EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MISSING CHILDREN

HON. ORRIN G. HATCH

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 3, 1983

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise before this distinguished assembly to focus additional attention on the tragedy of missing children. The Department of Health and Human Services has estimated that approximately 1.3 million children disappear each year. A significant number do not leave of their own accord.

Statistics do not disappear, but children do; dimpled babies, active preschoolers, little leaguers, and young teens are stolen, possibly mistreated, thus, leaving mothers, fathers, and siblings stunned and brokenhearted. As more and more children are victimized each year, the missing children nightmare has been brought to the forefront of national consciousness.

In response to increased public awareness, President Reagan signed into law the Missing Children Act. I was pleased to cosponsor this legislation of which the chief advocate in this body was Senator HAWKINS. The main component of the law gives parents the right to insist that their missing child's records are included in the FBI's computorized register and distributed to local law enforcement agencies throughout the country. This federal law is a step in the right direction, but in addition, we must build an active framework of concern and awareness within each of our communities.

Utahns were jarred into action by the occurrence of some tragic incidences which shocked our entire Nation. Television documentaries and news and magazine articles have detailed Utah's missing children cases. Danny Davis had not been seen since the afternoon he disappeared while shopping with his grandfather at a Salt Lake supermarket. Is he living? Is he being abused? Will we ever find him? Three-year-old Rachael Runyan was finally found—but long after she was dead. Her small body was badly decomposed and almost beyond recognition. With her hands tied behind her back, she was located in an isolated canyon creek bed.

But these are only two of many examples. Missing children are a horrifying reality. It is a reality that exists not only in our Nation's urban centers, but in the small country towns as well. Indeed, the people of the Rocky Mountain valleys are no longer naive to the grim disaster of missing children. The citizens of Utah, faced with this ugly reality have begun to fight back, and I would like to briefly describe their efforts. The initiatives taken by many citizens in Utah—law enforcement agencies, private organizations, and individuals in the State of Utah are worthy examples to all communities. I am proud of their efforts, and I urge you to share them with your constituents.

Thousands volunteered in the search for Rachael Runyan. Businesses and churches donated money, facilities, and manpower. A committee formed to organize the search for Rachael, working out of a neighborhood center, the committee began a nationwide distribution of flyers with Rachael's picture. From this a composite drawing of the suspect was made possible. The community raised $20,000, to be matched by the Runyans, for a $40,000 reward.

Out of this initial crisis, a continuing child protection effort evolved. The Utah Parent and Teacher's Association was the first to swing into action, dusting off unused child protection programs presented in the schools by local law enforcement agencies. They reinstated a force of mothers, "parent watch," to patrol streets during the hours when children are going to and from school. With the assistance of the Utah Association of Women, the PTA is promoting "McGruff House" posters to be placed in windows telling a child in trouble that he can enter that house for refuge and help.

Town meetings have been sponsored by law enforcement agencies, county and city governments, PTA's, and the Utah Association of Women to formulate policies and instruct parents in preventative measures and appropriate action to take should the need arise. All Utahns have been instructed to report any suspicious looking individuals.

In addition, the Utah Association of Women has organized a new committee with the sole responsibility of developing, coordinating, and promoting various initiatives. Volunteers disperse child indentification packets—"Identi-Child Kits"—which are produced by "Friends of Child Find." The kit includes identification instructions, precautionary measures, procedures to take when a child is missing, and guidelines for identifying a suspect and an automobile. This type of information, when really available to police, can expedite the speedy location of a missing child.

The Utah Association of Women has also organized groups of women to lobby the Utah State Legislature for stronger kidnapping legislation. Partially because of their encouragement, the State Department of Public Safety has renewed intensive training of police in kidnap recovery procedures and is developing an extensive roadblock and communication system. Further, the department of public safety, with the active support of the Utah Association of Women and the PTA, is taking positive action toward cracking down on "juvenile protection" violators. This law prohibits leaving a child in a situation that could prove harmful to the child.

Indeed the scope of contributors is impressively broad, and I have only briefly mentioned a few examples. Programs aimed at preventing missing children and locating those that are lost, have succeeded with outstanding community support, and without Federal intervention. As a Senator, and as a father, I am deeply grateful for the tireless efforts of Utahns in preventing and coping with the tragedy of this all-too-common crime.

DEVELOPING THE USES OF ARID LAND PLANTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been spending a great deal of time examining our dependence upon other countries as sources for a number of important materials. We experienced a rude awakening to our vulnerability with the oil embargo and have become aware of a number of other strategic and essential materials in the same category.

For some of these materials there is a solution to the problem of foreign dependence. Many plants growing in this country produce suitable replacements for products we are now importing. As many of my colleagues know, I have been working for some time to get these plants into commercial production. But one of the greatest impediments to commercialization is the financing required to bridge research on these plants into the commercial sector.

To overcome this problem, I am introducing legislation to establish the Arid Lands Renewable Agricultural Resources Corporation. This Corporation is identical to the Synthetic Fuels

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

Corporation but is directed at replacing nonfuel uses of petroleum with materials from renewable plant sources. It is focused upon arid land plants because many of these plants are proven sources of oils and hydrocarbons which can be used to replace imported petroleum.

The Corporation would use price guarantees, loan guarantees, direct loans, and joint ventures in that order of declining priority to encourage the production of critical materials from plants native to the Southwestern United States. Most of the bill details the function and organization of the Corporation, which is identical to the one that Congress approved for the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. The remaining parts of the bill detail the purpose and needs of this Corporation.

There are sections of this bill pertaining to production goals, expenses, and so forth, which have been purposely left open, to be made final after congressional deliberations. The cost of this legislation is dependent upon the production goals and is likewise to be determined later.

Some of my colleagues will undoubtedly ask why we need such a Corporation. Let me provide some background.

The plants which are the subject of this legislation are all native to the Southwestern United States and are drought resistant, more tolerant to salinity than other commercial crops, and all produce products in demand by industry and our Defense Establishment. They have been the subject of much research by universities and industry, and are at the threshold of commercial production.

One of the plants, guayule, is a semiarid perennial shrub which produces natural rubber and a number of commercially attractive resins. It has been used by industry in the past and, during World War II, was the subject of massive development as a part of our war effort. This country currently imports 100 percent of its natural rubber—800,000 metric tons—at a cost of nearly $1 billion per year. The Department of Defense is currently examining its natural rubber needs with an eye toward encouraging guayule production. Our strategic stockpile goal for natural rubber of 850,000 long tons is not close to being met with only 120,000 tons in storage.

If a classic example of the difficulties associated with the commercialization of a new idea or product, guayule has not been developed to meet the existing demand for natural rubber. Industry will not incorporate guayule in its products until there is an assured volume of plant material available. Farmers will not enter into commercial production until a market can be guaranteed. The Federal Government has been unwilling to finance the development of this crop without significant industry funding. Industry has been reluctant to make large development investments on this long-term payback undertaking without some financial assurances from the Federal Government.

Another plant which is the focus of this bill is jojoba, again a native Southwestern plant which produces a nut yielding a high quality lubricant. This lubricant has many times the life of petroleum products and is beginning to be marketed for use in the transportation industry. The oil, technically a liquid wax, is also useful as a feedstock for making plastic and fertilizers and has use in dermatological applications. Those of you who have seen advertisements for jojoba shampoo know of other commercial uses. Jojoba oil can replace petroleum and petrochemicals in many of these applications.

Euphorbia lathyris, also known as gopherweed, produces a hydrocarbon latex with a number of critical uses. This hydrocarbon can be used as a chemical feedstock as well, and has in addition produced high octane gasoline in laboratory tests. Much research is underway but, again, commercial development of this petroleum-replacing plant is not proceeding at a pace commensurate with the national need.

Circubita, commonly called buffalo gourd, is another arid land plant with considerable economic importance. Circubita seeds are a source of oil with many of the same applications as peanut and sunflower oil. The yields per acre are in the range of commercial production of soybeans and peanuts, but require much less water.

This is only a partial list of the plants which can be moved, using this Corporation, into commercial production.

Many of my colleagues are probably in agreement with me on the value of developing these plants but some may wonder why the need for this Corporation.

First, I consider these plant resources to be just as critical as the oil shale and sand or the plant sources of alcohol fuels which are the focus of the Synthetic Fuels Corporation. Yet the Synfuels Corporation is not set up to deal with the nonfuel petroleum demand addressed primarily in this bill.

Second, private industry cannot be expected to make the necessary development investments on its own. As with the Synthetic Fuels Corporation projects, the payback for investments made in these agricultural sources of materials is not within a length of time likely to be considered by a business as a justification for the investment. The efforts authorized in this bill are of critical importance to the strategy and defense of the United States and are a legitimate Federal concern.

This legislation has many advantages over the projects planned for the Western United States under the authority of the Synfuels Corporation. Those projects seek to save one limited resource—oil—but at the expense of another limited resource—water. The synfuels efforts planned for the West are entirely antithetical to our region's resource conservation needs. Water is already scarce in the arid West and many of the synfuels projects will only make that situation worse.

Also, the synfuels projects are extremely disruptive, causing rural areas to swell in numbers, with armies of outsiders coming to construct and run these facilities. This bill will use the existing farming structure and will increase the cropping options of Southwestern farmers.

But the most important reason is the potential for the creation of new industries and new jobs centered on the growing and processing of these crops. The Federal Government, through this Corporation, will have minimal budgetary exposure but will be able to leverage large amounts of private sector funding. We will be creating a Government-industry partnership which we all see as essential for revitalizing our economy.

What this legislation represents is one approach to removing the last barrier in the technology transfer process, the funding of the initial commercial venture. If we are serious about bringing new products and processes into the marketplace, then we would take a serious look at the approach embodied in this bill.●

A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 514(c) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill to amend section 514(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, a provision of the tax law that restricts the growth of endowments that support colleges, universities, and other educational institutions.

Growth in educational endowments is a key way for the private sector to increase its ability to underwrite a greater share of educational costs that must be borne by non-Federal sources. As educational costs have risen over the last decade, the need for additional support from all sources has intensified. If we are to look beyond the Federal Government for a larger share of the necessary assistance, we must create an environment where that aid can more readily be obtained. One of the most important sources for such

support is our educational endowments. In my judgment, these endowments are a national treasure—a vital resource for current students and our legacy to future generations of students.

To illustrate the present squeeze on higher education, one need look at one area—federally funded student aid. Over the last few years, in constant dollars, that aid has been cut by 23 percent, according to the American Council on Education. This growing gap in our commitment to universal access to quality education must be bridged.

I believe the legislation I am proposing today will move us toward that goal. Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will enable educational institutions to diversify their investment portfolios and provide a greater hedge against inflation through investment in real estate.

Real estate prices reflect the fact that the use of debt financing is customary in real estate purchases. Many investors, including pension trusts (representing an accumulation of funds 20 times greater than the endowments of all educational institutions combined) are permitted to earn income from leveraged real estate free of tax.

Consequently, educational organizations are placed at a competitive disadvantage. To the extent they acquire debt financed real estate, they must accept a lower rate of return than pension trusts on an identical investment because the income earned by an educational organization is subject to tax and yields less net income. The bill I am proposing will eliminate this inequity for tax-exempt educational organizations.

I want to emphasize that my bill would involve little or no revenue loss. The assets of educational endowments equal only about 5 percent of the assets of pension trusts which already enjoy this exemption. It has been estimated that the revenue loss that would occur with this change would not exceed $500,000.

