabama to the gulf for export on the Tenn-Tom, although it is not officially open for commercial use. This early use of the waterway portends the great potential it offers for moving bulk-type commodities, such as grain, coal, ores, and chemicals, in a low-cost and energy-efficient manner when completed in 1986.

The Tenn-Tom is not only of great importance to my State but will benefit some 14 States and ultimately the Nation. Its unique feature of providing a connecting link between the 16,000 miles of inland waterway system now serving the heartland of America with deepwater ports along the Gulf of Mexico guarantees it to become one of the busiest waterways in the Nation. Over 28 million tons of commerce are expected to be transported on the Tennessee-Tombigbee during its first year of operation, alone, at a savings in transportation costs exceeding \$104 million.

With over \$1.2 billion already spent, it is most important to complete the

Tenn-Tom as soon as possible. Only then can our farmers and businesses begin to realize a return on this investment. Investments by the Federal Government for the utilization of our natural resources, such as waterways, irrigation, and hydropower projects, which create new job opportunities and stimulate economic growth, are important in helping bring about economic recovery.●

ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to present Rev. William C. Cox to the House of Representatives on March 23, for the opening prayer. His prayer was an inspiring one, and it made me realize how important our guest speakers are. All of us become quite wrapped up in our own work and we tend to develop a particular method of looking at problems. Having someone from home share his or her thoughts with Congress helps to give another perspective. While we were learning from Reverend Cox, he was busy learning about Washington and our Government. Allow me to share with you parts of the sermon that he gave to his congregation in Nevada, Mo., after his visit here. The title is appropriately, "Where Religion and Government Meet."

WHERE RELIGION AND GOVERNMENT MEET

My trip was a religious experience for me. Symbols of religion and government meet throughout our land. I have been reflecting on these symbols.

There are points where the symbolism of the cross touches all of life. It reaches the depths of America. There is no way that religion and state can be totally separated. Our government is drenched with the concepts of the Judaeo-Christian faith. The powerful symbolism of the cross touches concerns of government at many points.

In Washington I found much concern about human needs. There was some joking among the representatives that I only partially understood. Some of it, no doubt, concerned their business for the day. But all joking aside, I noted a sense of concern for humanity. This does not mean that our representatives are perfect or that they have nothing but pure motives. They are like us in both respects! It does mean that there is much concern in Washington about the needs of Americans.

I sensed that concern as Representative Jim Wright spoke briefly about the plight of the unemployed and the failure of businesses throughout the country.

I sensed it as I stood before the majesty of the Lincoln Memorial and saw the words, "... this nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal..." and then recalled that Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his "I Have A Dream" speech in the same vicinity.

Washington is a humbling experience. I do not accept the belief of some religious fundamentalists who act as though the United States is favored by God. I am abhorred by persons like Garnet T. and Herbert W. Armstrong who believe that the United States is the kingdom of God!

However, I have to say that as I absorbed Washington, I was moved to confess that our country would not be possible except by the grace of God. I do not know how to explain it. I just believe it.

I sensed a spirit of humility and warmth among our servants in Washington. House Speaker Tip O'Neill is a warm, caring person. Representative Ike Skelton indicated that our Capitol is the only capitol he knows of that has a prayer chapel. Even prayer before the House and Senate each day is an important symbol. Madalyn Murray O'Hair will not be successful in her attempts to remove this symbol of humility from our land!

Not long after I finished my prayer, the House was called for a vote on the proceedings of the previous day. This provided a good opportunity for me to meet more people. I talked some with House Majority Leader Jim Wright who said that his father was a pastor. He pointed to other representatives who were related to pastors in various ways.

I reacted by asking if there was some connection between government and politics. The Representative replied that he had thought about that a lot and had concluded that pastors and politicians had a lot in common. He said that he felt that "service" was the touching point between the two. He commented, "After listening to sermons all one's life about service, one might be inclined to consider a profession such as politics."

FAREWELL TO SINAI

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment to call to the attention of the House an excellent photography exhibit that will open in the Cannon Rotunda on June 1. This exhibit, which is entitled "Farewell to Sinai," is composed of photographs made by one of Israel's most famous photographers, Mr. Perri Farag. I hope that Members will take a few moments to stop by the Cannon Building and view these photographs, which provide a most eloquent statement of the desire for peace that is fundamental in Israel. The exhibit will continue until June 12.

NATIONAL NAVAJO CODE TALKERS DAY

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last week the House approved by unanimous

consent a resolution establishing August 14, 1982, as National Navajo Code Talkers Day. As a cosponsor of the measure, I rise today to urge the other body to give this measure its swift approval.

August 14 is the 37th anniversary of the Japanese surrender in World War II. It is only fitting and appropriate that we honor on that occasion a group whose contribution to that conflict and our ultimate victory has long been overlooked.

In early 1942, Phillip Johnston, an engineer and the son of a Navajo Reservation missionary, approached the U.S. Marine Corps with the suggestion that the Navajo language be used to develop a code which would be indecipherable due to the complex verbal forms and tonal characteristics of the Navajo language.

A military code, encompassing 450 Navajo terms, was developed and used by over 400 Navajo code talkers. Over 250 of the code talkers served in actual combat. Their code, which was never broken, played a critical communications role throughout the war and particularly in the landings at Guadalcanal and other islands in the Pacific.

We owe those Navajo code talkers a great debt for their service to this country. I hope this body will join with us in setting aside August 14, 1982, as a day in their honor.

POSITION PAPER ON FISCAL YEAR 1983 REAGAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, much has been written in recent months on the administration's recommendations for the fiscal year 1983 budget. I would like to insert in the RECORD today one of the more comprehensive critiques I have seen of the budget, recently released by the Woman's National Democratic Club. This group has done an excellent job of pointing out the fallacies and gross inequities included in the budget recommendations put forth by the President last March, many of which are contained in the Latta substitute now before the House. I hope my colleagues will read this good statement and take its recommendations and analysis to heart.

[From the Woman's National Democratic Club Political Action Committee]

POSITION PAPER ON FISCAL YEAR 1983 REAGAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

BRIEF SUMMARY OF REAGAN 1983 BUDGET PROPOSAL

The Reagan Administration's budget proposal contemplates total expenditures of \$757.6 billion, revenues of \$666.1 billion, and a deficit of \$91.5 billion for the fiscal year 1983 (beginning October 1, 1982). The

Reagan budget proposal vastly increases defense spending. It makes severe cuts in various social, health, and education programs, contrary to assertions by the Administration that only the rate of increase would be curtailed.

Defense represents 29% of the expenditures of the total proposed 1983 budget; direct benefit payments for individuals, 43%; interest on debts, 13%; and the remaining 15% would be spent for grants to State and local governments and for other Federal programs for energy, environmental protection, foreign aid, space technology, and similar nondefense discretionary programs.

The 1983 budget also proposes seven new consolidated grants and additions to three existing block grants. These proposals continue steps taken in 1982 when nine new block grants, consolidating 57 categorical grants, were established.

In addition, the Reagan Administration proposes for 1983 a "Federal initiative" (sometimes referred to as the "new Federalism"). This "initiative" has two major components: (a) a Federal takeover of food stamps and aid to dependent children (AFDC) in a "\$20 billion exchange" (referred to as the "swap component"); (b) a turnback of more than 40 Federal education, transportation, community development, and social service programs to States. A separate allocation would be established for each State, beginning in 1984 and lasting through 1987, from existing excise taxes on gasoline, tobacco, alcohol, and telephone services, and from the oil windfall profit tax. Beginning in fiscal year 1988, the Federal Government would no longer fund these grants.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT—HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

The 1981 Economic Recovery Act, following supply-side economic theory, made sharp cuts, phased in over a three-year period, in the individual income taxes (the largest single source of revenue) as well as in corporate income taxes. The reduced revenues were to be offset by sharp cuts in Government spending on human resources and nondefense programs. Defense, however, would be substantially increased. The money saved from the tax cuts would be available for investment in the private sector, creating more employment and ultimately higher personal income tax revenues. Unfortunately, it didn't work out that way.

As the recession deepened, the Government has had to borrow more and more money in the capital market, competing with private industry for funds and thus pushing up all interest rates. The resulting high interest rates have severely discouraged private sector expansion, while the Federal government is obliged to spend higher amounts than ever just to service its debts—leaving less for the social programs. At the same time strong social, demographic, and economic pressures are acting to increase the cost of these same social programs.

We have had deficits before, but never of this magnitude in peacetime, and never with countervailing pressures of monetary restraint by the Federal Reserve Board, through its tight money anti-inflationary policy. Inflation is abating, it is true, as a result of the recession and a drop in oil prices. Under current tax law and defense plans, the deficit can only grow bigger and bigger in the future, frightening people in the financial markets away from long-term investments.

With the drop in personal income and rise in unemployment, the deficit grows even wider. Reagan's combination of tax cuts and defense increases may produce deficits of \$182 billion in 1983, \$216 billion in 1984, and \$232.5 billion in 1985, or a three-year total of \$630.5 billion. This is nearly as much as the entire amount spent by the Federal Government in 1981—\$657.2 billion. This is a blueprint for economic disaster. Republican leaders in Congress, as well as Democrats, recognize the danger.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT THE DEFICIT: TAXES

The Reagan Administration's tax cuts of 1981, enacted as the 1981 Economic Recovery Act, went too far. This Act provides for a 25% cut in individual income taxes over a 3-year period, which will chiefly benefit the well-to-do. For example, for a family of four with 2 wage earners and the following annual incomes, the tax cuts would amount to:

TAX CUTS FOR FAMILY OF 4 WITH 2 WAGE EARNERS

| Annual income | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|
| \$15,000..... | \$181 | \$283 | \$333 |
| 20,000..... | 275 | 456 | 544 |
| 30,000..... | 499 | 916 | 1,079 |
| 40,000..... | 798 | 1,460 | 1,697 |
| 50,000..... | 1,191 | 2,191 | 2,570 |
| 60,000..... | 1,547 | 2,895 | 3,423 |
| 100,000..... | 2,749 | 5,748 | 6,872 |

Source: Staff or Joint committee on Taxation, U.S. Congress.

Other tax cuts which will help only the wealthy are the sharp reduction, from 70 to 50 percent, in the maximum tax on unearned income and the substantial elimination of inheritance taxes. Very large reductions were also made in the taxes corporations have to pay, by a number of complicated provisions including the leasing of tax losses and much more generous depreciation allowances.

In order to reduce the deficit and get the economy out of the current recession, action is necessary on several fronts at the same time. But the major emphasis should be on increasing tax revenues.

The Political Action Committee (PAC), Woman's National Democratic Club, therefore recommends:

1. Postponing indefinitely the personal income tax cuts scheduled to start July 1983.
2. Rescinding the corporate income tax giveaways, especially leasing of tax losses; revising depreciation rules to eliminate current inequities among industries; imposing a minimum corporate tax.
3. Improving tax collection; i.e., providing the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) with adequate funds (a relatively minor expenditure) to insure collection of all taxes legitimately due. (It has been conservatively estimated that the "underground economy" of unpaid taxes that are owed could furnish as much as \$80 billion in revenue for 1983.)
4. Considering seriously other ways of increasing the Federal tax revenues, such as:
 - a. Excise taxes for luxury items, such as furs and jewelry, and raising current taxes for alcohol and tobacco.
 - b. Consumption taxes, such as oil import fees; personal hardship must be prevented, perhaps by providing subsidies for impoverished people.
 - c. Imposing or increasing current user fees for Federal services, such as those at airports or on waterways.