In 1969, the Congress enacted section 514(c) to eliminate so-called sham transactions where businesses utilized the tax-exempt status of certain organizations through sale-lease-back arrangements. The statute curing the abuse has proved to be unduly restrictive. The penalty tax imposed now is a serious disincentive for tax-exempt educational organizations seeking legitimate passive real estate investments.

Thus, under present law tax-exempt educational organizations are subject to tax on income from debt financed real property not utilized in education-related activities. The effect of existing law has been to encourage tax-exempt educational organizations to invest in more risky, less stable, stocks and bonds. This has occurred because the income from such investments is treated as passive investment income and is not subject to tax while income from leveraged real estate investments is subject to Federal income tax under a complex formula.

The bill I am introducing today would simply extend the exemption from this tax already enjoyed by tax-exempt pension trusts to tax-exempt educational organizations. Moreover, my bill includes a series of safeguards to prevent the use of abusive type transactions that led to the enactment of current law.●

BALANCE OF TERROR

HON. ARLAN STANGELAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, for Americans, there can be no greater challenge than the complex task of preserving our liberty, while also backing away from the nuclear "balance of terror."

Survival and freedom must be our equal goals. No matter how complicated this issue becomes, we cannot ignore our responsibilities.

The only practical way to have both the United States and the U.S.S.R. reduce their arsenals is to engage in face-to-face negotiations. And the best way for such talks to succeed is for the Soviets to realize that America is just as united in its commitment to liberty as it is in its genuine desire for peace and stability.

At this time, our best hope for improving the situation rests in the two negotiations being held in Geneva. These strategic arms reduction talks (START) could lead America and the U.S.S.R. to reduce the long-range and regional nuclear weapons in their arsenals, thus lowering the terrible risk of nuclear war.

On the same day last week, President Reagan and Yuri Andropov expressed optimism about these START negotiations. I share their optimism, if the American people can present a united front on this crucial issue.

There is room for disagreement on the approaches to preserving our liberty while reducing nuclear arsenals. But at these negotiations, America's envoys must have our full support.

For that reason, I am cosponsoring H.J. Res. 4. This resolution expresses full congressional support for our negotiators in seeking mutual, balanced, and verifiable nuclear reductions leading to equal and significantly lower weapons levels and decreased risk of nuclear war.

The resolution also urges negotiators to reduce first those weapons which are so fast that they could trigger nuclear war before world leaders can contact each other. These include the short-range missiles which the Soviets have placed in Eastern Europe.

The resolution also urges negotiators to work for new "confidence-building" proposals, such as improved communications which would reduce the risk of nuclear war starting because of error, misunderstanding, or equipment failure.

The issues of survival and freedom transcend all factions, all philosophies, all partisan political consideration. Every responsible American must work for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons from the arsenals of every nation of the world.

But we cannot do it alone—the Soviets must cooperate. And the best way to guarantee that they will negotiate in good faith is for the Congress to show that it is in full support of our negotiators, who are working to preserve our freedom and survival.●

DREW LEWIS: AIDE EXTRAORDINAIRE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, transportation is a priority issue in the 10th District of Virginia and soon after I began my first term in the House in 1981, I had the privilege to meet with Secretary of Transportation Drew Lewis to discuss the transportation problems of northern Virginia and particularly National and Dulles Airports, the two federally owned facilities located in the 10th District.

From that first meeting I was impressed with Secretary Lewis' genuine concern about these issues and his willingness to listen and to assist in solving those problems. From that meeting, too, evolved the initial work on the Metropolitan Washington airports policy, implemented in December 1981, which has proven to be a good beginning in achieving its goal of guiding the future operation and development of Washington National and Dulles International Airports and to improve the quality of the environment in the area.

Secretary Lewis' leadership and his direct and personal interest in addressing the needs of the Washington community and particularly northern Virginia made the critical difference in the adoption of the policy through which progress has been realized to achieve a safer and more efficient balance in traffic between National and Dulles.

He has also recognized the importance of mass transportation to the Washington metropolitan area and

has consistently supported funding for Metrorail.

In addition, his impressive accomplishments in just 2 years at the helm of the Department of Transportation include the sensitive handling of the air controllers' strike with his major concern to assure the safety of the Nation's airways, while also addressing problems raised about the management policies of the Federal Aviation Administration and later making changes to improve those policies to prevent future problems. In a related aviation issue, under Mr. Lewis' guidance, a multibillion-dollar program to modernize the air traffic control system was begun.

It was also Drew Lewis who recognized the deteriorating condition of the Nation's infrastructure and the critical need to repair the country's highways and bridges and first proposed early last year an increase in highway taxes to fund those repairs, with a portion also going for mass transit projects. After the proposal garnered the support of admijistration and congressional leaders, he worked round the clock during the recent special session of the 97th Congress to assure passage of highway legislation for that purpose.

Drew Lewis vision, creativity, and managerial expertise are qualities which are all too rarely found in our leaders today. His hard work and diligence earned him the respect of Members from both sides of the aisle and his recently announced resignation will leave a void in the Cabinet which will be next to impossible to fill. Not only is northern Virginia and the Washington community losing an ally, but the entire Nation is losing a dedicated public servant who will be returning to private industry on February 1.

On behalf of the people of the 10th District of Virginia, I offer sincere appreciation to Secretary Lewis for his help and guidance on so many transportation projects in this area and wish him continued success in his new position in the private sector.

I would like to share with my colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Post which pays tribute to Secretary Lewis as an "aide extraordinaire":

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 31, 1982]

DREW LEWIS: AIDE EXTRAORDINAIRE

Given the fact that transportation is usually not among the first-string positions in a president's Cabinet, the high regard that Drew Lewis has enjoyed as secretary of transportation is all the more notable. Topping a lengthy list of accomplishments is his latest—the nickel-a-gallon increase in the gasoline tax, for the construction of highways, bridges and mass transit systems. Long before even President Reagan would endorse this levy, Mr. Lewis was point man for the tax increase—meeting with potential opponents, working into the formula a share of its yield dedicated to transit and greasing the skids for it on Capitol Hill.

The most difficult situation Mr. Lewis says he faced was the 1981 PATCO strike. He had tried to negotiate a new contract with the air traffic controllers' union, and a generous settlement had been agreed to by the union leaders before the strike occurred. Mr. Reagan decided to fire the strikers, and Mr. Lewis supported the action vigorously—at the same time commissioning an important study of air traffic control procedures and supervisors' attitudes that was to find management weaknesses in the Federal Aviation Administration.

The secretary's attention to detail and knowledge of the Washington scene extended as well to the local area—from National Airport/Dulles policies to money for Metro and new life for Union Station.

The prevalent—and sound—view in the White House is that President Reagan is losing an exceptionally valuable Cabinet officer and team player. In two fast-paced years of selling and shepherding significant policies for the president, Mr. Lewis has earned widespread bipartisan respect for his keen political sense, management ability and intimate knowledge of the complex fields that his department is charged with overseeing. All this, coupled with strong loyalty, made Secretary Lewis a standout in an administration not exactly overstocked with such successful operators.●

RETIREMENT OF ALBERT M. LEDDY

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of Kern County's most able law enforcement officers, District Attorney Albert M. Leddy, is retiring this month, and I would like to commend his public service to my colleagues.

Albert Leddy has been considered one of the most effective district attorneys in Kern County's history. Congress often debates Federal support for local law enforcement efforts, and I have supported many such measures as a Congressman, but in truth, we cannot actually enforce the laws of our Nation and its States; that must be left in the hands of those such as Albert Leddy. It is fortunate that in Kern County we have had competent, effective, and respected administrators for our justice system.

Albert Leddy was educated in Bakersfield and at the University of California at Berkeley, where he received his bachelor's and law degrees. Following law school, Mr. Leddy returned to Bakersfield to begin his career in law in 1952 when he served as deputy district attorney and then as assistant district attorney until 1965.

In 1970, Mr. Leddy was elected district attorney, and he has been reelected twice since before retiring this year. He is on the board of directors of the California District Attorneys Association, and he is chairman of the University of California Continuing Education of the Bar Advisory Group on Criminal Law.

Mr. Leddy's civic affiliations include Rotary, Elks, American Legion, Italian Heritage Dante Association, Kern County and California Bar Associations, and Kern County Law Enforcement Administrators. As it is with outstanding people, it seems that his services are sought and obtained by many organizations.

As Mr. Leddy retires from the office in which he has served so well, I wish to congratulate him and extend my best wishes to him and his family.●

REPORT ON THE TAMPA BAY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL AREA ON AGING

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, to better serve our Nation's older Americans, the Congress in 1973 amended the Older Americans Act to create area agencies on aging which are charged with administering the Older Americans Act at the grassroots level.

The General Accounting Office in 1981 evaluated the success of 12 area agencies throughout the United States to determine if these agencies are serving older Americans as planned.

The Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Area Agency on Aging, which serves the senior Americans I represent in Pinellas County, Fla., was not one of the agencies included in the GAO report. In an effort to evaluate the Tampa Bay Agency on Aging, Ben Lowe, a distinguished journalist who has worked as my senior intern in Washington and was my representative to the 1982 White House Conference on Aging, used the criteria of the General Accounting Office and reviewed the Tampa Bay agency.

The agency is of great importance to the congressional district I represent, which has 141,405 residents 65 or older—one-quarter of the district's total population. In his report to me, Ben Lowe concluded that the Tampa Bay Area Agency on Aging is "well-run, aware, and efficiently functioning" and that the agency's director, Julia E. Greene, and her staff are "doing all they can to meet their responsibilities toward aging Floridians."

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to submit Ben Lowe's well-researched and complete report following my remarks.

To: The Honorable C. W. Bill Young, Member of Congress, Eighth Congressional District
From: Benton S. Lowe, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Subject: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Area Agency on Aging

REPORT

The General Accounting Office, for its report, surveyed six State Agencies and eleven area agencies. The Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Area Agency was not one. In Florida, "area agencies" reviewed were in Winter Park and Fort Pierce. Two others were in Missouri, two were in Oregon, two were in Arizona, two were in California and one was in Loveland, Colorado. Among others, the State Offices visited included Florida's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services.

It is not intended that this offering be detailed and ponderous. It is meant to be an impression relayed to you of how the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Area Agency on Aging seems to be standing up to the criteria of the General Accounting Office. This report is based on interviews, observation, and an understanding of the issues acquired after some years experience with the elderly in the Sixth Florida District Area Agency on Aging. From a personal standpoint, even after years of involvement, one is never sure how things are and the General Accounting Office approach was an ideal one to follow for this writing.

One of the major criticisms of the General Accounting Office was that the Area Agencies on Aging (hereinafter called "the agencies") paid off contractors in provider agreements (congregate dining, etc.) without exploring the level of service or even ascertaining in fact whether the service has even been provided. The Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Area Agency on Aging (hereinafter called "this agency") maintains a control on expenditures versus level of performance to the extent that funds spent are perpetually compared with services rendered. Two things are thus found: (1) how much money is left at any given time versus how much yearly service has been provided and (2) in doing (1), the controls themselves indicate performance. (One thing now being worked on is a better method of ascertaining how many people are accurately being served in various categories, duplications, etc.)

The General Accounting Office criticized "the agencies" for their general contracting procedures. "This agency" uses a Health and Rehabilitative Services model contract but adds strengthening clauses where possible. This agency never contracts with a profit organization as the concept is to contractually farm out needed elderly service to providers existing for those explicit needs. Meals, neighborly services, homemaker services, chore services, transportation, and the like are all included. All subcontracts under a prime contract are approved. This agency has eighteen contracts which procure 34 different services for the elderly. All of the contractual relationships are approved by the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. (There is much feeling that better supervision could be furnished by the Atlanta region of the Department of Health and Human Services.) Thus, it appears now what the area agencies really are. They are administrative offices creating and administering a group of contractors who furnish services mandated under the terms of Title III-B of the Older Americans Act. It is the backbone of the "aging network" which includes the Administration on Aging (of the Department of Health and Human Services), 57 state agencies on aging, and 6 territorial units, and about 655 local area agencies on aging. The total funds this year for Title III-B totals about $252 million. This Area Agency on Aging has about $5 million to dispense, and this is based on a formula grant basis prepared by each State. The census of older people in an agency territory also cannot be overlooked as this, plus need of the area plus other contributing factors form the basis of the formula. This Agency is among the top agencies in this regard.

To return to contracts and performance, this Area Agency seems to be nearly completely free of the weaknesses that the General Accounting Office found elsewhere. In fact, it seems to be a little ahead of the criteria of the General Accounting Office because during contract performance, when need lessens or contractors show that services could be better used in other categories, this is done by contract amendment or scope adjustment and the control documents reflect the changes. And as for payment, during start-up times (fiscal and contract years are January to December), 1/12 of the contract cost is paid in each of January and February and then in March actuals are available and the agency goes back and adjusts to actual. This is a good contracting procedure. Extra surveillance is also given new resources under contract but this is not too impressive if tight surveillance is not also put on the old contractors. This agency, however, seems to be doing well on watching all its contractors.

To support the feeling of this writer that Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council's Area Agency on Aging is doing a workmanlike job of administration in contracts and services control, attached are Exhibit I (contractual agreement), Exhibit II (analysis of spending), and Exhibit III (control of performance). Exhibit IV is a group of three administrative documents used in this agency's control of services and contractors. It would be fine if a properly-qualified person within the Area Agency on Aging could be designated, delegated contracting officer. As it is, the federal contracting officer has authorized the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services in Tallahassee to act in such capacity. The inherent power of a federal contracting officer is well-known throughout government and it may well be that this power has to be contained at the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services but the idea is still meritorious. The other probably unachievable goal would be to escape the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services altogether and operate closer to the Atlanta contracting officer.

Although the agency exists to administer the funds given it by the Congress via the Older Americans Act, it also constantly is alert to the things that go with such responsibility. The General Accounting Office was quite critical of the fact that many of the Area Agencies on Aging that it explored persisted in screening the income of the elderly served as a part of determining a person's eligibility for services under Title III-B. This is prohibited under the Older Americans Act. Two of the three Florida area agencies that the General Accounting Office surveyed fell under this criticism. This agency is quite active in community care for the elderly. As an example, which includes a variety of services like some health care (catheter techniques, bandage changing, etc.): homemaker services (shopping, lunches, clean house, etc.); and, an area between the two foregoing, personal care, which is a variety of things. In Day Care, taking invalids to day care centers to relieve the family, dialysis and other more involved health care adjuncts are done. However, the agency does a lot of care need investigation but generally for making sure the proper service is made available. In the use of the services outlined above, this agency does allow contributions from those who wish to make them. Under a new Florida law in community care, in certain instances, a sliding scale of fees based on income is part of the eligibility. It is not working very well. Most of the services are to add to those furnished by family or other sources but when things like stroke and the like are involved, a more detailed arrangement is necessary.

It is noteworthy that this agency contributed one-half of all of Florida's program income for the last fiscal year.

However, despite the confusion in this area, this agency sees to it that those who need services furnished by the sources funded by this agency, receive them. It is generally true that in the Florida Sixth District, many older people do not depend on outside help for their living requirements. But, many do, too.

The General Accounting Office did not think that Area Agencies on Aging were giving proper attention to the priority service requirements. This agency (and all other) under law must spend at least 50% of its funding for the delivery of access services (transportation, etc.), in-home services (homemaker, home health aide, etc.), and legal services. This requirement is being met at this agency. The mandate of the law is respected.

The General Accounting Office felt that the area agencies were woefully lax in using Title III-B funds as catalysts to attract needed outside resources. (This, by the way, is an increasing requirement as federal funds get more difficult to obtain.) This agency has done acceptably well in this. As an example, it made possible some books with large print for bookmobiles and then, the County stepped in the took over the service. In another case, this agency contributed much toward the progress of the Senior Center in St. Petersburg and now, it is supported by the City and other elements and is a tremendous success. Again, a badly-needed mobile dental care service was propelled by this agency until it was picked up by local government. This service is a dynamic example of practical service to needy elderly.

This writer also explored some things he had wondered about that you would also ponder. It is a dilemma over how many older people the Area Agency on Aging should employ. The Federal Register mandates that the area agency must give preference in hiring to all those over 60. The Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Area Agency has eleven personnel. Older Americans number four. It must be recognized that younger people must also have a chance at employment and a chance to grow in this kind of effort. The younger people in Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council's Area Agency do understand their work. They do not patronize or make light of or ridicule the many older people with whom they come in contact. This is admirable. I cannot say this of a lot of younger geriatric careerists. It is also true that many older people who may need work cannot qualify for this kind of complex activity. Many

might be interested in part-time work but there is no provision for it. All in all, it would appear that considering the realities of the situation and the dedication of Director Greene and staff, at least a sincere approach and recognition is being kept in mind. However, it is certain that more pressure will develop in this category of operations, from a variety of standpoints.

During the years (literally) of this writer's observance of this agency, remarks have been heard regarding whether or not the level of meetings and regional, state, and national conferences were all necessary. Certainly, there are many. This was explored. Certain and recurring new staff members have to be oriented to various degrees and this is part of the "meeting" requirement. The Director, Julia Greene, has become a resource, nationally, in this kind of endeavor and she often heads academic-type activities at conventions and meetings. She combines these larger meetings into opportunities to achieve things which might have to be done at separate meetings. Those who attend the meetings, converse with one another and observe the constantly-changing atmosphere of the older American achieve new understandings in housing grants, humane approaches, preventative health and legal restrictions thereon (a coming field) and other things. One new effort, badly needed, is in the field of retirement planning for those some years away from the actual date. However, it would be recommended that strong surveillance be exerted on out-of-office activities.

This concludes the report. This writer generally can reassure you that the Sixth Florida District has at its service a well-run, aware and efficiently-functioning Area Agency on Aging. There are some things that could be improved but these are mostly outside the decision-making authority of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council Area Agency on Aging. It is satisfying to be able to report this good state of affairs because so many worthwhile services are being administered by the group being reported on. Older Americans will continue to have trouble, and circumstances will continue to change to add to the dilemma, but all in all, considering the problems, those on the firing line here are doing all they can to meet their responsibilities toward aging Floridians.●

REVITALIZING OUR ECONOMY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the new unemployment figures will be announced. If the trend continues, it will be even higher than the 10.8 percent post-depression record of November, with more than 11 million people looking for work, millions of others settling for part-time employment, and still millions of others simply too discouraged to continue to look for work. Even the President's generally optimistic economic forecasters predict that unemployment will not go below 10 percent this year.

Other economic factors look bleak as well. Federal budget deficits have reached levels almost beyond comprehension and they continue to grow. Factory utilization has not been so low since the Great Depression. Record numbers of businesses are going bankrupt. The agriculture, steel, automobile, and housing industries, which in the past have provided the foundation of our industrial strength, are suffering from a prolonged depression. We have strayed off the course of economic prosperity.

The causes of our present economic difficulties are many and complex. Some of the problems have been developing for more than a decade and some are the result of recent short-sighted policies. There are fundamental changes taking place in the world economy, changes to which we have been slow to respond. International trade is becoming an increasingly important part of the world economy. Our economic leadership in the past has resulted in large part from our lead in technology and industrial innovation. In the last generation, 9 out of every 10 jobs created have been in the service and information sectors, and new markets continue to grow in industries such as computers, communications, electronic components, aerospace, pharmaceuticals, energy, and bioengineering.

Now other countries are realizing the important role that technological developments will play in the coming decades. Other nations, such as Japan and France, are using targeted research and development plans to challenge the United States in markets of both mature industries and high-technology industries. This fundamental change in the world economy forces us to establish new policies for both the short term and long term to insure that the United States remains competitive in the world economy.

Meeting that challenge will require an investment in people and technology, and economic cooperation among labor, small business, large corporations, educational institutions, and government. New technologies are essential both to make basic industries competitive and to expand opportunities in high-technology growth industries. Therefore, we must invest in a work force which is adequately educated and trained to function in a technological society. Hearings on innovation and productivity have made it clear that the present efforts of the Federal Government to provide technically trained workers and to facilitate technology development are fragmented and are too small to provide a focus for a national economy in which innovation can thrive. I am introducing legislation today which will attempt to remedy this aspect of the problem.

We must act now to restore economic growth and regain economic security. No single, simple response will be enough. But an emphasis on our economic strengths—innovation and productivity specifically—can help to meet the economic challenges of today. An understanding of our economic capabilities and the nurturing of our economic potentials will insure not only a brighter future for our own children, but for all the children of the world.●

NATIONAL DAY OF PEACE

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, the issues of war and peace have been on the mind of every American in recent months. On the one hand, the administration has been calling for a $1.6 trillion increase in defense spending, saying that we have been falling behind the Soviet Union in nuclear arms and that it is essential for us to build more of them. On the other hand, people all over the country have become increasingly concerned that this unending arms buildup could lead us into a nuclear war. In letters, petitions, and local referendums they have overwhelmingly expressed their support for a halt to these preparations for a war that nobody wants to fight. The administration may claim that these people are influenced by Communists, but there is simply no ignoring the fact that a deep and genuine desire to turn away from war and to work toward peace has been growing in our country.

For the past few years, several of my constituents in Massachusetts have set aside a day to express this desire for peace, to take some time to stop and think about the importance of international peace and the prospects for achieving it. People have gathered on the first Sunday of every August to celebrate peace with dance, music, and theater. Similar celebrations have been held in other parts of the country. I think that it is important for all Americans to have this opportunity to devote a day to the celebration of peace. For this reason, I am introducing the following resolution to establish the first Sunday in August as a "National Day of Peace":

Whereas all Americans need to reflect on the prospect of peace among the peoples of the world; and

Whereas a time should be set aside when people of all shades of opinion can come together in unity to consider the possibilities for peaceful coexistence: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first Sunday of every August is designated as "National Day of Peace" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation

calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. Speaker, whatever our individual views may be on defense matters, I think that all of us can agree that peace is the goal we are all striving for. I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this legislation that will set aside a day to remind us of that goal and to give us a chance to reflect on how we can best achieve it.●

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF THEDA JUNE DAVIS

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce a private bill to correct an injustice that has been done to a constituent of mine while working for a program funded and supervised by the Federal Government.

Miss Theda June Davis of Phoenix, Ariz., is a schoolteacher who was hired by a federally funded job training program known as SER/Jobs for Progress in 1970 to 1971.

During the course of her employment, Miss Davis was passed over for promotion. She filed a claim against Jobs for Progress for discrimination based on sex, and was successful in obtaining a judgment in her favor. In addition, she was awarded some $35,000 compensatory damages by a Federal court.