PROPOSED DEFENSE BUDGET

The \$263 billion outlay for defense in the Reagan 1983 budget proposal represents a

record peacetime increase. This has been called a "hardware" budget. The largest part will not go for improving readiness or for paying personnel but for procurement of new and very expensive, high-technology weapons.

No one challenges the need for a strong defense. But greater attention needs to be given to establishing a balanced defense policy and to examining the many existing opportunities for achieving economies and efficiency and for eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse in defense. For example, the GAO recommendations for eliminating waste and improving managerial effectiveness should be implemented. Needed also is a reevaluation of current procurement policies and practices so as to reduce cost overruns.

The billions of dollars spent on nuclear arms in no way address the real security problems. Instead, they drain financial and human resources away from the domestic economy, ignoring existing human needs in our society. The huge jump in defense outlays in 1983 will lead to greater outlays once the planned weapons begin rolling off the assembly lines in 1984, 1985, and 1986. The growing military burdens will put pressure on money available for social, health, education, and other domestic programs. National security not only involves weapons and military defense preparedness; it involves the security and well-being of members of our society.

The Political Action Committee, Woman's National Democratic Club, recommends that major cuts be made in the proposed 1983 defense budget.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES FOR SOCIAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS

The range of programs designed for the protection of the needy, such as aid to dependent children (AFDC), food stamps, Medicaid, and low-income housing, would sustain proportionally deeper cuts than other programs under the 1983 Reagan budget proposals. Many of these programs have already suffered punishing cuts under the 1982 budget.

For example, Congress cut AFDC by \$1 billion in 1982. When combined with the loss of State matching funds, the 1982 cuts were closer to \$2 billion. These cuts undermined protection for as many as 650,000 households, of which 400,000 are deprived of assistance altogether. For the total AFDC program, 68% of the recipients, or over 7 million are children. The 1983 budget proposes an additional 17.5% cut in this program.

The food stamp program was also drastically cut in 1982, denying food stamps to about a million recipients and reducing benefits to about a million more. In 1983, the Reagan budget proposes an additional cut of 1.9%.

Federal programs of funds for health services focus on vulnerable populations, notably the aged, disabled, and impoverished. Consequently, the numerous cuts in health programs reduce the access of these groups to medical care. For example, the 1982 budget for health service programs for mothers and children was cut 27%. By the end of 1982, 120 health centers are expected to close because of these cuts, according to the Children's Defense Fund, affecting 1.2 million people of whom 562,000 will be children and 440,000 women of childbearing age. Another illustration of the seriousness of the cuts in health programs is Medicaid. This program furnishes health care for 23 million low-income elderly, blind, disabled,

and single-parent families with children under 18 years of age. Because of the 1982 cuts, over 1 million Medicaid recipients have already lost Medicaid coverage. The Reagan 1983 budget proposes a cut of another 10% after inflation.

The proposed cuts in low-income housing account for more than one-third of all cuts in the housing budget. Not only will the 1983 proposals reduce the number of low-income people to receive housing assistance; they include major rent increases for all tenants living in HUD-assisted housing.

Instead of placing on impoverished people the brunt of the impact of the cuts, other segments of our society must shoulder more of the burden. Some streamlining is possible, sensible, and equitable for those entitlement programs that are not subject to means tests; i.e., those for the more affluent groups. For example, there appears to be an agreement among Congressional budget negotiators for some upper limit or "cap" on the cost-of-living increases starting next year, a proposal to which careful thought should be given. The PAC strongly supports efforts to contain costs of medical care, which in recent years have risen far in excess of the general cost-of-living index.

The Political Action Committee, Woman's National Democratic Club, recommends that the responsibility of the Federal Government should be maintained, without reduction in Federal funds in 1983, for social and health programs designed to meet the social and human needs of impoverished people, the disabled, the elderly, and children in our society.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES FOR EDUCATION

The 1983 budget proposes cuts in the program for aid for the disadvantaged under Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (known as ESEA Title I) of 40%, from \$3.5 billion this school year to \$1.9 billion. This means 2.3 million children will not be served and 80,000 specially trained teachers and staff will lose their jobs. The proposed cuts in other elementary and secondary education programs will have similar effects on the education of children.

Massive cuts in Federal student aid, and in most of the categorical support programs for higher education, are proposed in the 1983 budget. Student aid for academic year 1983-84 would be cut 56% below the levels of last year's Reconciliation Act and 50% below current 1981-82 year, with cuts or discontinuance in other higher education programs. Cumulatively, this would represent a loss of over 2.4 million awards, which would force hundreds of thousands of students to drop out or change their educational plans.

The Political Action Committee, Woman's National Democratic Club, recommends that the cuts not be made in Title I, handicapped, vocational, and continuing education; science education, student assistance, and other secondary education programs; nor in higher education programs. The PAC also recommends against replacement of the Cabinet-level Department of Education by a Foundation for Education Assistance.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURES FOR ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The Environmental Protection Agency's operating budget, which was cut by 20% in 1982 (with adjustment for inflation), would be reduced by another 20% even though EPA's legally mandated responsibilities are increasing significantly. The result would certainly delay or even abandon action in such areas as cleanup of the thousands of

toxic waste dumps now scattered throughout the country, removal of toxics from air and water, and prevention of further illegal pollution.

Funds for energy conservation projects would be virtually wiped out (cut by 97% between 1981 and 1983) under the proposed Department of Energy Research budget. Cuts in fossil fuel and renewable resource projects would be nearly as large. Only nuclear energy projects would escape being cut.

The Political Action Committee, Woman's National Democratic Club, recommends that the Department of Energy's budget for nuclear energy projects be sharply reduced and the funds transferred to more constructive conservation, renewable resource, and fossil fuel programs. For many basic reasons, the PAC recommends particularly that funding be stopped for the Clinch River Breeder Reactor.

The PAC also recommends that the funds for the Environmental Protection Agency and for the Department of Energy conservation and renewable resource programs be kept at least as high as in the 1982 budget.

"FEDERAL INITIATIVE" AND BLOCK GRANT PROPOSALS

We recognize the importance of trying new approaches and improving efficiency in programs for which grants are made to States and local communities, particularly since there are now more than 500 different programs. The programs for which grants were provided to the States were established because the States were not giving their citizens equal access to services nor did they have equal resources for the provision of services. Merely handing responsibility over to the States does not assure that efficiency and adequacy of services will be achieved.

The Reagan "Federal initiative" shifts responsibility for certain programs from the best-financed unit of government and from corporate and personal tax bases to the more regressive sales and property taxes of States and local communities. Moreover, this "initiative" transfers to the States certain basic income maintenance programs that have long been recognized as a Federal responsibility and should continue to be so; e.g., AFDC and food stamps.

The Political Action Committee, Woman's National Democratic Club, recommends against the use of the "Federal initiative" and block grants as devices for reducing Federal expenditures, eliminating programs, or relinquishing Federal responsibility.

UNIFIED BUDGET

In 1969, the budget was unified. This meant that general revenue funds programs and trust funds programs which are self-financed, the largest of which is social security, were combined for accounting purposes and public relations.

One particularly troublesome problem has been that the real proportion of military expenditures has been masked since 1969 by the unified budget method of accounting. For example, according to the unified budget for 1982, military expenditures account for 28 percent of the budget. Using this same analysis, human services are radically inflated in the unified approach, taking 50 percent of the budget. Exclusion of the trust funds results in a more realistic 23 percent of appropriated funds for human services, which includes education, training, employment, social services, health, and income security programs.

The Political Action Committee, Woman's National Democratic Club, recommends

that the Social Security, Unemployment Compensation, and other Trust funds be removed from the unified budget.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the Political Action Committee, Woman's Democratic Club, joins the Children's Defense Fund in stating:

"The budget battle in 1982 is a battle for a fair and decent America. It is a battle about whether we will continue to invest federal dollars in the young, in families, in the needy, and in working men and women or whether we will invest in the rich and in more and more arms, which leads us down the path of economic and moral bankruptcy. It is a battle about whether we invest in human capital—new generations of healthy, well-educated, productive citizens—or whether we choose short-term profit and easy political fixes. It is a battle about who and what we Americans are as a people and as a nation.

CHART I.—TAX DOLLARS RAISED AND SPENT

(In billions of dollars)

| | Last year (ended Sept. 30, 1981) actual | This year (ends Sept. 30, 1982) estimated | Next year (ends Sept. 30, 1983) estimated |
|--|---|---|---|
| Income: | | | |
| Taxes on individual income | 285.9 | 298.6 | 304.5 |
| Social security taxes | 160.5 | 182.5 | 199.5 |
| Taxes on corporate profits | 61.1 | 46.8 | 65.3 |
| Excise taxes | 17.5 | 18.8 | 20.4 |
| Crude-oil excise tax | 23.3 | 24.2 | 21.3 |
| Unemployment-insurance taxes | 15.8 | 16.5 | 18.5 |
| Estate and gift taxes | 6.8 | 7.2 | 8.9 |
| All other revenue | 28.4 | 32.2 | 30.7 |
| Total income | 599.3 | 626.8 | 666.1 |
| Outgo: | | | |
| National defense | 159.8 | 187.5 | 221.1 |
| Social security benefits | 138.0 | 154.6 | 173.5 |
| Interest on public debt | 95.6 | 115.7 | 132.9 |
| Medicare and other health programs | 66.0 | 73.4 | 78.1 |
| Public assistance, food stamps, other aid | 42.9 | 44.0 | 42.4 |
| Education, manpower, social services | 31.4 | 27.8 | 21.6 |
| Aid to veterans | 23.0 | 24.2 | 24.4 |
| Aid to transportation, business | 26.0 | 23.9 | 20.7 |
| Civil-service retirement | 17.5 | 19.4 | 21.1 |
| Unemployment compensation | 19.7 | 25.2 | 22.6 |
| International affairs, economic and military aid | 11.1 | 11.1 | 12.0 |
| Energy | 10.3 | 6.4 | 4.2 |
| Aid to community, regional development | 9.4 | 8.4 | 7.3 |
| General-revenue sharing | 6.9 | 6.4 | 6.7 |
| Rivers, dams, natural resources | 8.4 | 7.2 | 5.3 |
| Science, space, technology | 6.4 | 6.9 | 7.6 |
| Pollution control | 5.2 | 5.4 | 4.6 |
| Aid to agriculture | 5.6 | 8.6 | 4.5 |
| Payment to the Postal Service | 1.3 | .6 | .5 |
| All other spending | 3.0 | .1 | -11.0 |
| Rents and royalties on outer continental shelf | -10.1 | -7.9 | -18.0 |
| Interagency deductions listed as spending above | -20.2 | -23.6 | -24.5 |
| Total outgo | 657.2 | 725.3 | 757.6 |
| Deficit | -57.9 | -98.6 | -91.5 |

USN&WR table—Basic data U.S. Office of Management and Budget. ●

FLOYD G. SMITH MOURNED

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1982, the world of music, specifically the world of jazz, lost one of its finest artists. I would like to introduce you to the man and to his accomplishments and to praise

him posthumously for his lifelong dedication to his work.