While Jobs for Progress is a fully federally funded grant program, it cannot, by law, use its funds to pay claims. The Federal Government supervises this program, funds this program, makes all the rules for this program. Yet, Miss Davis, who has been wronged by this program cannot be compensated by those responsible. The bill that I am introducing would not right the wrong that has been committed, but it will compensate Miss Davis for her hardship, and carry out the lawful award given her by a Federal court for damage done to her by a Federal program.

H.R. 743

A bill for the relief of Theda June Davis

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Theda June Davis of Phoenix, Arizona, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $35,499.25 plus interest thereon calculated at the rate of 6 per centum per year from December 1, 1976, to April 3, 1980, and at the rate of 10 per centum per year from April 4, 1980, to the date the sum is paid. Such sum is the amount of a court judgment in favor of Theda June Davis against a nonprofit Arizona corporation based upon a finding of sex-based discrimination. The Arizona corporation is totally funded by Federal grants from the Department of Labor.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount provided for in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim described in the first section, and the payment or receipt in excess of 10 per centum of the amount provided for in the first section shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Violation of the provisions of this section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed $1,000.●

RETIREMENT OF DR. THOMAS MAHONEY AS THE SECRETARY OF ELDER AFFAIRS FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, JANUARY 6, 1983

HON. SILVIO CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues some of my reflections on the retirement of my good friend, Dr. Thomas Mahoney as the secretary of elder affairs in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. His retirement leaves a void in the administration in my State, a void that will be very difficult to fill.

It was April 30 of 1971, Mr. Speaker, when the Massachusetts Executive Office of Elder Affairs became the Nation's first cabinet-level agency of State government with the responsibility of dealing with the problems of the elderly and the issues of aging within the State. In 1973, the department of elder affairs was established in Massachusetts with some very specific responsibilities. Among these are the administration of certain direct service programs, including a new concept in social service: home care. It assists elderly residents of the Bay State in giving them the best physical and mental health facilities attainable, suitable housing, opportunity for employment, and a chance to pursue meaningful activities.

Tom Mahoney took over these responsibilities when he became the secretary of elder affairs under the King administration in 1979. Today, with the change in administrations in Massachusetts, Dr. Mahoney will leave to become a professor of history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Mahoney has assured my colleagues in the Massachusetts delegation that he will remain active in affairs affecting the elderly, and I know that I speak for all of them when I say we appreciate his support.

There have been many secretaries of this department in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but Tom truly distinguished himself as one of the greatest. Tom was charged with the responsibility of leading the Massachusetts delegation to the White House Conference on Aging in 1981, and he introduced, on behalf of the Commonwealth two highly successful and far-reaching resolutions calling for an end to the discriminatory practice of mandatory retirement in all employment sectors and urging the Congress to work their hardest to protect social security benefits. Both eventually won positions as among the 10 highest priorities of the White House Conference.

He has appeared on more than 130 radio and television programs, authored countless articles for newsletters and editorial pages, and has initiated many public forums on issues affecting the elderly. In 1982, Secretary Mahoney was awarded credentials from the United Nations, and participated in activities of the World Assembly on Aging in Vienna, Austria. By July of last year, he had traveled over 50,000 miles in Massachusetts alone, addressed more than 700 groups and represented my State before thousands of interested citizens in public sessions.

Tom and I share a strong concern for the rights of the elderly in this Nation, and have worked long and hard to see that they are treated fairly in America. There have been countless times when both myself and my staff have relied on him and his office for assistance.

His presence will be sorely missed at the department of elder affairs, but I know that I will still be able to count on my good friend, Tom Mahoney, to fight for the rights of the elderly. I know that I speak for all of my colleagues in the Massachusetts delegation when I say: "Goodby, Tom—it was a job well done." We are going to miss you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

H.R. 5, THE OCEAN AND COASTAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, Monday I introduced, along with Mr. WALTER B. JONES of North Carolina, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, H.R. 5, a bill to establish an "ocean and coastal resources management and development fund." This legislation is identical to H.R. 5543, which was approved by the House during the 97th Congress by a vote of 260 to 134.

H.R. 5 is intended to serve several clearly defined and critically important principles. First, the bill implements the principle that a modest por-

tion of future increases in Federal revenues from the extraction of publicly owned, nonrenewable, ocean energy resources should be allocated to coastal States for the continued sound management of, and research on, renewable ocean and coastal resources.

Second, it recognizes that States will continue to be asked to address, perhaps more intensely than in the past, the impacts of energy development and other development in the coastal areas.

Third, the bill recognizes that to reduce Federal-State conflict, coordinate the acceleration of offshore lease sales and State management capacity and, thus, establish critical Federal-State partnership required for maintenance of the national interest, it is necessary to build on the progress made in State coastal management and living marine resource activities by continuing Federal financial involvement.

Fourth, it acknowledges the valuable role played in nationally directed oceanographic and coastal research by the national sea grant college program and asserts that this type of Federal-State partnership in university conducted research will continue to be critically important.

Fifth, it rectifies a serious imbalance between States that receive substantial funds from the leasing of Federal lands within their boundaries and coastal States that receive no revenue from the leasing of tracts in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) off their coasts.

Last, it also recognizes the need to address the size of the Federal budget deficit by basing the block grants on an increase in future Federal OCS revenues and not on the present level of such revenues. An improvement of the Federal-State partnership in ocean and coastal resource management and offshore oil and gas development should encourage cooperation in attaining a more predictable OCS leasing schedule and, thus, increase OCS bonus revenues to the Federal Government.

These principles are effectuated in H.R. 5 through the establishment of a fund capturing 10 percent of the growth in OCS revenues from a base year—fiscal year 1982—up to a maximum of $300 million. These funds would go to coastal States in the form of block grants to support activities authorized by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, the coastal energy impact program various living marine resource programs, the national sea grant college program, as well as other natural resource management programs of importance to the individual States. Great latitude and discretion is given to the States in using these funds.

Congress long ago recognized the coastal zone as an area of vital environmental and economic importance. The pressures placed on the coastal zone as a result of the often conflicting demands of environmental and economic interests have made it an area of special congressional attention.

In 1969, the Stratton Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources found the uses to which the coastal zone was being put had outrun the abilities of the local governments to plan for and manage, and that furthermore, the States did not have the resources to coordinate local efforts.

In 1972, Congress established the Coastal Zone Management Act, which was designed to assist coastal States in developing and carrying out comprehensive programs for managing their coastal zones, protecting valuable coastal resources such as wetlands and beaches, and increasing access to recreation. In 1976, Congress added another title to the Coastal Zone Management Act, to establish the coastal energy impact program (CEIP). CEIP provides grants and loans to State and local governments to offset the effects of such energy-related activities in the coastal zone as offshore oil and gas development, fuel transportation and energy facility siting. Over the years Congress has also extended strong support to the national sea grant college program, which provides research, education, and advisory services in marine research, including management, conservation, and utilization of our marine resources.

The pressures on our coastal areas have never been greater, especially in light of the accelerated Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leasing program pushed by this administration. Nevertheless, the present administration has set about to dismantle all the coastal programs that have allowed the States to plan for and manage these concerns.

H.R. 5 is an attempt to provide a mechanism by which these critical programs, such as the coastal zone management program and the sea grant program can survive and prosper to meet the present challenge to the coastal areas of our Nation.

Lastly, let me add that OCS mineral development is the only exception to a longstanding Federal policy of sharing with affected States a significant portion of receipts from resource development activities on federally owned lands. Currently, we turn over to inland States a full 50 percent of all revenues derived from on-land mineral resource development. In fiscal 1981 close to $1 billion in payments were made to these States. That same year, the OCS oil and gas leasing program generated over $10 billion in revenue for the Federal Government, but one penny went to coastal States to help mitigate the undeniable effects of OCS activity. This is wrong. H.R. 5 still falls far short of providing equal treatment to coastal States, but it is an important step in the right direction.

H.R. 5 is clearly needed and long overdue legislation that deserves speedy congressional consideration.●

RETIREMENT OF LOUIS A. "AL" LOUSTALOT

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, we often discuss in this body the need for Federal criminal code revision and more Federal grants to fight crime. However, the key to effective law enforcement lies not in Washington but in the efforts of our local law enforcement officials. It is one such official, retiring Kern County Sheriff Louis A. "Al" Loustalot, whom I would like to honor today.

Sheriff Loustalot has served more than three full decades with the Kern County Sheriff's Department. During his competent tenure as County Sheriff, Al Loustalot relied upon his long experience in all law enforcement fields to build a respected and effective department.

Al Loustalot is a native of Kern County and a product of Kern County schools. He served his country as a sergeant in the U.S. Army in the South Pacific during World War II. When he returned, he went immediately into law enforcement in 1947.

Any good leader must have the respect of those he commands, and Sheriff Loustalot earned it through his own experience with the department, first as a deputy, then as a sergeant, detective patrol commander, captain, and search and rescue commander.

Sheriff Loustalot has served as president of the California State Sheriffs' Association, and he is a member of several other State and national law enforcement associations, including the State Board of Corrections.

In addition, he has served his community through other organizations such as American Legion, Elks, Caledonia Lodge, Scottish Rite Bodies, Shrine Club, Native Sons of the Golden West, the Kern County Basque Club, and the Kern County Fish and Game Association.

As Sheriff Loustalot retires from a career of public service, I would like to thank him, congratulate him, and extend my best wishes to Sheriff Loustalot and his family. It is people such as our sheriff who bear the great responsibility of enforcing and upholding our laws.●

A CIVILIAN SPACE POLICY: LONG OVERDUE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been calling for a renewed and vigorous space policy for some time. I introduced legislation under President Carter and again under President Reagan during the 97th Congress. I hope to promote discussion of the development of a coherent, long-range policy stressing the civilian, economic, and technological benefits of an aggressive space program by reintroducing this legislation now. The bill I introduce today, if enacted, would support the recommendations of the 1981 report of the House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications on which I serve.

There was a great deal of public discussion this past year regarding the activities of the United States in space, particularly the interface between the civilian and military uses of space. The last years have seen the Department of Defense budget for space activities overtake the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) entire budget.

I cannot entirely blame this administration for the downward trend in funding for civilian space programs or for the increasingly larger budget for Department of Defense activities. According to NASA's figures, defense spending in space has exceeded civilian spending in the last years. Moreover, it is no secret that the Space Shuttle, funded primarily by NASA, is largely committed to defense purposes, with more than half of its flights destined for defense missions into the next decade. However, this administration is the first to indicate that it wishes to pursue, with increasing enthusiasm, the development of arms in space, with even greater possibility of the violation of the Outer Space Treaty. This is a serious matter effecting more than only NASA. At the same time, the administration has cut back on the civilian space program, including severe cuts to the planetary programs. Despite its past successes, and the inspiration and national pride the planetary program fosters, the expenditures in fiscal year 1983 are just two-thirds of what they were 5 years ago. What is left of the civilian space program is shrunken and diminishing.

I was sorely disappointed with the space policy announced by President Reagan last July 4. The increasing emphasis placed on the military uses of space and particularly the weaponization of space is an alarming trend. While my legislation does not address this problem directly, various other legislative proposals do, including my own legislation calling for multilateral disarmament as well as legislation soon to be introduced by Representative MOAKLEY calling for a ban on weapons of any kind in space. I support these initiatives and will be urging action this Congress on this important issue. While my legislation is strictly framed as a civilian space policy, it may be important to devise a comprehensive civilian/military space policy.

Former Secretary of Defense under President Carter, Harold Brown, for whom I have great respect perhaps summarized this issue best in an editorial appearing in the Washington Post during our October election break. The occasion was the 25-year anniversary of the launching of Sputnik. His is a well reasoned argument for salvaging our civilian space program and curtailing the spread of the arms race into space. Dr. Brown, former president of the California Institute of Technology and former Secretary of Defense, has long supported a strong defense while being keenly aware of the importance of Federal support for science and technology to this Nation. He is particularly sensitive to the open process that is so important to good science. For many reasons he is opposed to the militarization of space and I urge my colleagues to read this article. I insert it for the RECORD at this time.

[From the Washington Post, October 4, 1982]

25 YEARS AFTER SPUTNIK: WAR AND PEACE IN SPACE

(By Harold Brown)

Sputnik's anniversary today reminds us that crucial choices must now be made about U.S. activities in space; some are already being made by default. These choices include the exploration of the solar system, the prospects of Soviet-American agreement not to damage or kill each other's satellites, and the possibility of deploying a gigantic system to destroy ballistic missiles in flight.

Various scientific, civil and military functions can be carried out from space—often but not always better than from the surface or atmosphere of the Earth. Many of the civil and military functions overlap—in navigation, communication and weather satellites. Acquiring satellite data on Earth resources has something in common with military intelligence-gathering. But the frequency, timing, geography and fineness of detail required are completely different. Early warning of a missile attack by detection of the infrared signal emitted from a missile exhaust is a peculiarly military requirement.

Even when the requirements have much in common, the differences will sometimes dictate separate military systems, though the military often can and should use civil systems, as it does on Earth. U.S. military space activities now outspend civil ones, not because the former are too large—yet. The latter have shrunk too far.

By and large, the United States is ahead of the U.S.S.R. in these military support uses for space; in general, the Soviets, by virtue of their geographically central position, have less need to rely on space-based systems for such support. There are exceptions to each judgment—radar surveillance of the oceans is one. But overall there is good reason for the United States to avoid having space become a scene of active combat.

In space, unlike the seas, it may not be too late to limit by agreement the threats to its free use before those threats are fully developed. Greater U.S. reliance on space, and the likelihood that the United States could if necessary bring enough technological abilities to bear in space wars to win, could well provide motives for each side for such an agreement.

The Soviets have spent a decade working on a limited anti-satellite capability, capable of intercepting low-altitude satellites. Their system, which consists of only a few launchers and vehicles and has experienced occasional failures, is now in being. The United States has countered with the development of a system, scheduled for tests at the end of this year, with considerably more capability and flexibility.

In my judgment, the value from the U.S. point of view of a few such vehicles, or even of the development program itself, is to get the Soviets to agree to a rollback to zero anti-satellite (ASAT) capability on both sides, or to deter them from using such a capability in times of crisis.

The ASAT negotiations of 1978 and 1979 made only marginal progress. One difficulty is that vehicles suitable for launch of satellites are also suitable for launch of satellite killers. Moreover, high-energy lasers from the ground or from space can be used for anti-satellite or other military activities. Adequate verification of an anti-satellite agreement is likely to be more difficult than adequate verification of a strategic arms agreement, because a few anti-satellite vehicles can cut a substantial swath in the satellite capabilities at which they are aimed, while a few ballistic missiles more or less make very little difference to the balance.

Thus, it may be that the best that can be hoped for from ASAT negotiations would be 1) a declaration that attacks on satellites are a hostile act prohibited in peacetime and 2) limitation—for example, to low altitudes—on development and deployment of anti-satellite capabilities consistent with what can be adequately verified. The United States should press to resume such negotiations.

In recent years, some enthusiasts for space wars have proposed all sorts of space-based systems involving such ideas as particle beams, lasers and multiple warheads. Many of the individual technologies required for such systems are far from being demonstrated. Most of the proposed schemes require combinations of several such new technologies into a complex system; some would entail enormous costs.

A space-based chemical laser deployed in a satellite to defend the satellite itself is probably feasible within the next five years. A system of such satellites to defend not only themselves but other satellites would cost some billions, but could probably be feasible in a decade. A system of space-based lasers to intercept ballistic missiles would probably not be feasible before the next century, if ever, and would cost on the order of $100 billion. Moreover, by the time it was deployed, countermeasures against it would be possible, at lower cost, to prevent the system from operating as a successful ballistic missile defense.

My expectation is that the financial limitations under which the Defense Department is again laboring will prevent any such system from being mounted. But it is less clear that its enthusiasts can be prevented from spending some billions of dollars in a fruitless attempt.

Finally, a word is in order on the evisceration of the planetary exploration and space science programs. These are human and intellectual adventures for whose achievements U.S. technology and determination will deservedly be remembered a century from now. The potential terrestrial applications of space-based astronomy, from the understanding of planetary atmospheres and geological processes and from the knowledge of the birth and evolution of the universe, are also real, though less predictable.

Both the planetary exploration and space science programs have been decreasing in funding at an accelerating rate over the last decade. Under budgets now projected, it is likely that the ability to carry out such programs will be lost for the rest of this decade. In that case, it would take most of another decade and many billions of dollars to rebuild it.

At a time when U.S. technology is one of the few comparative advantages that this nation has, and one of the few instruments of American prestige and morale, it is foolish to let the space science and planetary exploration programs wither. The contrast with the proposals for technologically and militarily dubious multi-billion-dollar space weapons programs is all the more painful.

The benefits provided this country economically through space technology spinoffs, through jobs, and through improvements throughout many sectors of our society—spanning agriculture, communications, medicine, energy—are unparalleled in any other Federal program. To turn our back on the fundamental economic strength represented by our country's scientific leadership, in the name of national security is, in my view, a form of hypocrisy. It is also bad economic policy.

The exploration of deep space, and the development of near-Earth applications of space, will continue regardless of what our Government chooses to do. However, the development can be accelerated and conducted in an orderly fashion if we choose to proceed in a conscientious, deliberate manner. It is time for the United States to end its space policy drift, and to firmly chart a new course for the future. Mr. Speaker, the time is now for a new, bold national space policy. The text of my legislation follows.

H.R. 478

A bill to establish the national space policy of the United States, to declare the goals of the Nation's space program (both in terms of space and terrestrial applications and in space science), and to provide for the planning and implementation of such a program.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Space Policy Act of 1983".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to establish a national space policy and program direction that will enable the United States—

(1) to maintain leadership in space science and technology;

(2) in collaboration, where appropriate, with other countries and international entities, to develop and use the space environment for the benefit of humanity; and

(3) to develop and demonstrate advanced technology capabilities in open and imaginative ways for the benefit of developing as well as developed countries.

FINDINGS

SEC. 3. The Congress finds that—

(1) the United States space program has challenged mankind to travel beyond our planet and has provided the opportunity to expand human knowledge, to extend the limits of our consciousness, and to improve the human condition;

(2) the United States space program has established the scientific and technological leadership of the United States in space activities devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind;

(3) evolving space transportation capabilities will permit the confident placement of facilities and people in orbit, and thereby produce new opportunities for developing and using the space environment;

(4) the development of economical and flexible space transportation systems will make possible productive, cost-effective, and routine uses of the space environment that can materially assist the United States and other nations in the solution, control, and management of problems on Earth;

(5) the technological challenges and advances of space research and development contribute to the vitality and competitiveness of the economy of the United States;

(6) further exploration and study of the solar system will promote understanding of the Earth and its environment and their evolution;

(7) progress in data processing and analysis, together with enhanced methods of acquiring and transmitting data from space, provide new opportunities for developing useful information and services in such areas as climate and weather research and prediction, environmental and pollution-monitoring, crop forecasting, plant disease control, drought and flood control, mineral and natural resource exploration and management, land use planning, geodesy, mapping soil and water conservation, and earthquake research and prediction;

(8) advanced satellite communications technology can provide new commercial and public services in such areas as personal communications, data transmission, education, delivery of health care services, access to governmental institutions, traffic control, emergency services, search and rescue missions, and navigation;

(9) space activities provide new opportunities for international cooperation in the realization of benefits for humanity;

(10) the successful development and use of the space environment for scientific and applied purposes depends on continued research and development efforts conducted by the government and private sector; and

(11) the productive development and use of the space environment requires new policies, procedures, and institutional arrangements that encourage initiative by, and use the innovative capabilities of, the private sector.

POLICY

SEC. 4. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States that—

(1) the United States is committed to the exploration and use of outer space by all nations for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind;

(2) the United States is committed to the exploration and use of outer space in support of its national well-being;

(3) the space programs of the United States will be conducted to increase scientific knowledge about the Earth and the universe, to develop and use space technology, and to maintain United States leadership in space science and technology;

(4) the United States rejects any claims of sovereignty over outer space or over natural celestial bodies or any portion thereof;

(5) the United States considers that the space systems of all nations and international organizations are the property of such nations and international organizations, respectively, that space systems for peaceful purposes have the right of passage through, and operation in space without interference, and that interference with space systems will be viewed as an infringement on sovereign rights;

(6) the United States will continue to foster cooperation in international space activities by conducting joint programs;

(7) close coordination will be maintained among the space activities of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote integration of programs and technology transfer and to allow optimal use of all resources;

(8) data and information from the space program of the United States will, to the extent practical and consistent with Government policy on cost recovery, be fully disseminated;

(9) the benefits of space program research to terrestrial applications will be maximized by rapid dissemination of information concerning such programs to appropriate public and private bodies; and

(10) the development of space capabilities and systems by the private sector to produce economic benefits to, and to enhance the technological position of, the United States, will be encouraged.

PROGRAM

SEC. 5. (a) Consistent with the provisions of this Act, the President shall assure that the space program of the United States will proceed toward the achievement of the goals in space and terrestrial applications, and the goals in space science, which are described in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) The goals in space and terrestrial applications to be achieved, as soon as possible consistent with the efficient and prudent use of public funds, are—

(1) the pursuit of scientific and technical knowledge and experience to suport the continued leadership of the United States in the development and use of space for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind;

(2) the establishment and operation, in collaboration with the private sector as appropriate, of a system of high-resolution remote sensing of the Earth's resources and environment;

(3) the development of improved capability for the interpretation and rapid utilization of remote sensing data;

(4) the investigation and determination of institutional arrangements for international cooperation in the use of remote sensing systems, including the fullest possible declassification of satellite monitoring and

surveillance data, and provision for increased training in data interpretation;

(5) the design and development of advanced satellite communications systems, providing increased capabilities for frequency and orbit utilizations;

(6) the establishment, in collaboration with the private sector as appropriate, of satellite communications systems in space to meet public needs in emergency services, health care delivery, education, teleconferencing, and other public services and activities deemed appropriate; and

(7) the design and testing of technologies and procedures to determine the technological and economic feasibility of space-based manufacturing of products such as materials and pharmaceuticals, as welll as the creation of new and useful goods, services, and markets.

(c) The goals in space science to be achieved, as soon as possible consistent with sound scientific procedures and the prudent use of public funds, are—

(1) the continued United States leadership in the extension of scientific and cultural knowledge through experimentation in and from the environment of space;

(2) the expansion of our international planning and coordinating effort in order to maximize scientific potential;

(3) the pursuit of a vigorous program of planetary and lunar science and exploration, including reconnaissance of the outer planets and comparative studies of celestial bodies, to understand the origin and evolution of the solar system, and to better understand the Earth and its space environment;

(4) the development of increased understanding of the Sun, its interaction with the terrestrial environment, and basic atmospheric processes;

(5) the utilization of advanced technology, including orbiting astronomical observation facilities and free-flying satellites, to investigate and better understand the origin and evolution of the cosmos and the fundamental laws of physics that govern cosmic phenomena;

(6) the continuation of research in the life sciences to insure human health, safety, and effective performance in space flight, to further use the space environment and space technology in the advancement of knowledge in medicine and biology, and to understand the evolution and distribution of life in the universe; and

(7) the interpretation and application of these advances in scientific knowledge to the preservation of the Earth and its environment and to meeting related human needs.