Floyd G. Smith was born the son of a musician in an obscure portion of St. Louis, Mo. He cut his "musical teeth" on the ukulele, the banjo, and the guitar, the latter of which carried him to prominence among jazz enthusiasts. Floyd was not a musical superstar as we know superstars today and yet he did as much for jazz as any other musician of his time. In 1939, early in his career, Smith became the first man to record the newly invented electric guitar. The record, "Floyd's Guitar Blues", not only served as a standard for aspiring young guitarists, but also became the catapult which thrust Floyd Smith into the musical limelight.

Fame was to elude Mr. Smith. Despite associations with such greats as Wes Montgomery, Bill Doggett, and big-band leader Jimmy Doe, his success was slow and plodding. Again opportunity knocked in 1939 when Benny Goodman asked Floyd Smith to join his sextet, an offer which was declined because of a previous contract commitment with another band. In retrospect, the Goodman invitation was to be the single greatest opportunity of Floyd's career.

Smith was a self-made man. He had no professional training. His career as a jazz guitarist spanned 30-plus years, and he performed throughout the United States and Europe. He inspired young professionals and did not hesitate to assist their careers whenever possible. Floyd Smith's final years were spent in Indianapolis, where, after a 2-week gig, he decided to reside.

Since his death, accolades have been forthcoming. In life, Floyd Smith struggled as an artist for success in an arena he loved more than life itself. He struggled as a black man for acceptance in a time when being black was less than fashionable. He was a dedicated man, a free spirit, and a great musician. His honesty and integrity are to be proclaimed, and it is to this end that I submit this testimony into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. ●

FINANCING COGENERATION PROJECT

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a speech delivered in Boston by Dr. Robert Young, vice president of Energy Investment, Inc., dealing with cogeneration, an issue that concerns us all in our era of dwindling oil supplies and skyrocketing energy prices. Cogeneration can be an effective, effi-

cient mode of energy production. Financing, however, presents an obstacle for most firms interested in cogeneration. The following is the speech delivered in Boston:

**CONSIDERATIONS WHEN FINANCING
COGENERATION PROJECTS**

(By Dr. Robert Young, Vice President,
Energy Investment, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

American industry will require enormous amounts of capital for energy conservation to remain competitive in the 1980s.

The average 3.8 percent after tax profit generated by energy intensive industries will not be sufficient to provide the capital required for both normal business expansion and energy conservation projects. Debt financing for energy saving equipment will adversely impact balance sheet figures and liquidity. It appears that only a few of the largest industrial firms have the cash flow to internally finance energy conserving cost reduction projects.

In general, co-generation projects have a lower R.O.I. than heat recuperation and steam generation. Co-generation only becomes attractive where there is a simultaneous need for electricity, steam and heat, such as a paper mill or a combination of industrials and a utility. There are a number of ways to finance co-generation:

A. INTERNAL FINANCING

Lets the owner capture all of the savings and tax benefits. However, the owner bears all of the technical and economic risk of the project. The cost of money, when included in R.O.I. calculations, will turn a three year payback to a five year payback.

B. LEASING

Leasing enables the owner to conserve working capital. If the owner will relinquish the tax benefits, leasing money is available at about 12 to 14 percent annual interest. If the owner wishes to retain the tax benefits, leasing money usually costs two points above the prime lending rate. The owner still takes all of the technical and economic risks of the project. The leasing company will require minimum payments for a fixed period, even if the completed project is not viable.

C. SHARED SAVINGS

Shared savings is a plan in which the payments are entirely provided by savings. The client has no financial obligation for the use of energy conservation equipment except for sharing the savings with the group.

Financial institutions pay for the engineering study of the owner's facilities. The engineering study is provided to the client at no cost. The institutions then engage a professional engineer to supervise the installation of conservation equipment. The financial institutions then share the savings generated by the conservation equipment with the client on a 50-50 basis for ten years.

The owner captures half of the savings for absolutely no investment. This frees discretionary capital for other purposes. The lower energy costs derived from conservation lower the client's manufacturing costs and enhance the client's competitive position and liquidity.

How do the financial institutions benefit from shared savings? The financial institutions benefit from shared saving by retaining title to the equipment for ten years. This enables them to claim the investment tax credits and depreciation on the investment creating a tax advantage which exceeds their usual lending rate. In order to

claim the tax benefits and depreciation, the institutions must be responsible for the maintenance costs of the equipment for the ten year period.

Shared savings is a riskless, off credit, off balance sheet method of financing cogeneration and is the preferred method of financing if:

1. There is uncertainty about the technical and economic aspects of the project.
2. The project does not meet the investment threshold for internal financing.
3. The emphasis is on capital liquidity.

We favor co-generation projects where almost all of the generated electricity is consumed on site to avoid exposure to political manipulation of the utilities tariffs.

The basic decision to investigate cogeneration depends on a thorough analysis of the plant's heat and material balance. Our experience indicates that heat recovery is usually a more effective alternative unless there is a significant plant electrical load.

Co-generation projects must be justified within the sites heat and material balance. Projects justified only on sale-back to utilities contain too much uncertainty about the long term economics to attract outside investors.●

**FALKLAND ISLANDS DISPUTE
SHOULD GO TO WORLD COURT**

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the Falkland Islands crisis grows more serious each day. It seems incredible that so many fine young men's lives should be lost and so much destruction caused by an issue which should easily be resolved by a judicial process. The basic issue, of course, is which nation legally has sovereignty over the Falkland Islands.

Of course, the use of force by Argentina to assert its claims of sovereignty over the Falklands created another major issue; namely, whether such aggressive action can be tolerated by the world community. Of course, it should not, and the United Nations Security Council itself has ordered Argentina to withdraw.

Even though hostilities are now in full fury, undoubtedly, there will come a point at which it will be possible for the forces of reason to assert themselves. At that point, one must hope that both parties would see the wisdom of agreeing to submit the question of sovereignty to the International Court of Justice and agree to abide by its decision.

We are in debt to our colleague, Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM, for introducing a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 328, expressing the sense of Congress that the President should seek agreement by Argentina and Great Britain to refer the issue of sovereignty to the World Court. I would hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee would report out such a resolution at the earliest possible date.

In the meantime, Members will find cogent support for such a resolution in an article by Lloyd N. Cutler, a distinguished Washington lawyer who served as counsel to President Carter, that appeared in the Washington Post for last Thursday, May 20. Mr. Cutler makes a very compelling case for submission of the question of sovereignty to the World Court. The full text of Mr. Cutler's article follows these remarks:

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 1982]

NOT TOO LATE TO GO TO COURT

(By Lloyd N. Cutler)

In a civilized society, when two individuals or institutions cannot agree about who owns a piece of property, one takes the other to court. Both must accept the court's jurisdiction, and both must abide by its judgment. This is what Britain and Argentina would have to do, even if they were already locked in armed combat.

The society of sovereign nations is not fully civilized, but it has created a court with the capacity to resolve territorial disputes. Every nation that signed the United Nations Charter also signed on to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Under this statute, the court's jurisdiction extends to all cases that the parties may refer to it. Some U.N. members, including the United Kingdom but unfortunately not Argentina, have agreed to accept the court's compulsory jurisdiction in all cases involving questions of international law or of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation. U.N. member states are bound to obey the court's decisions. If they do not, the Security Council may take enforcement measures such as economic or military sanctions.

The Falklands-Malvinas issues are ideally suited for judicial resolution. They involve factual and legal claims about sovereignty over people and property of the type that international judicial tribunals have been resolving for centuries. These claims have existed for more than 100 years, and they have been under active negotiation since 1967. They do not involve the turly vital national interests of either party—the people and property in dispute are marginal to the central economic, political and security concerns of both claimants. Perhaps neither side can "afford" to give in to the claims made or the force applied by the other, but any civilized nation can honorably "afford" to submit such issues to a neutral judicial tribunal and to abide by the result.

Modern history is full of judicial settlements of conflicting territorial claims, especially in the new lands of the Western Hemisphere. Neutral arbitration panels have resolved disputes between Venezuela and Britain over the boundary with Guyana, between the United States and British Canada over the Alaskan Panhandle, between Argentina and Paraguay over the Verde-Pilcomayo region, between Colombia and Venezuela over their border, and between Argentina and Chile over the Beagle Channel Islands.

In no case but the last—where Argentina kicked over the traces—has either side refused to accept the decision of the tribunal. Even in the Beagle case, Argentina has joined in resubmitting the issues to a pending "mediation" by the pope, and has not tried to occupy the disputed islands by force.

In the light of this history, it seems puzzling that neither of the parties, nor the United States nor the United Nations, has publicly proposed that if negotiations fail, the Falklands-Malvinas issues, or at least some of them be submitted to the International Court of Justice. It is especially puzzling that the U.N. Security Council has not done so, since Article 36 of the Charter requires the council, in framing its recommendations, to consider that "legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties" to the court.

Perhaps Argentina or Britain would initially refuse—perhaps one or the other has already done so in response to a non-public proposal—just as Argentina refused a British submission to the court of the sovereignty issues as to South Georgia and Antarctica (but not the Falklands themselves) in 1955. But even so, the proposal should be publicly made—at least by the United Nations with the support of the United States—and the refusing state should be put to the burden of explaining why the claims it asserts to be so strong are not strong enough to submit to the judgment of a neutral judicial tribunal.

In the search for a solution of the Falklands-Malvinas dispute, a method of judicial resolution has been the missing ingredient. Both sides appear agreeable to withdrawing their forces, accepting a neutral interim administration and negotiating a final solution. The main hangup is Argentina's concern that the negotiations will stalemate again, and that has been its reason for stating that its claim of sovereignty is not negotiable. Britain cannot accept this position under the duress of the current Argentine invasion. The reasonable and honorable compromise is to assure Argentina against stalemate in a better way, by an agreement that if the negotiations do not produce a mutually acceptable solution of all issues within a specified time, either side may submit the unresolved issues to the International Court. As the court proved in the case filed by the United States over Iran's refusal to return our hostages, it can act promptly when the need arises.

Whatever else may divide them, the principle of judicial resolution is a banner under which all honorable and civilized nations can stand. ●

NASA: HELPING WITH DOD'S BILLS

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, many articles have appeared recently in the media on the subject of NASA subsidies of the Department of Defense where the Space Shuttle is concerned. A recent article appeared in Science News which takes another look at the problem.