PROGRAM PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, AND REPORTING

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall, to the extent practical, carry out the program described in section 5 through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The resources of other agencies and departments, including but not limited to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the defense and intelligence organizations, and the Department of State, Energy, Education, Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce, shall be utilized as appropriate in research, development, and demonstration, dissemination of information, and industrial or commercial development.

(b) The President shall report to the Congress on the progress of the space program as follows:

(1) Not later than one year following the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prepare and submit to the Congress a five-year plan which shall establish priorities for the space program over the succeeding five-year period, and which shall contain details regarding—

(A) the role of each Federal agency and department in the program;

(B) proposed annual outlays over the five-year period; and

(C) specific missions, projects, or programs to be undertaken in achieving the goals set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 5.

(2) The President shall annually revise the plan to reflect the progress that has been achieved in meeting the scientific and technological goals specified in subsections (b) and (c) of section 5. The revisions shall be submitted to the Congress as part of the annual budget message.

(c) Not later than one year following the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prepare and submit to the Congress proposed goals for the space program over the succeeding twenty-year period.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act such sums as may be specified for that purpose in annual authorization Acts hereafter enacted.●

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, constitutional scholars and political scientists alike have endlessly dissected the problems associated with the very real possibility of a Presidential election being thrown into the House of Representatives. But they have all apparently overlooked a glaring loophole that could send our system into a tailspin.

Current law makes no provision for replacement of a candidate who dies or is disqualified during the 3-week period between inconclusive voting of the Electoral College and balloting for a President and Vice President by the House and Senate. With the loss of a candidate and in the absence of a replacement mechanism, we risk the disenfranchisement of millions of Americans and the possibility that a major political party could be left without a candidate.

Section 4 of the Constitution's 20th amendment calls on Congress to provide for this contingency, but to date we have done nothing. To close this gap in our Presidential election process, I have reintroduced a bill which provides that in the event of the death or disqualification of a Presidential candidate, the Vice-Presidential running mate automatically would be elevated for consideration by the House, and would name his successor for the Vice-Presidential candidacy. If the Vice-Presidential candidate dies or is disqualified, the Presidential candidate would name a replacement. If both candidates of a party die or are disqualified, their party's national committee would name replacements.

No election procedure is perfect. But I believe the approach outlined in my bill, following precedents set down for succession, is the clearest, most logical procedure to meet the contingency described in section 4 of the 20th amendment. And I believe we must have a procedure in place to meet that contingency.●

RENTAL HOUSING IN OR NEAR COLLEGE CAMPUSES

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. CONABLE and I are introducing a bill, similar to legislation we introduced last year, to address a situation that threatens an important aspect of college life on many campuses.

For many years a substantial number of colleges and universities, both public and private, have maintained rental housing for their faculty and administrators on or near their campuses. In April 1982 the IRS issued technical advice memoranda in cases involving four New England colleges which held that when colleges and universities provide such rental housing to their employees at less than a hypothetical "fair rental value" that could be obtained from members of the general public, the difference between that value and the rent actually charged constitutes income to the employees under section 119 of the Internal Revenue Code. Furthermore, it was held that this income constitutes "wages" subject to income and social security tax withholding and that the educational institution would be retroactively liable for the full amount of taxes not withheld in past years. Thus, if a faculty member is charged rent of $300 a month to live in a small house near the campus for which a business executive, attracted to the campus atmosphere, would be willing to pay $400 a month, the faculty member is deemed to have received $100 a month in additional "income," and the college or university for which he or she works is assessed for the withholding taxes on that amount.

The IRS took this position despite the fact that the colleges involved were charging what they believed to be reasonable rents, rents that covered the costs to them of owning the property and took into account the value to both the employees and the colleges themselves of having such housing available. These values are considerable. The availability of attractive housing at a reasonable cost near their place of employment can be an impor-

tant factor in attracting top-quality faculty members to a college or university. Furthermore, institutions that provide this type of housing have found that the educational atmosphere is greatly enhanced by having administrators and faculty members living on or near the campus, where they are readily accessible to students and where all three groups may mix in an informal atmosphere.

The IRS position also seems contrary to recent law, in particular the Supreme Court's decision in *Central Illinois Power Co.* v. *U.S.*, 435 U.S. 21 (1978), in which the Court held that the taxpayer had no duty to withhold tax on lunch reimbursements to its employees where its liability was not certain, and IRS Revenue Ruling 80-53, published in response to Central Illinois, which states that withholding will not be required where the employer has a reasonable basis for believing that the benefits involved do not constitute wages and no statute or other authority specifically requires withholding. It also seems to contradict the moratorium on changes by the IRS in the fringe benefit area that was enacted in 1978 and which will be in effect until the end of this year. The IRS claims that its position is based on legal precedents that were established long before the moratorium was enacted, but the fact remains that educational institutions had been following this practice for years without being challenged by the IRS.

If the IRS implements this policy, the retroactive tax liability could deal a serious financial blow to colleges and universities across the country at a time when they are already suffering serious financial burdens due to declining enrollment and cuts in Federal aid. It is likely that many such institutions would be forced to sell off the housing units involved. Ironically, this could actually result in a revenue loss as private owners acquired these residences and began deducting the mortgage interest and property taxes from their Federal income tax. The institutions would be caught in a vicious circle—by maintaining an attractive campus atmosphere they would attract outside people to the community who could afford to bid up rental values, driving faculty members away from the campus area, and diminishing the special quality of life there.

The legislation that we are introducing would simply prevent the IRS from implementing this policy before January 1, 1984. Until then, as long as the rent charged by an educational institution for this type of housing met the institution's necessary direct costs in providing it, the difference between that and the "fair market rent" could not be charged as income to the employee. This would accord this rental housing the same treatment that other types of employee benefits enjoy under the 1978 moratorium. We hope that by the expiration of this moratorium period Congress will be able to take a good look at this area and make some decisions about how all of these benefits should be treated. This legislation is not intended to affect the position of the IRS in applying section 119 to situations not covered by the bill. Thus, where the IRS currently concludes that a college housing situation does not give rise to any tax obligations, we do not intend enactment of this legislation to change that result.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we introduced last year was supported not only by the four colleges initially involved but by the American Council on Education, the National Association of Independent Colleges, and colleges and universities across the country. Many Members of Congress have been contacted by schools in their districts urging them to support the legislation, and many more, if they looked, would find a college or university in their district that would be affected by these provisions. I urge my colleagues to join Mr. CONABLE and me in giving these schools a break by supporting these provisions.

H.R. 677

A bill to provide that subtitles A and C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be applied without regard to the value of lodging located in the proximity of an educational institution and furnished by such institution to its employees for taxable years or periods beginning before January 1, 1984

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

(a) IN GENERAL.—For taxable years or periods beginning before January 1, 1984, subtitles A and C of the Internal Revenue Code shall be applied without regard to the value of qualified campus lodging furnished by, or on behalf of, any educational institution described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii) of such Code to any employee of such institution or to any spouse or dependent (within the meaning of section 152 of such Code) of such employee.

(b) QUALIFIED CAMPUS LODGING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term "qualified campus lodging" means lodging—

(A) which is provided by an educational institution described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii),

(B) which is located on a campus of, or in the proximity of, such institution, and

(C) for which such institution receives a reasonable rent which is not less than the necessary direct costs paid or incurred by such institution in providing such lodging.

(2) REASONABLE RENT.—

(A) LESS THAN FAIR RENTAL VALUE.—A rent shall not be precluded from being treated as a reasonable rent solely because of the fact that such rent is less than the fair rental value of the lodging provided.

(B) FACTORS.—The determination of whether any rent is a reasonable rent shall take into account such factors as the necessary direct costs of such institution furnishing the lodging, the value of the lodging to the employee to whom the lodging is furnished, and any educational purposes of the institution in furnishing such lodging.

(c) SPECIAL RULE WHERE RENT IS LESS THAN DIRECT COSTS.—In any case in which lodging would be treated as qualified campus lodging but for the fact that the rent received was less than the necessary direct costs described in subsection (b)(1)(C), only the excess of—

(1) the amount of such necessary direct costs, over

(2) the rent received with respect to such lodging, shall be taken into account for purposes of subtitles A and C of the Internal Revenue Code for taxable years or periods beginning before January 1, 1984.●

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF INTERIOR SECRETARY JAMES WATT

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, after the dust settles every time another self-proclaimed environmentalist group makes personal attacks on our Secretary of the Interior, it gives us time to pause to view Secretary James Watt's great qualities and the truly tremendous accomplishments he has made in 2 short years in office.

Secretary Watt, who holds the Stewardship responsibility for one-third of the land in America, has brought about positive change in the management of our natural resources, nothing short of remarkable at this point of the administration.

Recently, the Secretary publically detailed all of his Department's achievements in the last year, and I was pleased to read one distinguished journalist's account of the complete record of Secretary Watt.

One of the most distinguished members of the Washington press corps, Ben Cole, a Washington correspondent for the Arizona Republic and the Indianapolis Star gave his review of James Watt's performance in a recent column. Honored by his peers in the news media in many respects, Ben Cole has served as president of the renowned Gridiron Club, he has been named to the Sigma Delta Chi Hall of Fame, and his many years of dedication to this field are well known in and out of his profession.

I would like to share a copy of Ben Cole's recent column, "A Proud James Watt Reviews Interior's Accomplishments," a well-written and, I think, telling story of the true record of our Interior Secretary.

[From the Arizona Republic]

A PROUD JAMES WATT REVIEWS INTERIOR'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—There was something poignant about watching Interior Secretary James Watt flipping charts and telling a

roomful of reporters of his achievements in the last year.

Nobody in the Reagan Cabinet has been as beset by critics as the tall, bespectacled lawyer from Colorado.

Interior, Watt said, is one of the smallest of the federal agencies, yet one of the most visible.

It spends $6 billion a year, but generates $20 billion.

Watt noted that in the last year, only the departments of the Treasury and Defense have been called before committees of Congress more frequently than Interior.

In ringing, almost jubilant tones, Watt read the letter of transmittal he sent to President Reagan covering the annual report of his department.

"Mr. President," he said, "we can have both a clean environment and the development of our energy resources needed for a sound economy. It is not an 'either-or' proposition."

Flipping his charts, Watt proudly demonstrated how his administration has picked up the neglected National Parks system and is spending $1 billion over a five-year period to restore facilities enjoyed by millions.

In the field of energy, Secretary Watt noted potential of public lands resources that he insists are available without destruction of scenic wonders or degradation of the land.

"Eighty-five percent of the crude oil still to be discovered in America is likely to come from public lands," he said.

"As well, 40 percent of the natural gas, 35 percent of the coal, 80 percent of the oil shale, nearly all of the tar sands, and substantial portions of uranium and geothermal energy will come from public lands."

He noted that in 1982 he signed leases for 70.4 million acres of public lands for coal mining.