I urge all of my colleagues to read this article carefully and then to think long and hard about the consequences of heavy NASA subsidies of the Department of Defense at the expense of other NASA programs. I think it highly improper that NASA be forced to foot more than its fair share of the

bill for the Shuttle, especially when, according to a recent GAO study, the Department of Defense will require 114 of the estimated 234 Shuttle flights through 1994. This amounts to about 49 percent of all Shuttle flights through 1994.

If the Department of Defense is intensely interested in using the Space Shuttle, then it is appropriate for the Department of Defense to pay its fair share of the Shuttle-related costs.

This is an issue which I believe the Congress must study carefully, for if we continue to approve of the gradual militarization of our space agency, soon we will have so few programs of nonmilitary basic research within the agency itself that we shall, no doubt, lose our ability to compete in the international marketplace in areas of high technology. I ask that the article "NASA: Helping With DOD's Bills?" be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The article follows:

[From Science News]

NASA: HELPING WITH DOD'S BILLS?

(By J. Eberhart)

Concerns about military influence on the U.S. civilian space program are not new. Since the 1960's, for example, there have been occasional reports of Defense Department efforts to restrict access to data from National Aeronautics and Space Administration spacecraft, for fear that they might reveal too much about U.S. capabilities. The coming of the space shuttle, however, has raised another sort of issue, even apart from the shuttle's acknowledged dual role in both civilian and military programs. It is that the NASA budget, suffering in several key areas because of its domination by the shuttle's development, production and operations, includes a number of expenses directly related to the shuttle's military role—a role that, some critics are now charging, ought to be borne by DOD.

In February, a General Accounting Office analysis concluded that the space agency's method of charging non-NASA users of the shuttle's launch services (particularly DOD) amounts to a subsidy "at the expense of the [NASA] space science, applications and aeronautics programs." In 1976, said the report, the average cost of flying a standard shuttle mission was projected to be \$16.1 million. By September 1980 the projection had grown to \$27.9 million. Acting under a policy established in 1977, however, NASA had been planning to charge DOD only \$12.2 million per launch during the shuttle's first six years of operation. Commercial, foreign, and other U.S. civil agencies would get a smaller discount, to \$18 million, and with a lid on the price for only three years.

NASA says that it is now considering revisions to its plan. "However," reported GAO, "an underlying principle of the Space Transportation System's pricing policy is to encourage users to change over to the shuttle [from other launch vehicles] by offering a launch price that is less than the cost to NASA to launch the shuttle. Consequently, GAO believes it is reasonable to assume that even after NASA revises its current pricing policy, the agency will be subsidizing users in the early program years." GAO recommended that NASA update its price to reflect its growing costs, "and charge it to

all users, including DOD and other government users." Furthermore, the report added, "GAO believes the user agencies should be responsible for justifying any additional program costs to the Congress. If a user cannot justify a program's cost, then it raises a question as to the program's overall worth."

A more recent GAO analysis, however, suggests that DOD may be benefitting from NASA's economics in more ways than just cut-rate launch fees. In response to a request from Sen. William Proxmire, ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, GAO set out to determine just how much of NASA's requested FY 1983 research and development budget (about \$5.3 billion) was actually serving DOD's purposes. First, GAO asked NASA to break down the total into three sections, indicating how much money was going for (1) NASA's use alone, (2) combined goals relevant to both NASA and DOD, and (3) strictly DOD needs. Then GAO conducted its own analysis, using the same rules. The differences are striking.

In the areas of space science and applications, aeronautics and space technology, and tracking and data acquisition, GAO's analysis agreed with NASA's. In the case of the shuttle and its operations, however, which account for 65 percent of the total, NASA cites no DOD-only expenses at all. Nearly \$3.2 billion is for dual-purpose, civil/DOD items, while less than \$0.3 billion is NASA-only.

The GAO version paints a different picture. In GAO's view, there is nothing in the dual-purpose category. Civilian needs account for almost \$2.4 billion, and the DOD-only portion—"work . . . that would not be funded by NASA in fiscal year 1983 without a DOD requirement"—amounts to more than \$1 billion, a fifth of the total.

Administration officials, including NASA head James M. Beggs, have repeatedly noted a need for NASA to cooperate closely with DOD, particularly because the shuttle is the primary launch vehicle for both agencies. The new GAO report, however, proposes a division of the source of expense. "Based on NASA's latest traffic model," says GAO, "DOD is estimated to require 114 of the estimated 234 shuttle flights through 1994, or about 49 percent of the flights." The report translates this into a similar percentage of the shuttle's production and modification costs, or \$0.9 billion, and a portion of operations costs.

GAO's conclusions are already making themselves felt. Last week, the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously passed its version of the administration's NASA budget bill. The total is the same—\$6.612 billion—but \$409 million of it has been reassigned from shuttle operations to various other NASA programs. DOD "should not be 'subsidized,'" says the bill's sponsor, Senator Harrison Schmitt (R-N. Mex.), "at the expense of our nation's civil aeronautics and space programs. . . ." The \$409 million includes \$40 million for planetary data analysis and spacecraft operations (keeping the Pioneer probes going) and \$20 million for physics and astronomy, as well as \$64 million for aeronautics, \$150 million for a fifth shuttle orbiter and \$90 million for a modification of the Centaur upper-stage rocket (though not the one that might have saved nearly half of the Galileo mission's 4½-year flight time). A day later, the House Budget Committee recommended a similar kind of shift, including the assumption that DOD

would pick up a greater portion of shuttle operations costs.●

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY'S STAND
AGAINST APARTHEID

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, at its commencement exercises on May 19, Columbia University awarded an honorary degree to Bishop Desmond M. Tutu in absentia. Reverend Tutu had been forbidden to leave his nation by the South African Government because of his outspoken criticism of South Africa's white rule.

At my urging, the State Department put in a special request to the South African Government to allow Dr. Tutu to attend the ceremony. But the Republic of South Africa fears the freedom of ideas and the freedom of speech so profoundly that even this request was denied. At the time of the ceremony, Tutu remained in South Africa against his will.

Only twice before has Columbia awarded degrees in absentia. The first recipient was President Abraham Lincoln, who was unable to receive the degree awarded him in 1861 because of the Civil War. The second was Justice William O. Douglas in 1979, who was unable to travel because of a stroke he had suffered.

Today, because of South Africa's perceived strategic value, our own Government glosses over the systematic violation of human rights and the institutionalized racism in South Africa, thus lending its tacit approval to a way of life repugnant to the values of freedom and liberty upon which our Nation was founded. Columbia's courageous condemnation of South Africa's policies is a welcome contrast.

"We want the Government of South Africa to know the world is watching," said Columbia's President Michael I. Sovern during the commencement address. He went on to call South Africa's system of apartheid "a government's sustained effort to degrade its citizens through the most systematic abuse of law to outlaw a people since Hitler's Nuremberg Laws."

"Desmond Tutu," said Sovern, "is a beacon of hope and decency in a dark land."

In addition to addressing the human rights violations in South Africa, Sovern's speech faced many of the problems that we are confronting at home, particularly our Government's waning commitment to financing higher education, the administration's stance on arms control, and our country's capacity to realize our greatness. Such thoughtfulness is rare in Washington as we rush to meet our day-to-day

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

deadlines. I commend his address to my colleagues:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT
MICHAEL I. SOVERN

Congratulations. Columbia is very proud of you today.

You have risen to every academic challenge, successfully navigated every rite of passage, grown older and wiser. You are almost ready to be turned loose on an unsuspecting world. Only one test remains, perhaps the most grueling crucible of all: To survive the Commencement Address.

By rough count, 11,117 commencement addresses will be delivered within the next month. That is a little like telling a couple about to marry that four million people will also take the plunge this year. It is not romantic, but it may offer a useful perspective. And perspectives are what a commencement speech should be about.

First, a perspective on you. It has become fashionable for commentators to claim that because you do not march, you do not feel; because you do not chant, you do not care. I know differently. I have talked to many of you and I know the depths of your commitment to serve. I have worked with many of you as we have struggled to preserve equal access to higher education in America, and I know how effective you can be. You seek results, not publicity for yourselves.

Some of your elders may have forgotten that private initiative, private energy and private responsibility can go hand in hand with public compassion, but you have not—at least not yet. And I hope you never do.

You will be pursuing your callings for the next half century. My heartfelt wish for you is that, along about the year 2025, as anticipation yields to reminiscence, you will look back over your lives and know that you not only did well, you also did some good.

You cannot do everything to cure the ills of mankind, but you can do something. The moral test of your responsibility is not what happens to the world but whether you did your part, as best you could, to make this small and fragile planet a better place.

Business School graduates, where are you? I want you to be able to take pride in a society you will have helped to define; engineers: to rejoice in what you have designed and built; diplomats and public officials: to have done your part to keep us all from going up in a giant fireball. Architects and planners: I want you to have made the most of the spaces in which we live and work; artists and performers: to have helped the human spirit to soar; scholars and teachers: to have helped others to grow even as you have shaped and stretched your disciplines.

Doctors and dentists; social workers and nurses; ministers and therapists: as you come to look back over the thousands of people you have cared for, I hope for you that you are able to keep right on caring. And journalists: when you come to look back over the thousands of stories you have told, I hope you will respect what you see—for its humility and decency as much as for its elegance and commitment to truth. To our librarians: in an era of microfiche and computer print-outs, may you always know the joy of books, honest-to-God bound books.

To my old friends in the Law School, I can do no better than offer the words of Lord Brougham: "It was the boast of Augustus that he found Rome of brick, and left it of marble; a praise not unworthy of a great prince. But how much nobler will be our Sovereign's boast, when he shall have it to say, that he found law dear, and left it cheap;

May 26, 1982

found it a sealed book—left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich—left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression—left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence!"

Graduates of Barnard College; of Columbia College; and of the School of General Studies: as you go to pursue your dreams in the work place, graduate school or professional school, may you share our confidence that you are as ready as you can be to meet your future.

The universities to which many of you go next will be under extraordinary financial pressure. We have fought well together against Draconian cuts in student aid. Those who come after you are in your debt. But next year's grants will still contain fewer real dollars than this year's and next year's student borrowers will have to pay more for their loans than you are paying.

When I became President, I promised to give close attention to Columbia's role as an open door to our society for promising young people, from the streets of this city and from all over America, whose ability to learn is greater than their ability to pay. If such a door had not been opened to me, I would not be here today.

When I made that commitment, I believed that the challenge was to persuade our alumni and friends to increase their support so that we might help all of our students who need and deserve help. I did not dream that a short-sighted federal Administration, apparently believing that student aid programs were some vast giveaway, unrelated to vital national interests and compelling human needs, would seek to decrease the aid available to Columbia students by more than two-thirds.

Though some real harm was done, in time we were able to demonstrate that few Americans shared the Administration's wish to retreat from a proud American commitment—that the richest country in the world should not deny an education to students merely because their families lack the means to pay for it. The same federal student aid policies which implement that principle also contribute to student choice and institutional diversity.

Federal student aid programs never did, and do not now, give anyone a free ride. Some two-thirds of America's students are working to put themselves through college. As so many of you know, Columbia students who receive federal grants also contribute their own earnings, draw upon whatever help their families can provide, receive a Columbia scholarship and incur debts that must be repaid.