This, he said with a smile, was the most since 1968, when then Secretary Stewart L. Udall, one of the nation's fervent environmentalists, signed leases for 164.1 million acres of coal lands—more than twice the 1982 figure.

Then he declared with almost boyish enthusiasm that the nation's energy future is secure for hundreds of years.

His charts showed that in 1982, Interior has increased onshore oil and gas leasing to 50 million acres, up from 11.3 million the last year of President Carter's administration.

Offshore leasing jumped from nearly zero to 200 million acres.

Watt pointed to the work done in revising and publishing proposed new rules for restoration of strip mine lands.

He noted that his administration collected $1.6 million in fines from violators in 1981 and $1.9 million in 1982, with a projection of $2.2 million in 1983.

Returning to energy, Watt noted that in 1979–80, only 1,064,927 acres were leased for geothermal development, whereas in 1980–81 the total is 2,106,775.

Taken together, these achievements are noteworthy. They are also going to bring down upon Secretary Watt the increasing wrath of the environmentalists, many of whom would rather freeze us all to death than give up an acre of marginal wilderness to energy development.

Matter it not that Interior in 1982 added 245 miles to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System; designated 192 National Recreational Trails to a total of 7,182 miles; marked 18 new properties as National Historical Landmarks; and designated six new National Natural Landmarks (to a total of 543). Secretary Watt isn't going to get much credit in some quarters.

In some places he will be scoffed at for calling 1981 a year of change, and 1982 a year of progress.

Criticism, he said, will still come from the same small groups that have been hacking on him the last two years.

He said he intends to remain Interior secretary through the rest of President Reagan's term, and implicitly beyond, if the president continued in office.

Some of those who watched Secretary Watt's vigorous performance, boasting of what his administration has done, said that he had beat his own drum for more than an hour.

Secretary Watt deserves to have some appreciative Americans beat his drum for him.●

INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO THE IMPOSITION OF AN OIL IMPORT FEE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing on behalf of myself and many other notable Members a resolution expressing the opposition of the House of Representatives to the imposition of an import tax on crude oil and refined petroleum products as a means of raising revenues. I am also pleased to report that Secretary of the Department of Energy Edwards in a letter dated April 14, 1982, stated to me that he, too, opposes such a proposal. He states:

> Our past experience with quotas, taxes, price controls, and entitlements have taught us, at the very least, that we must make every effort to avoid such a course.

Now, as the administration and the Congress contemplate negotiating the details of the fiscal 1984 budget, discussions regarding a "quick fix" solution to raise revenues persist. One such proposal which has reared its ugly head is the most regressive, penny-wise and pound-foolish concept imaginable: an oil import fee on crude oil and products. Lest you characterize my efforts here today—and those of my colleagues from the Northeast who have joined me in cosponsoring this resolution—as an attempt by the Northeast to avoid paying for its energy needs, I suggest that you consider the results of the study prepared by the Congressional Research Service on the dire impact on the economy if a $5 per barrel fee were to be imposed. The bottom line is that the effect of such a fee will reverberate throughout all sectors of our economy. No family will be spared the impact of the fee as the price of domestically produced crude oil rises to the level of the artificially priced imports. The price of gasoline and home heating oil will increase by 12 cents per gallon; residents will witness an increase in their electric utility costs of approximately $100 per month in some sections of our country.

The residual effect of a $5 per barrel tax is ominous—not only will the price of all petroleum products increase by 10 to 15 percent, but the already depressed housing industry will be devastated; the already ailing automobile industry will be devastated; the already distressed agriculture industry will be devastated. The list is endless.

In fact, many of those recipients of social security will have wiped out whatever benefits are protected by budget negotiators in this latest round of "revenue raising roulette." In addition, the CRS study estimates that a $5 tax will cause unemployment to rise by another 96,000 workers in 1984; real gross national product will decline by 1.4 percent; and inflation to increase by 1.5 percent in 1984. All this is expected to occur while domestic oil producers are reaping another $10 to $15 billion in additional net profits.

One of the most telling statistics, however, in this high-risk game of chance is that with a $5 per barrel tax, the Federal deficit will be reduced by $4 to $9 billion in fiscal year 1984. It may, however, increase the deficit by $5 billion in fiscal year 1985, as the economy slows down as a direct result of Uncle Sam's self-imposed "oil shock."

Mr. Speaker, it is painfully obvious that there are available more progressive, more efficient revenue-raising options.

The cosponsors of this measure find it unconscionable to levy this tax on our economy and thus on the consumers of this Nation; particularly while they are enduring the present economic situation.

Therefore, I hope that Members from all regions of the country will realize the wisdom of this resolution. Send a message to the President before he comes up here later this month for the state of the Union address and proposes this nonsense. Send a message to the administration and Members of Congress who are feverishly drafting a budget plan that we oppose this foolishness, and cosponsor the resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE REVITALIZATION ACT, H.R. 13

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, January 3, 1983, I introduced H.R. 13, the Defense Industrial Base Revitalization

Act. The bill is identical to H.R. 5540 as reported by the Banking Committee last May. For more information about our committee's action I refer my colleagues to House Report 97-530, parts II and III.

Although the committee-reported bill was debated on the House floor and some amendments were adopted, I chose to reintroduce the unamended version in this Congress. I think that it is not necessary for the committee to go back to square 1 to judge the merits of this proposal: the hearing record that was developed during the 97th Congress sufficiently supports the need for the bill.

The Banking Committee should consider the amendments offered by our colleagues, as well as those that were going to be offered, to determine how H.R. 13 should be improved. And then I would urge prompt referral of the legislation to the full House for speedy passage.

I supported a number of the adopted amendments and would urge their inclusion again. But the Banking Committee can consider also the numerous other amendments to H.R. 5540 that were pending and help expedite further consideration when this proposal comes before the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Industrial Base Revitalization Act in the 97th Congress had an impressive list of bipartisan cosponsors as well as an equally impressive list of supporting groups representing labor, business, education, defense, manufacturing, mining and mineral sectors of the economy. I expect to see the same support rally behind H.R. 13.

This bill should be recognized for its merits. It is an economic stimulus program; it is a jobs program; it is a defense program; it is a skills training program; and, it would use more effectively funds from the national defense function of the budget to accomplish its objectives.

I invite my cosponsors of H.R. 5540 to rejoin me in sponsoring H.R. 13 and I invite those of my colleagues who were not on that bill to get on board this year. The country needed this legislation last year, but it is even more critical now.●

INFORMATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1983

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the "Information Science and Technology Act of 1983." Joining me as cosponsors of this bill are the chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, DON FUQUA, and DOUG WALGREN, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology in the 97th Congress. This proposed legislation is an updated version of a bill I introduced in the 97th Congress, H.R. 3137. In May and June of 1981, the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, on which I serve, held hearings on the bill. The subcommittee's recommendations and an analysis of the hearings prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) are available through the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology.

Since I introduced this legislation 2 years ago, the computer has continued to gain importance in our society. Last week, for the first time ever, Time magazine chose a machine, the computer, to be "Man of the Year." During these last few years, many people have devoted a great deal of time and effort to determine the best mechanism for developing an information policy. At the request of the Science and Technology Committee and other committees, the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) recently completed several studies on informational technology and public policy issues. These studies include "Informational Technology and Its Impact on American Education," "Computer-Based National Information Systems: Technology and Public Policy Issues," and "Implications of Electronic Mail and Message Systems for the U.S. Postal Service." The hearings, the OTA reports, and the continued rapid advances in information science and technology have convinced me that the United States must strive to develop a coherent information policy.

The Institute for Information Policy and Research, as established by the bill I am introducing today, is one of several alternatives for creating a forum for the development of a comprehensive information policy. The Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology is soliciting suggestions for other means to achieve the same goal. I would like to thank those experts who have already provided comments on this subject. My purpose in reintroducing this bill in an essentially unmodified form is to provide a vehicle for continued discussion. Mr. Speaker, I welcome any comments on the general goal of the best means to develop an information policy and on the particular approach outlined in this bill. When we have gathered those comments together, we will be revising this bill and proposing other legislation as necessary and appropriate.

I would like to include here an excerpt from the subcommittee's recommendations following the hearings on H.R. 3137. These recommendations demonstrate the increasing need for an information policy as we advance into the "information age."

RECOMMENDATIONS ON H.R. 3137

(NOTE.—Excerpt from "Report Prepared by the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, for the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology. Transmitted to the Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives. Ninety-seventh Congress, Second Session. Serial DD. June 1982.")

The United States is continuing a rapid transition from an economy based on industrial production to one based increasingly on information products and services. Information and the ability to access it quickly and reliably is becoming a vital source of political and economic power. The products of microelectronics technology now permeate virtually every aspect of commercial and industrial activity, and the importance of microelectronics is manifest not only in the dollar value of information products and services themselves, but also in the central role played by information technology in increasing productivity and promoting innovation in other sectors of industry and commerce.

Important as these economic consequences are, the impact of the Information Revolution will also be felt in many ways that are difficult to measure in dollars and cents. Decisions about development and applications of information technology will have a major influence on the pattern and quality of American life for many years to come.

The Information Revolution is rooted largely in American scientific and technological leadership, but foreign governments have been quick to recognize the economic and social challenges posed by the transition to the information age. A number of our major trading partners have responded with active programs designed not only to enhance their competitive positions in international trade, but also to train their citizens in the effective use of information technology. The stakes are high in this information game, and we ignore at our peril the importance which our competitors now ascribe to their information industries and to the development of widespread computer literacy in their societies.

UNITED STATES RESPONSE TO THE INFORMATION REVOLUTION

From the testimony received on H.R. 3137 and on the broader issues prompting its introduction, it is clear that the Federal Government is having a difficult time developing a coherent strategic view of how our transition to an information society should take place. A consensus on the proper scope of "national information policy" does not yet exist in this country. The important contribution of commercial and not-for-profit enterprises, combined with the Government's inclination to defer to the marketplace in information activities, requires a unique approach to policy development in the United States. However, there appear to be at least three major problems in the present decentralized approach to information issues:

1. Lack of coordination among agencies charge with information responsibilities and between the public and private sectors;

2. Inadequate attention at high levels to the broad changes in many economic, technical and social sectors which may be triggered by information technology; and

3. Lack of investment of human or financial resources to insure that our Nation makes best use of new technological devel-

opments both domestically and in our competitive trade position.

COORDINATION

Responsibility for Federal research, development, and policy activities concerned with information is widely dispersed throughout the Executive Branch, and there appears to be no adequate mechanism for developing and promoting an integrated approach. This inadequacy is most obvious in the areas of international information policymaking; scientific and technical information (STI); and the general question of public and private sector interaction.

In each of these areas what appears to be lacking is a systematic approach to information technology and its uses which could assemble and focus the collective insights of different agencies and the private sector, and plug them into the policymaking process. It is particularly difficult to provide objective analyses of long-range concerns under the present institutional and bureaucratic constraints within which agencies deal with their various portions of information policy. In the absence of a strong coordinating mechanism, important decisions with great potential impact are sometimes made with little or no involvement of groups with relevant expertise. For example, the recent landmark settlements made by the Justice Department with AT&T and with IBM were made with virtually no contribution from the Federal information and telecommunications policymaking apparatus.

HIGH-LEVEL ATTENTION TO INFORMATION CONCERNS

Information is part of the life blood of any institution or organization. There is a strong tendency to take information and the tools used to process it for granted, and to think of them as ancillary to the real business at hand. Nowhere is this more apparent than at the high levels of the United States Government, where officials, beset with performance demands and operating with diminishing resources, have generally not accorded a high priority to information issues.