Every element of the package is critical. I wish I could tell you that the Administration has come to understand this, but they have not. They still want to shrink the federal part of the package so drastically that hundreds of thousands of students would be barred from the institutions best suited for them. Others would be denied a higher education altogether.

Should the Administration prevail, we would have a new national policy, a policy that would proclaim: If you are not lucky enough to be born wealthy, your country does not care how good you are or how hard you work, the most selective colleges are not for you; they are reserved for the children of the rich. That is what America would be saying. We must not let that happen.

In the Administration's position on student aid, I see a recurring human failing—a dangerous tendency to forget that when we

talk of hundreds of thousands of students, we are not talking about abstract numbers; we are talking about people. We encounter that danger again in talk of limited nuclear war and proposals for a civil defense program intended to save the lives of more than half our population, sacrificing perhaps only a hundred million. Even to contemplate such a strategy requires that we think only of numbers, and block out all thought of one hundred million individual men, women and children—blasted, incinerated or irretrievably poisoned by radiation. Numbers save us from empathy; there is no sympathy for statistics.

Let us forget, the risk of nuclear annihilation is no longer limited to superpower confrontation. Our government should return to its commitment to nuclear non-proliferation. We must do so before some madman acquires and uses the power to obliterate a nation, thinking of it as just an abstraction, its poor dead people as just numbers. In some ways, this is the easier part of the problem, for here we and the Soviets clearly have some interests in common.

We have a common interest too in finding a way out of our current arms control stalemate. This may be a promising moment: on both sides of the Iron Curtain we see signs of an awareness that the risks of standing still outweigh those of moving forward to agreement. I hope most fervently, as I am sure you do, that the President's recent proposals are the beginning of a process that will lead us to a safer world. But, in Flora Lewis' wise words, this is not a time for Americans to "turn away with relief, or disbelief."

The problem is to bring all nations to reduce the nuclear threat. We in the universities have the analytic capabilities to contribute to a solution. We and several other institutions have just added to our efforts a fellowship program in the combined fields of Soviet/East European and international security/arms control studies. At Columbia this will complement the work of our Institutes on Russia, War and Peace Studies, International Change and East Central Europe. But we must do still more. And our government should make clear that our participation is welcome.

In our colleges and universities, we take pride, and justly so, in our ability to abstract, to synthesize, to shape concepts from seemingly unconnected data. We bear a measure of responsibility for the tendency toward abstraction in public policy. We must be on our guard to see that the models we build and the concepts we shape do not obscure the reality they are intended to help us understand.

John Maynard Keynes observed that "the ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed, the world is ruled by little else. Practical men . . . are usually the slaves of some defunct economist."

We see ideas override reality every day. We are the richest, freest, most powerful nation in all of human history. Yet how many of our countrymen are convinced that we are dangerously weak, too poor to meet the needs of our own citizens, too inept to compete with a monstrous tyranny for the friendship of the peoples of the world?

America may be a sleeping giant, but it is a giant still. Our true task must be to release the extraordinary talents and latent energies of millions of American men and women.

We know our faults. More than any other nation on earth, ours has a genius for self-criticism. If that sometimes leads us to doubt, more often it inspires us to reassessment and reconstruction. We remain optimists at heart, enduring believers in the American capacity to solve the insoluble. We even dare to hope that, just as the world watched the awesome dawn of our self-government, so can we be admired and emulated in the light of noon.

If we are to rekindle the American spirit, as I believe we can and must, you—the class of 1982—must help to bear the torch. And recognize, with William James, that—

"Not a victory is gained, not a deed of faithfulness or courage is done, except upon a maybe; not a service, not a sally of generosity, not a scientific exploration or experiment or textbook, that may not be a mistake. It is only by risking our persons from one hour to another that we live at all. And often enough our faith beforehand is the only thing that makes the result come true."

There is one member of the class of 1982—an honorary member to be sure, but a member nonetheless—whose faith and courage may serve to guide you more than any words we say today. He is not here.

We regret that Desmond Tutu, Bishop of Lesotho and Secretary-General of the South African Council of Churches, has been prevented from joining us by the current government of South Africa.

The Trustees' decision to award an honorary degree to Bishop Tutu is more than a re-emphasis of our University's deep repugnance for apartheid, of our revulsion at a government's sustained effort to degrade its citizens through the most systematic abuse of law to outlaw a people since Hitler's Nuremberg Laws.

Desmond Tutu is a beacon of hope and decency in a dark land, and we want to help keep that light burning. We want him to know that we care. We want the government of South Africa to know that the world is watching. And we want to reaffirm our own humanity by presuming to claim that he and we are brothers.

We have kept a chair for our absent guest and, when we reach that part of the program, you will hear the citation for his degree, but we shall not award it today. The Trustees have authorized me to announce that for the third time in its history Columbia will undertake to award an honorary degree away from campus—in this case, in Soweto, South Africa. And if the government of South Africa refuses to let us come, Bishop Tutu's chair will be a part of Columbia commencements next year and in future years in the confident hope that one day he and we will stand side by side.

Columbia has presented only two other honorary degrees off campus. One was to Justice William O. Douglas at the Supreme Court of the United States when a stroke left him unable to travel. The other, because the conduct of the war made a trip away from the capital impossible, was also presented in Washington—to President Abraham Lincoln.

The Columbia degree—whether awarded honoris causa or in the regular course—signals our respect and trust. You are about to join those who have earned that respect and trust.

Have faith in yourselves. You are our tomorrow. To you will come that success and good fortune which carry special responsibilities. I have great confidence that you will fulfill them well. That, in fact, is the

strongest reason for my stubborn optimism about the future of our planet.

For generation after generation, the special quality of the Columbia student has been demonstrated by the distinction of our alumni. Today, as you join their ranks, the Latin phrase you have seen on the sundial assumes new meaning: *Horam Expecta Veniet. Await the hour; it will come.*

Your hour has come. I wish you joy in your work, love in your life, happiness in your heart. Good luck and Godspeed. ●

A STRATEGY TO CREATE JOBS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my "Washington Report" for Wednesday, May 26, 1982, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A STRATEGY TO CREATE JOBS

The unemployment rate rose from 9 percent in March to 9.4 percent in April, the highest since World War II. The number of jobless climbed to 10.3 million last month. The unemployment rate stood at 12.9 percent in March in Indiana, with more than 330,000 Hoosiers out of work. People are asking why we cannot come up with a strategy to create jobs.

Most people realize that getting the economy growing again is the single most important way to bring unemployment down. However, growth alone will not solve all our problems because the issue is not simply a shortage of jobs. Even when employment is high, certain jobs go unfilled and certain workers remain idle. The jobs demand skills and training which the workers do not have.

Because millions of Americans lack the skills to make their way in an increasingly specialized industrial economy, business, labor, and government must open up new opportunities for work. Improvements in "human capital" will not occur solely due to improvements in the economy. Investment in people is even more important.

A strategy to create jobs must be formulated in three stages. We must identify its basic features, understand its main goals, and develop specific plans to reach those goals.

BASIC FEATURES

Private sector: A strategy to create jobs does not mean turning to new government programs. Rather, it means making maximum use of the resources of the private sector. Reliance on the private sector really boils down to reliance on small business, which is generating an increasing share of employment. Between 1969 and 1976, for example, small business accounted for some 87 percent of all new jobs in the private economy. The outlook for employment will brighten when the small businessman feels he can begin to hire again.

Cooperation: A second basic feature of the strategy is cooperation. For example, in hundreds of plants around the nation, committees of workers and employers are finding solutions to problems of mutual concern, such as new skill requirements, labor bottlenecks, outdated production processes, absenteeism, red tape, and how to create a climate favorable to local economic development. These cooperative activities enhance

government's efforts to smooth out imbalances in the labor market.

Flexibility: A third basic feature of the strategy is flexibility. The transition to a new economy has enormous implications for labor: more skills, permanent losses of employment in heavy industry, and aggressive bidding from specialists in engineering and computers. There will be fewer entrants into the work force and more minorities among job seekers.

MAIN GOALS

Disadvantaged worker: Most people agree that we should help the disadvantaged worker but sometimes disagree about the choice of help: should it give him temporary income or train him for long-term employment? My impression is that while both kinds of help are needed, training for long-term employment should be stressed.

Dislocated worker: The problem of the worker whose job has disappeared is becoming serious. We are not really set up to help him adjust to changes in the economy. Collectively-bargained arrangements for adjustment aid cover a small portion of the population. The main federal response has come in the form of cash benefits, which fill a vital need for temporarily unemployed workers but are inadequate to deal with dislocation or long-term joblessness. Most people agree that something should be done to help ease the hardship of dislocation and make the idea of industrial change less threatening, but what should be done and how should pay for it?

Skills of the entire work force: The skills of the entire work force should not be overlooked. Education and training occasioned 20 percent of the increase in productivity between 1948 and 1966 and 75 percent between 1973 and 1978, increases larger than those due to capital investment during the same periods. The disagreements on how best to train the worker are major. Can existing programs of education and training merely be improved to meet our needs? How should work relate to school?

SPECIFIC PLANS

Targeted jobs tax credit: This tax credit gives employers who hire disadvantaged workers up to \$3,000, but only about 2 percent of employers know of the credit and a mere 3 percent use it. Certification is complex, so small firms do not like it. The credit could be streamlined or re-targeted to entry-level, dislocated, or "skill-shortage" workers.

Other tax credits: Bills in Congress would grant tax credits to firms which gave equipment to colleges for use in teaching scarce skills or to firms allowing workers to teach engineering part-time. Such bills are worth examining.

Federal procurement and research and development: The declining productivity of the economy is due in part to the decline of small business. We should increase federal procurement and research and development available to small business. Small firms hire more people and produce many more innovations per dollar than do other firms. Innovations mean even more jobs.

Modification in unemployment compensation: Altering unemployment compensation to include retraining of dislocated workers may be helpful. One idea is to make cash benefits conditional on re-training; another is to split the funds available, with part going to income maintenance and part to re-training; yet another is to set up a new fund for re-training. These ideas are bold, but they should be studied.

Basic federal employment and training programs: Some government training pro-

grams have failed, but this does not mean that government should not help train the worker. It should draw heavily on the private sector and find more effective programs to address imbalances in the labor market.

Funding of vocational education and of programs to strengthen basic skills are important. So, too, is a program under which data on education, training, jobs, and job seekers would be broadly dispersed. The main point is that we cannot build a high-quality society with low-quality people. More attention must be given to the quality of the labor force. ●

OUTSTANDING YOUTH HONORED

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with great pride and pleasure that I focus my colleagues' attention on the meritorious achievements of young people in my district who are recipients of my 1982 Medal of Merit for Outstanding Youth. Too often society has a tendency to focus on the poorest examples among our young people. But I believe the 32 I honored on May 16 in a ceremony at the Wayne County Extension and Education Center are a true representation of young people in the 1980's.

I began the Medal of Merit program as part of the Bicentennial celebration in 1976. At that time, it was so well received that I was encouraged by my constituents to sponsor it on an annual basis. As a result, I have sponsored the awards for the last 6 years. Young people are selected from the 21 communities in my district by a citizens panel to receive the awards. Those eligible are 14 to 18 and still in high school, or from 18 to 22 years of age. Recipients are chosen based on their contribution to the community, leadership, heroism, academic, musical and/or athletic ability. The recipients from each of the communities in the 15th Congressional District for 1982 were:

LIST OF RECIPIENTS

Phillip Freeman, 21, of Garden City, son of Robert and Rose Freeman, for his special attendant care for a friend afflicted with cancer and the outstanding ethical standards he sets for the members of the wrestling team he coaches.

David Pavelka, 17, of Garden City, son of David and Vicki Pavelka, who has assisted as a volunteer on a daily basis in teaching physical education to autistic children.

Rebecca Minges, 17, of Huron Township, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Willard Minges, who while maintaining a straight A average and serving on the Student Council at Huron Senior High School, was crowned in 1981 as Miss Teenage Michigan.

Grindl Garrett, 17, of Huron Township, daughter of James and Dorothy Garrett, for her contributions to Tot and Teens, a help

group dedicated to strengthening the family unit.

Lori Vicchy, 18, of Belleville, daughter of Samuel and Susan Vicchy, for her leadership and hard work in the cleanup of Belleville Lake and Victory Park, and for her volunteer work with the elderly.

Audrey Sidick, 18, of Canton Township, daughter of Stanley and Mary Sidick, for her participation in Red Cross activities, and for organizing a weekly discussion group of high school students to discuss current events.

Carol Bryer, 17, of Dearborn Heights, daughter of Carl Bryer, for all-around leadership in the classroom, in school band and in her church.

Maureen McLaughlin, 17, of Dearborn Heights, daughter of James and Noreen McLaughlin, for her work tutoring Vietnamese refugees in basic education skills, and her volunteer activities with the Red Cross at the Blood Donor Center.

John LaChance, 18, of Flat Rock, son of John and Marion LaChance, for his extensive work in arranging for benefits and parties for underprivileged children and senior citizens.

Michelle Ferenchick, 17, of Garden City, daughter of Stephen and Josephine Ferenchick, for being the first female President of the Garden City East High School senior class while maintaining an outstanding record of academic excellence.

Robert Bales, 17, of Romulus, son of Daniel and Carole Bales, for fundraising activities on behalf of a child afflicted with a brain tumor, and for maintaining a 4.0 grade point average.

Gina Toth, 17, of Romulus, daughter of William and Helen Lawrence, for work at the Veterans' Administration Hospital as a volunteer in the intensive care unit.

Deborah Coon, 18, of Southgate, daughter of Gerald and Carol Coon, for three consecutive years of service on the Anti-Smoking Committee and her work with the American Lung Association on the Bowl-a-Thon fundraiser.

Daniel Ferretti, 16, of Southgate, son of Algeria and Rose Marie Ferretti, for serving as president of the Schafer High School Marching Band, the Symphonic Band, and the Drama Club. He also played the lead role in several school plays, while maintaining a high academic record.

Kimberly Ann Johnson, 20, of Taylor, daughter of James and Betty Johnson, for her work with the mentally and physically handicapped, and attaining the honor of Miss Michigan National Teenager.

Jane Sobieraj, 18, of Taylor, daughter of Jerome and Roberta Sobieraj, for her work in the Taylor school millage election.

Scott Stoner, 18, of Taylor, son of JoAnne Sileskie and Donald Stoner, for his work as a coach and umpire with Taylor South Little League Baseball, and for his leadership in the Junior Rotarians.

Sarah Nagy, 17, of Wayne, and daughter of Frank and Susan Nagy, for nine years of outstanding achievement and service to the Girl Scouts of America.

Cecile Arbour, 16, of Westland, daughter of Vernon and Katherine Arbour, for brave and heroic conduct when a fire swept through her family's home.

Daniel Jbara, 18, of Westland, son of John and Joan Jbara, for service on the Westland Recreation Advisory Committee, and his volunteer activity with the Wayne Goodfellows, Wayne Rotary and Westland Lions.

David Nicosia, 18, of Westland, son of Charles and Norma Nicosia, for service to

the American Legion and VFW as a trumpet player at military funerals, and for entertaining senior citizens and church groups.

Monica Bradford, 15, of Sumpter Township, daughter of Gwendolyn and Nathaniel Bradford, for assisting a blind friend in learning braille.

Kevin Carnahan, 18, of Van Buren Township, son of Kenneth and Shirley Carnahan, for working on the development of local zoning policy, and for his contribution to the Mid-Census Committee and the Family Day Community Fundraiser.

Carla Loshinskie, 18, of Van Buren Township, daughter of Carl and Dorothy Loshinskie, for restoring and maintaining the baccalaureate program at Belleville High School, and for numerous community activities.

The only group receiving an award—the West Side Singers from Garden City West Senior High School—is being tapped for their many performances before patients of Wayne County General Hospital, and at nursing homes, retirement centers, service clubs and charity benefits. The Singers are made up of eight young men and eight young women.

A very hard-working and dedicated Citizens Committee selected the Medal of Merit winners and made the arrangements for the awards ceremony. Headed by Chairman Frank Weiss, representing the Gibraltar-Rockwood area, they were Adolph Jedryczka of Ash Township-Carleton, Stella Adams of Belleville, Nick Galovich of Brownstown Township, Doug Ritter of Canton Township, William Dohan of Dearborn Heights, Judy Artley of Flat Rock, Elva Ryall of Garden City, Helen "Cookie" Kowalski of Huron Township, Ernest Lyons of Inkster, Al Prause of Romulus, B. Michael Hendin of Southgate, Girtha Folks of Sumpter Township, William Greenslalt of Taylor, Imogene Pence of Van Buren Township, Robert Beeny of Wayne, Anita Cobb of Westland, and Gene Palmer of Woodhaven.●

DISCHARGE PETITION FOR BUSING BILL NOW FILED

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, S. 951 has sat before the Judiciary Committee awaiting action since March 22, 1982. Yesterday, a bipartisan coalition, of which I am a member, was formed to bring this important legislation to the House floor. That coalition includes the Honorables RON MOTT, JIM COLLINS, ROBERT YOUNG, SKIP BAFALIS, CARROLL HUBBARD and PHIL CRANE.

A petition to discharge S. 951 is now at the clerk's desk on the House floor. Discharge petition number 15 needs the signatures of 218 Members to force this bill to the floor for consideration.

S. 951 contains an amendment which prohibits the court-ordered busing of schoolchildren more than 10 miles, or 30 minutes, roundtrip beyond their neighborhood schools. Statistics and history have shown that forced busing for the purposes of desegregation is not the best remedy. In fact, forced busing only drives more and more individuals away from our public education system, costs our taxpayers great amounts of money which could be better used for teaching our children, poses an unnecessary, daily safety risk and has been proven to be opposed by an overwhelming majority of our citizens.

The Senate passed its legislation in March, and it is vitally important that the House be extended the opportunity to vote on this issue. Our citizens deserve to know where the Congress stands on busing and our public education system.

Unfortunately, no substantive sign of action on S. 951 is in sight. For this reason, we have filed our petition to discharge.

I have worked to establish reasonable limits on the courts' power to impose busing, and I introduced legislation in February 1981 to this end. It remains in the Judiciary Committee where no action is scheduled.

After the Senate passed its landmark legislation, it sat on the Speaker's desk for 18 days before it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The committee chairman, Mr. RODINO, requested an administration opinion regarding the constitutionality of the provisions in S. 951. That administration opinion, it was implied, would be a precursor to action. The Attorney General, Mr. Smith, addressed the question May 6, 1982, and found no constitutional problems with S. 951.

Mr. Speaker, we now have that opinion. I have twice written the gentleman, Mr. RODINO, to urge consideration of this legislation that the American people have a right to see brought to the House floor. Mr. Speaker, we can wait no longer.

I encourage Members to sign our bipartisan discharge petition number 15, to insure that the House has the opportunity to consider S. 951, and has that opportunity now.●

SUPPORT MICHIGAN FARMERS

HON. JIM DUNN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, high interest rates coupled with low commodity prices have conspired to create a serious condition for our Nation's farmers.

I stand in firm support of American agricultural community. On March 6, 1981, I cosigned a letter to the Presi-

dent expressing concern about the negative impact of the embargo on American farmers. As a result, the administration has eliminated the use of the embargo as a diplomatic tool. The embargo was unfair and singled out the American farmer to bear the burden of our foreign policy.

On June 3, 1981, I cosponsored H.R. 3773, legislation to permit farmers to recover agricultural products stored in warehouses that are in bankruptcy.

On September 9, 1981, I cosponsored H.R. 1819, the Family Farm Estate Relief Act of 1981 to exempt certain farm property (up to \$750,000) from estate tax. The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, which I strongly supported, gradually increases the exclusion on estates from the current \$175,625 to \$600,000 by 1987.

Late last year, I supported the passage of the 1981 farm bill, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1981, which reauthorized price supports, food stamps, and other programs important to the farm community for 4 years. During the debate on the House version of the farm bill, I supported higher dairy price support levels than those favored by the administration in order to protect Michigan dairy farmers. Although the final bill did not include everything I might have hoped for, I believe a measure of success was achieved in preserving important farm programs through passage of this bill.

On March 16, 1982, I signed a letter to the President urging him to let S. 1504, the Standby Petroleum Allocation Act of 1982, become law. This measure would have given the President the power to allocate fuel in a shortage thus assuring a supply for farmers. Unfortunately, the Senate approved the President's veto of this measure.

Finally, I have cosponsored H.R. 4975, the Agriculture Fair Practices Act Amendments of 1981. The amendments of 1967 established standards of fair practice for handlers in their dealings with producers but did not require good-faith bargaining. Producers of some agricultural products continue to be at unfair advantage when marketing their products to handlers and processors. This legislation seeks to remedy that situation by defining good-faith bargaining and establishing necessary methods of enforcement.

Since I have come to Congress, I have consistently supported efforts to reduce Federal spending, taxes, and burdensome regulations. These actions are imperative if we are to bring the Federal budget under control and reduce interest rates. High interest rates are currently ruining our economy and are particularly disastrous to farmers.

Looking to the future, I believe that the economy will recover from the current recession and the scheduled tax

cuts this July and again in 1983 will boost consumer purchasing power. This will lead to increased demand for farm products and strengthen farm level prices. The general inflation rate is declining rapidly, leading to a lower rate of increase in prices paid by farmers for production items and family living. This reduction in inflation is expected to be maintained during the economic recovery. A combination of stronger demand and reduced inflation will be beneficial for our farmers.

The American farmer is the backbone of our Nation's economy and deserve the Nation's full support. We must continue to pursue a strong plan of action to seek immediate economic recovery for the good of our agricultural community and our Nation as a whole. ●

WARM UP TO CHILE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, a good friend of mine, Gil Nettleton, recently completed a trip to Chile. When he returned to the United States, he shared with me his views on the political and economic climate in that country. His commentary, I believe, provides a valuable counterpoint to some of the more critical opinions usually expressed on Chile.

I urge my colleagues to take a moment to reflect on Gil Nettleton's conclusions.

WARM UP TO CHILE

If you are one of the many travelers who think that San Francisco is the most international city in the Western Hemisphere, then you are sure to proclaim Chile as the most international country. And if you tend to believe everything you read in liberal newspapers, you are in for the most delightful surprise.

It is tempting to start writing about what Chile is not since one who spends time there tends to be defensive about the allegations and interferences carried in the carefully timed publication of human rights horror stories and books, supported by misleading propaganda films. The best rebuttal, however, is to be found in just plain facts which anyone with an open mind can find out for himself by observing the local scene and by meeting with citizens from various walks of life.

Lest the reader might gain the impression that this writer is naive and gullible, let it be a matter of record that years of international living and business experience include firsthand exposure to and involvement in the Kemal Ataturk Turkish democracy, Hitler's Germany of 1934 and 1938, the Nationalist Chinese flight to Taiwan, Paris riots at the time of the Algerian conflict, the Iranian revolution of 1978, to name a few. The bottom line is that the writer long ago

learned to recognize police states—and Chile is not one.

What proof does the United States need to accept Chile as a country working its way toward true democracy? We should not use our insular United States measurements and definitions but rather look at the accomplishments and environment on a world scale.

The Junta leaders of Chile are students of democracy. They know, appreciate and analyze the history of beginnings of the United States and trace our democracy from its roots in England. They know that education is the linchpin of democracy, and now the Chilean literacy rate has moved above 90 percent. It is targeted for 100 percent by 1984. Surprised? Read on . . .

Elimination of poverty and disease is most easily accomplished in a free and open society. Chile has only built one major new hospital in the last three years, because the community health education programs have drastically reduced the demand for hospital beds and services. Remember reading about Thomas Jefferson's preoccupation with vaccines? The Chilean leaders are going to the root of the problem and treating the causes, not the effects. Infant mortality is down to 27.2 per 1,000 births compared with the Latin American average of 85 per 1,000.

If you have traveled in such places as Puerto Rico, Venezuela, Peru and other Latino areas, you are accustomed to seeing abject poverty, barrios, filth and other evidences of democracy dimming conditions. In Chile there is poverty, but it is not hopeless. City streets are clean; pride in possessions is evident even in the poorest sections; slums have almost disappeared (have you visited Detroit, New York, Washington lately—they should be so well advanced in hovel removal).

In addition to these basic signs of democracy, be advised of the following:

1. The press is free and uncontrolled and therefore delights in playing up the negatives and sensationalism in order to build circulation (sound familiar?)

2. You can walk the streets of the largest cities in Chile, day or night, without fear of being mugged or robbed.

3. The economy is open to foreign investment and features a free market system. It is struggling right now, but the military leaders have not lost their faith in the ultimate outcome of the democratic approach to capitalistic enterprise.

4. The liberal activities of the Jesuits which recently resulted in the recall of the leadership to Rome for conferences with a disturbed Pope John Paul II have not resulted in repression of the Church. The quality-of-life improvement is progressing positively and will soon out distance the derogatory efforts by the Jesuits to spotlight the few remaining oases of problem situations.

5. A member of the Committee of 100, a woman's group which was active in bringing an end to the Allende regime in 1973, recently made it clear that original regard for Allende as a socialist individual was replaced by dislike for the communist system to which he became captive. The freedom gained for Chile in the early 1800's by Bernardo O'Higgins will not be traded in for the Red Manifesto.

6. The people, at all levels, are pleasant, polite and friendly. They are relaxed; tensions are not evident. The sight of the occa-

sional pair of Uzi-armed carabinieri is welcomed as evidence of security, and the police personnel are trusted individually.

7. The culture of the country bespeaks the successive influence waves of Spanish, Irish, French, British, Germans and U.S. settlers. The aborigine heritage of the Indians is cherished but retained in very few country locations.

Fellow internationalists who were with the writer during a recent stay in Chile and who were experiencing the country for the first time could not correlate what they were seeing with what they had read in the U.S. press. Garage mechanics and U.S. taxi drivers see a bogyman when one mentions Chile. It is unfair and a shame that the Chileans have not yet developed a Madison Avenue style to tell the true story of an international, cosmopolitan country which has so much to offer and which is moving steadily and confidently toward unquestionable democracy.

So, warm up to Chile. Travel writers can best describe the lure of a California-like climate, the elegance of ski resorts, the expanse of ocean beaches, the serenity of the lake country, and the magnificence of the scenery, be it the majestic Andes or the peaceful vineyards. This writer has just one message—try it, you'll like it, and you will feel warm all over. ●

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION ANALYZES PRESIDENT'S START PROPOSAL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, 1982, President Reagan outlined a proposal for reducing nuclear arms which he had promised during the 1980 election campaign would be one of his highest priorities. It took him almost a year and a half, but at least this administration is finally getting closer to the negotiating table.

Unfortunately, close analysis of the President's proposal is leading many analysts to conclude that just proposing large reductions in nuclear forces is not enough. If the United States and the U.S.S.R. continue with their modernization programs, the strategic nuclear balance could become inherently unstable because the fear of a first strike could be drastically increased for both sides.

Adm. Eugene Carroll, Deputy Director of the Center for Defense Information and former director of U.S. military operations of all U.S. Forces in Europe and the Middle East, has made this point very clearly in a brief analysis which I include at this point in my remarks:

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTION PROPOSAL

The table below summarizes Soviet and U.S. strategic arms reductions as proposed by President Reagan on May 9, 1982, at Eureka College:

| | Soviet missiles/weapons | | | United States missiles/weapons | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Strategic missiles | ICBM weapons | SLBM weapons | Strategic missiles | ICBM weapons | SLBM weapons |
| Today | 2,400 | 5,500 | 2,000 | 1,572 | 2,152 | 5,000 |
| New limit | 850 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 850 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| Required change | -1,550 | -3,000 | +500 | -722 | +348 | -2,500 |

As you can see, this proposal may not be terribly appealing to the Soviets. They will have to cut about 1550 strategic missiles compared to a U.S. cut of about 720. Much worse from their standpoint is that they would have to reduce weapons on their ICBM's by almost 3000 while the U.S. could add another 350. The compensatory U.S. reduction would be about 2500 weapons on SLBM's but these are generally smaller and less accurate than the weapons on ICBM's. Thus the President's proposal cuts Soviet strength in more destructive ICBM weapons (while adding to U.S. strength) in exchange for U.S. cuts in the less destructive SLBM weapons.

Furthermore, the Soviets clearly foresee that the U.S. intends to modernize both its ICBM and SLBM systems as part of the "arms reduction" program. The resulting U.S. program might look about like this:

| | Missiles | Weapons |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Reductions: | | |
| 52 Titan II | 52 | 52 |
| 450 Minuteman II | 450 | 450 |
| Minuteman III | 250 | 750 |
| Poseidon-Trident I | 496 | 5,000 |
| Total | 1,248 | 6,252 |
| Additions: | | |
| MX | 160 | 1,600 |
| Trident II | 360 | 2,500 |
| Total | 520 | 4,100 |

Final ICBM MIX—160 MX (1,600 weapons); 300 MM III (900 weapons).

Final SLBM MIX—360 Trident II (2,500 weapons)=15 Trident subs.

In summary, the U.S. strategic missile force would consist of nothing except highly accurate, high yield, long range missiles with first strike capability. Even if the Soviets agreed to such a program, the results would be very destabilizing and would do nothing to reduce the arms race. The Soviets would undoubtedly keep pace with our modernization program and the ultimate balance would be two first strike systems facing each other, cocked on a hair trigger. It is difficult to see how this situation would reduce the risk of nuclear war even though the numbers of missiles and weapons are reduced from present levels.

Of course, this analysis assumes that the Administration intends to continue with all elements of the present nuclear force modernization program. This assumption is consistent with the testimony of General Haig to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 11th. If it is not the Administration's intention to add these new weapons, that fact should be established very soon before massive sums are wasted on weapon systems we do not intend to build.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO TEMPLE BETH TIKVAH OF WAYNE, N.J., UPON THE GALA CELEBRATION OF ITS 25th ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 30, the residents of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will be joining with Rabbi Israel S. Dresner and the members of the congregation of Temple Beth Tikvah in a gala celebration commemorating the 25th anniversary of the founding of Temple Beth Tikvah, located in my hometown of Wayne. It is indeed my privilege and honor to call this most historic occasion to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress and seek this national recognition of Temple Beth Tikvah's quarter of a century of commitment to the Jewish community and to all of our people.

At the outset I know you and our colleagues will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the members of the congregation of Temple Beth Tikvah through their current officers—and may I commend these distinguished community leaders to you, as follows:

The Honorable Rabbi Israel S. Dresner; Dr. Alvin Adelstein, President; Jerome Stockhammer, Executive vice president; Fred Goldstein, vice president; Arlene Goodman, vice president; Joel Smith, vice president; Jerry Tinsky, financial secretary; Sara Topal, secretary; Benjamin Stein, treasurer; Bonnie Schwartz, gala dinner cochairperson; and Helena Cantor, gala dinner cochairperson.

Mr. Speaker, a silver anniversary ago, 15 families of our community joined together in providing an opportunity for life's fulfillment and purpose through the establishment of a temple for Jewish worship and religious instruction for themselves and generations to follow—the plan for the establishment of Temple Beth Tikvah was conceived.

The history of Temple Beth Tikvah is inextricably intertwined with the love and caring of this devout and dedicated nucleus of our citizenry and a host of other dedicated men and women whose leadership and responsibility for the spiritual and cultural

well being of the Jewish community and to all of our people have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. With your permission I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress an excerpt of a statement prepared by distinguished historians of Temple Beth Tikvah, Joan and Egon Fromm, which will provide you with a brief history of the Temple, its outstanding membership and the sincerity of purpose of the people who have worked diligently over the past 25 years on behalf of the Temple. The excerpt reads, as follows:

TEMPLE BETH TIKVAH: QUARTER CENTURY OF COMMITMENT TO THE RICHNESS OF THE JEWISH HERITAGE

Fifteen Jewish families, recognizing the need for the furtherance and solidarity of Jewish life, conceived Temple Beth Tikvah. With the vision of Wayne as a growing community before them, this handful foresaw the need to establish a Temple for themselves and those to follow.

Soon, as their ranks grew, they found it necessary to move to larger quarters and, so, borrowed the facilities of the American Legion Hall on Route 23, Wayne, New Jersey. There, Religious School opened for 40 children and, there, on November 16, 1956, the small congregation held its first Erev Shabbat service.

In early 1957, with the organization of a congregation well under way, the future of our Temple as a Reform congregation became a reality when affiliation with the UAHC (Union of American Hebrew Congregations) was established. This was a significant stage in the formative years for it was then, too, that our Sisterhood was formed to support the Temple with social activities and needed funds as plans for the future unfolded. Throughout our history, the women of our Temple have provided tremendous backbone and support for both our spiritual and physical expansion.

With congregational life, religious services and Religious School well under way, the next step in the Temple's growth was to fulfill the need for spiritual guidance in the form of a Rabbi. During this period, the Temple retained the part-time services of a student Rabbi, Neil Brief, who regularly conducted religious services in the borrowed facilities of the American Legion Hall and the Christian Reformed Church.

In September of 1957 we were presented with our first Torah, and the motto, "Have Torah-Will Travel", became the by-word of Temple Beth Tikvah. At this time the Christian Reformed Church completed construction of its new home on Valley Road, Wayne, and turned over to us its old quarters located on Valley Road at the foot of Preakness Avenue, Wayne. There we continued to meet, to hold services and conduct our Religious School . . . and all the time, the Temple membership continued to grow from within Wayne and its surrounding communities.

In 1960 we adopted our Hebrew name, Beth Tikvah—House of Hope, the name reflecting the unbounded optimism of a congregation which now numbered 150 families. In the Fall of 1960, our first full-time Rabbi was called to our pulpit in the person of Shai Shacknai. Rabbi Shacknai, a young man, exemplified the youthful zeal of our growing community and became a guiding light in helping to shape its future . . . and so we grew and outgrew our borrowed facilities . . . in October of 1960 we purchased land on Preakness and with Rabbi Shacknai's blessing and guidance, the young community hired an architect and raised the necessary funds to begin the building of a permanent home.

The young congregation responded overwhelmingly to the need for a permanent building. The \$175,000 Building Fund goal was oversubscribed and soon construction began. A home and a sanctuary of beauty, character and permanence that continues to serve us to this day and into the future was erected. The diligent efforts of the Building Committee were rewarded with the completion of the building in early 1963 and with its formal dedication in May of that year.

Later in 1963, our Temple's Men's Club (now known as Brotherhood) and Youth Group, BTTY (Beth Tikvah Temple Youth), were inaugurated into our program. These new affiliate organizations quickly became active and vibrant adjuncts to Temple life. Both of these groups, along with Sisterhood, have continued to play an increasingly significant role, not only within our Temple, but in the broader Jewish community as well. Each of these affiliates is a member of its national parent organization—NFTS (National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods); NPTY (National Federation of Temple Youth); and NFTB (National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods). Members of our Temple have served and now sit on both state and national Boards of all three organizations.

Still in its infancy, the congregation moved ahead enthusiastically. A part-time Cantor was retained in the Fall of 1963, and several short years later, Charles Romalis joined us on a full time basis. And yet another milestone for Temple Beth Tikvah . . . in 1965 we purchased a house to serve as the Rabbi's residence—35 Anderson Drive. Rabbi Shacknai and his family moved into these quarters and the house soon became a Jewish home.

Our second Torah was given to us by the Daughters of Israel Home in West Orange in 1962 in honor of Martin Rakitt, our first president. In 1966, our tenth year, we purchased and dedicated our third Torah, a Sephardic remnant of the ancient Jewish community of Alexandria, Egypt. We later dedicated this Torah to the memory of Rabbi Shacknai.

Our Religious School facilities, built just a few years past, were now taxed to the point of inadequacy and it soon became apparent that plans would have to be formulated for our second phase of expansion . . . and so, without really having had the opportunity to accustom ourselves to our new building, it became too small almost overnight.

In late 1968 and 1969 60% more space was added to the Sanctuary-Assembly Hall wing of the Temple; the school capacity was doubled; our kitchen was enlarged and we provided facilities for future creation of a nursery school.

Dedication of the expanded building and re-dedication of the Temple took place in June 1969, as the Temple celebrated its thir-

teenth-Bar Mitzvah year. As part of the Dedication Weekend celebration, the Congregation awarded Rabbi Shacknai a lifetime contract in recognition of his untiring and selfless devotion during the Temple's formative years.

Soon after the joy of the celebration of our Bar Mitzvah year, we suffered a severe tragedy with the passing of Rabbi Shacknai in November, 1969. The shock of his death was shared and mourned by the entire Temple family as we felt the keen loss of our beloved leader and friend. For the remainder of 1969-70, religious activities were continued and conducted in the Temple by a number of "visiting" Rabbis, who, with the help of our lay leadership, conducted services each Friday evening and Saturday morning. These "visiting" Rabbis were sent to us through our affiliation with the UAHC—Union of American Hebrew Congregations—from the CCAR—Central Conference of American Rabbis. It was not an easy year for the Congregation, but with very few exceptions, we maintained a meaningful course as Temple life continued.

A Pulpit Committee was formed for the purpose of retaining the services of a new spiritual leader and again, with the aid of the CCAR, a panel of Rabbis was submitted to us and interviews began. After long and careful deliberation, Rabbi Israel Dresner was called to Temple Beth Tikvah and assumed the pulpit in the Summer of 1970.

With the continued growth of the Temple, we found ourselves with a Religious School population totaling more than 600 young people, one of the largest religious schools in the State of New Jersey. The services of a full time principal were long overdue and so the School Committee—which has always, in our history, been one of the hardest working and most diligent committees of the Temple—sought a solution to the problem. With the help and guidance of Rabbi Dresner and the Temple Board of Trustees, Philip Schimmel was retained as our first full time Principal.

In 1972 we affiliated with the Regional High School of Jewish Studies of the JFNIJ (Jewish Federation of North Jersey), of which we are a member community. An immediate increase was apparent in the great numbers of our young people who continued their religious education beyond Bar/Bat Mitzvah through Confirmation and twelfth grade.

The plan for a Nursery School became a reality in 1973 and was a success from its very beginning. It is an integral part of our Temple program. It serves—to capacity—the youngest element of our entire Jewish community.

Temple Beth Tikvah, through its Board of Trustees, its affiliate organizations and its various committees, continues to serve the Jewish community of Wayne and provides that community with its leadership in every facet of Jewish life, including the United Jewish Appeal, Israel Bonds, JFNIJ, YMWHA and all other agencies and organizations serving the greater Jewish community. It is the vibrancy of our home our Beth Tikvah, House of Hope, our devoted leaders and congregants. We are proud of our past, grateful to many for our achievements and progress, and look forward with renewed hope to the future of our Temple.

Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to take a few moments to look through the hourglass and reflect on some of the highlights of the past quarter of century of Temple Beth Tikvah and express our warmest greet-

ings and felicitations to Rabbi Dresner and the members of his congregation whose spiritual and cultural endeavors over the years have contributed to the quality of life and way of life here in America. We do indeed salute Temple Beth Tikvah of Wayne, N.J. upon the 25th anniversary of its founding in pursuit of the promulgation, enhancement and preservation of the richness of our Jewish religious and cultural heritage.●

A SALUTE TO SOL KEST

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1982, the Board of Trustees and Board of Directors of the Michael Diller High School Yeshiva Gedolah of Los Angeles will hold a testimonial banquet in honor of Sol Kest.

Since immigrating to the United States in 1955, Sol Kest has been an important and much admired member of our community. In the business world, as partner in the firm of Goldrich, Kest & Associates, he has been a prominent developer of housing for low and moderate income families.

A survivor of the Holocaust, Sol Kest has devoted much of his energy to rebuilding the religious and communal institutions destroyed during Nazi era. He has been especially devoted to the projects in both the Holy Land and the United States of the Grand Rabbis of Viznitz. The Kest family are Chassidim of the Viznitzer Dynasty of long standing.

Sol Kest resided for several years in Israel. He has shown great concern and support for Israel in general and especially for its Torah institutions.

Sol Kest has given much of his time, expertise and resources to numerous philanthropic and community causes in the Los Angeles area. Many organizations have benefited from his interest and support. Among them are the Yeshiva Rav Isaacson which he founded and continued to serve as president for 7 years. He was vice president of Congregation Magan Abraham. Mr. Kest has also served on the education and housing committees of the Jewish Federation Council of Los Angeles.

As a leader in the Orthodox Jewish community in Los Angeles, with a special interest in the religious education of children, Sol Kest has been a strong advocate of improving Torah studies in the Orthodox day schools. His wife, Clara and children, Francesca, Michael, Benny, Ezra, and their families have encouraged and supported Sol Kest in his community efforts.

I ask the Members to join me in commending Sol Kest for a lifetime of community service and to wish him

many more years of success and fulfillment.●

FEDERAL SPENDING INCREASES
MAY WRECK ECONOMY

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, many people in my district say that one of the ways to solve the current economic crisis is for the Federal Government to drastically reduce spending. One of the countless people who have written to me on this issue is Mr. C. M. (Dusty) Rhodes of my hometown, Mayfield, Ky. I believe Mr. Rhodes' comments in a recent letter to me are very appropriate at this time and I would like to share them with my colleagues.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: For some time now there has been a considerable public discussion concerning deficits, possible budget action, and the possible results, all of which seem to be detrimental to our financial and business health if the budget is not agreed upon at an early date.

The problem is that the unreal increase in federal spending, particularly in entitlement programs with their built-in increases, will wreck our economy if a realistic reduction in these expenses is not agreed upon between the Congress and the President.

Unusually high interest rates have aggravated tremendously our present depression. Small businesses and good farmers are in a credit crunch unlike anything since the early 1930s. If government spending is not reduced and the deficits put under reasonable size and control, there is no determining how high interest rates will go and how detrimental such results would be to our business economy.

I am very hopeful, along with my friends, of seeing substantial reductions agreed upon in the near future for our upcoming budget. I trust you will have a supportive part in such reductions.

Sincerely yours,

C. M. RHODES.●

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 Re-

marks 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 27, 1982, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 28

9:30 a.m.

Finance

To hold hearings on the purchase of Canadian-built subway cars by the New York Metropolitan Transit authority.

2221 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.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of Donald D. Engen, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

235 Russell Building

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on the nominations of Joan D. Aikens, of Pennsylvania, Lee Ann Elliott, of Illinois, and Danny Lee McDonald, of Oklahoma, each to be a member of the Federal Election Commission.

301 Russell Building

Veterans Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the administration of out-patient care facilities for veterans.

412 Russell Building

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

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the uranium enrichment program of the Department of Energy.

5110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 15

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee

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

235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

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

4232 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

*Conferees

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

S-116, Capitol

JUNE 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee

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

235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources

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

4232 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration

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

301 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

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

4200 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

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

412 Russell 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

Office of Technology Assessment

The Board, to hold a general business meeting.

EF-100, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

JUNE 18

2:00 p.m.

Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax measures, S. 2012, S. 2015, S. 2092, S. 2113, S. 2176, S. 2321, S. 2413, and Section 127 of the Economic Recovery Act of 1981.

2221 Dirksen Building

JUNE 22

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2202, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1989 for the Colorado River basin salinity control program.

3110 Dirksen Building

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

Labor and Human Resources

To resume oversight hearings on the Department of Labor's law enforcement programs.

4232 Dirksen 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

2:00 p.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to review the services provided to older veterans.

412 Russell Building

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

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

412 Russell Building

AUGUST 12

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

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

412 Russell Building

SEPTEMBER 21

10:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

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

318 Russell Building