The United States is probably unique among developed nations in not having any clearly designated Cabinet-level official with primary responsibility for information and communications issues. Given this situation, it is essential that leadership in information issues be forthcoming from the agencies and individuals with statutory or designated responsibilities in these areas. The Congress should make clear to high-level officials with these responsibilities that it regards the development and application of information technology as an issue deserving high priority.

RESOURCE LEVELS

Although the Subcommittee acknowledges the need for budget stringency, it has serious concern about underinvestment in precisely those areas which have most promise of yielding great future economic returns. Information products and services represent one of the fastest growing areas of the United States economy, and our future economic success and national security depend heavily on the continuing development and application of new microelectronic technology. The long-term consequences of deep budget cuts in this area, including in particular the loss to key Government agencies of highly skilled policy professionals, will be to weaken our ability to adapt and use the fruits of the Information Revolution.

SUMMARY

Information and communications technologies are still in a rapid stage of development, and this development will be a dominant feature of the next decade. Ensuring the efficient and humane use of this technology raises many difficult public policy issues. Existing mechanisms appear to be incapable of generating and sustaining the kind of government-private sector cooperation that is essential to maintain United States leadership in world information markets and to maximize the potential benefits of microelectronics and communications technologies. The Subcommittee believes that rapid improvements are needed.

Mr. Speaker, there are several ways to approach the issues summarized above. The "Information Science and Technology Act of 1983" addresses these issues in the following manner.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Information and communication technologies are still in a stage of rapid development, and this development will be a dominant feature of the coming decade. The Information Science and Technology Act establishes an Institute for Information Policy and Research, with a lifespan of 10 years. This independent institute in the executive branch would be a transitional mechanism to facilitate our Nation's evolution toward a society based increasingly on information products and services. This mechanism would make possible cooperative interests, and State and local governments, for the productive and humane use of information technology in the workplace, school and home.

The independence of the Institute would allow it a broad and integrated perspective on such issues as institutional structure and regulatory policy, a perspective not subject to the political or bureaucratic constraints on the several dispersed agencies now concerned with information issues. As structured in this legislation, the Institute would not be engaged in hardware research and development, nor would it have any regulatory authority. Its primary purpose would be to provide a focal point for policy research and analysis and a forum for consideration of the information interests of government, business and education. The Institute would be governed by a 15-member National Information Science and Technology Board representing all functions involved in information generation and transfer, and administered by a Director. It would be concerned with conducting policy options, and proposing goals and methods in support of policy development for scientific and technical R & D; dissemination of scientific and technical information; international information issues; regulatory issues; and impacts of information technology on education and training needs and on the work force. The Office of Policy Analysis and Development of NTIA would be transferred to the Institute, and other policy research and analysis programs which are of overall national important and transcend particular agency missions may be transferred.

The bill requires close coordination between the Institute and other agencies, including the National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce. Appropriations of $6, $8, and $10 million are authorized for fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986 respectively.

Title II of the bill establishes the position of Special Assistant for Information Technology and Science Information in the Office of Science and Technology Policy. The Special Assistant would be a member of the Board of the Institute and would have responsibility for coordinating the Institute functions with other agencies of the executive branch and with assisting the Director of OSTP in formulating policy on information technology and on scientific information.

(For further details about the bill, I refer you to my introductory statement for H.R. 3137 in the Congressional Record of April 8, 1981.)

Mr. Speaker, Congress must move quickly to address some of the important concerns arising from the information revolution. A concerted effort is needed, and I look forward to working with other Members and other committees to meet the legislative challenges presented by these exciting new advances.

National information policies will evolve whether answers are arrived at consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or haphazardly. The question is whether our Government, and Congress in particular, will be foresighted enough to take a considered and coordinated approach. I hope and believe that Congress will, and I invite my colleagues to join me in working to make that hope a reality.●

ASSISTANCE FOR UNEMPLOYED TEENAGERS

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced a bill today that will provide assistance for unemployed teenagers. According to the latest U.S. Department of Labor statistics, there are 12 million people out of work today, representing 10.8 percent of our work force. The teenage unemployment rate is better than twice that amount at 24.2 percent, and for black teenagers, the rate is a devastating 50.1 percent. While the overall unemployment rate for white teenagers has inched up gradually, the rate for black teenagers has grown in quantum leaps—from 10 percent in 1948 to over 50 percent today. This racial disparity is obviously becoming more acute, and many economists agree that we can expect even worse in the immediate future.

A basic law of economics is that the quantity of labor demanded is inversely related to the wage rate. When a minimum wage is established at a level above one that would be determined by market forces, employment opportunities are restricted for the least productive workers by pricing their services out of the market. The resulting higher labor costs may exceed the value of some workers' services, causing disemployment among these workers. Indeed, the minimum wage may benefit those workers who retain their jobs at the higher wage, but those who lose their jobs or are not hired at all clearly are made worse off. Some un-

employed workers may seek jobs in uncovered sectors, where minimum wage laws pose no barriers to employment, but in so doing, increase the supply of labor, exerting downward pressure on wage rates in those areas. In addition, as coverage has expanded, fewer jobs have become available in uncovered sectors for displaced workers to turn to.

Surely everyone can agree that there is a serious youth unemployment problem, contributing to crime rates and growth in welfare rolls, and that something must be done. There is, indeed, one obvious step we can take to attack teenage unemployment without embarking on an expensive Government jobs program. We can enact a youth opportunity wage. This legislation would allow youths of 19 years and under to be paid at 85 percent of the minimum wage for the initial year of this employment. After this training period, such employees would be paid at least the full minimum wage.

The Federal minimum wage has been extolled as a moral effort to assure every worker a decent wage. In reality, it prices many low-skilled workers out of the job market, and hits hardest at the teenage worker who is likely to be low-skilled because of age, immaturity, and lack of job experience. Most people assume that minimum wage benefits accrue to the needy, yet the Minimum Wage Study Commission's report reveals that less than one-third of an increase in the minimum wage would go to families with pre-tax earnings of $10,000 or less.

A youth opportunity wage would encourage private employment, with its hopes of job permanence. In fact, studies have shown that a 15 percent wage differential would create a minimum of 170,000 jobs at the current unemployment rate. Also, contrary to the arguments of some, experience in other nations with a youth differential indicates that older workers would not be displaced. Rather, business would be encouraged to retain the marginal, entry level jobs that would otherwise be lost in times of high unemployment or as the minimum wage increases. And this initiative would not cost the taxpayers a dime. Instead, it would save money as we move young people into the productive labor force.

Mr. Speaker, America's young people are anxious and willing to work, but without a youth opportunity wage, teenagers will continue to bear the burden of high unemployment.●

ENDING THE VIOLENCE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, a problem that is a continuous source of concern to Americans and indeed to people all over the world, is the unending violence in Northern Ireland. Every few weeks we are treated to a new report of innocent civilians killed and injured by the terrorist activities or reactions by British troops. I had the opportunity to travel to Northern Ireland last year as part of a delegation from the Friends of Ireland, and I saw first hand the terrible destruction, both to property and human life, that has resulted. That experience left me with a firm belief that we in Congress must do all we can to help alleviate this situation.

Today I am reintroducing two resolutions that I introduced shortly after my visit to Ireland last year. They propose measures that, if carried out, would be important steps toward breaking the cycle of violence that is currently gripping Northern Ireland.

The first resolution calls upon the British Government to create and enforce a ban on the Ulster Defense Association, or U.D.A. The U.D.A., which was formed in 1972, is the largest terrorist organization in Northern Ireland; it is currently estimated to have a membership of about 10,000. Several sources in Ireland have estimated that the U.D.A., along with other loyalist organizations, are responsible for at least 600 deaths, many of them sectarian murders. It is also involved in bomb making and gun running, and many of its mambers have been jailed for these and other serious crimes. It has also organized and participated in several general strikes designed to undermine peace efforts and intimidate those who support such efforts. Despite British suggestions that the U.D.A. is a political organization, U.D.A. members have openly admitted that they are a military body dedicated to terrorizing their opponents.

No one would deny that the existence and activities of terrorist organizations are a major factor in the atmosphere of violence that now pervades Northern Ireland, and that the violence can never be contained as long as such organizations are allowed to operate freely. For this reason the British Government has, justifiably, banned other terrorist groups such as the Irish Republican Army, the Irish National Liberation Army, the Ulster Volunteer Force, and the Red Hand. Indeed, the British policy is to ban any republican organization, no matter how small, as soon as it turns to violence. Yet a group that openly proclaims itself to be a terrorist organization is allowed openly to organize, raise money, and recruit new members. British authorities argue that if the U.D.A. were banned, members would be forced underground, where they would commit covert crimes, and that allowing the U.D.A. to remain legal allows identification of U.D.A. members who may be involved in illegal activities. But is this is true, why is the same policy not applied to other terrorist organizations?

The failure to ban the U.D.A. contributes to the violence not only because it allows its members to operate with impunity, but also because it creates suspicion and resentment among members of the Catholic minority. It leads to an image of partiality and selectivity in British enforcement policy in which security forces are seen to concentrate excessively on activities of Catholic groups while ignoring those of the U.S.D. Peace can never come to Northern Ireland unless justice is seen to be exercised in a fair and impartial manner. A ban on the U.D.A., as called for in my resoltuion, would be an opportunity for the British Government to show a commitment to such fairness.

The second resolution I am introducing today calls upon the British Government to ban the use of plastic and rubber bullets against civilians in Northern Ireland. Both of these bullets were introduced into Northern Ireland by British forces for the purpose of crowd control. The rubber bullet is designed to be fired short of a crowd and to bounce against the crowd's shins and thighs. Over 56,000 of them were used between 1970 and 1975, when their use was halted because of an unacceptable serious injury rate. The plastic bullet has been used as a replacement since then, despite the fact that it has a far higher death and injury rate than rubber bullets. According to British Army instructions for their use, plastic bullets are designed to be fired at selected persons rather than indiscriminately at crowds, and to be aimed so as to directly strike the lower part of the body, rather than be bounced off the ground. Despite the fact that they are supposed to be used only in limited circumstances, over 36,000 of them have been fired; and despite the Army guidelines, they have often been aimed at the upper part of the body.

To date, 11 persons have been killed by plastic bullets and more than 160 have been seriously injured, with injuries ranging from bruises and lacerations to broken bones, brain damage, and several cases of blindness. Many of the victims were children; many had not been involved in any sort of riot or protest. A 14-year-old girl was killed while returing home from a local shop in an area where witnesses

had seen no rioting taking place, a 39-year-old man was killed in his kitchen when a plastic bullet came through the window.

Although the British Home Secretary last year described these bullets as lethal, British authorities in Northern Ireland have indicated that they will continue to use them as a security measure. Many groups in Ireland and Great Britain have called for a change in this policy, and in May 1982 the European Parliament passed a resolution calling for an end to the use of plastic bullets against civilians by members of the European Community. I hope that Congress will add its voice to theirs and that this will persuade the British Government to reconsider its use of these deadly weapons.

All of us here in Congress, and all of our constituents, would like to see an end to the destruction and violence in Northern Ireland. We would like to see an end to the bitterness and mistrust that has prevented the people of Northern Ireland from finding a solution to their problems. I hope that my colleagues will join me in sponsoring two resolutions that could encourage the British Government to take steps that could lead to a reduction in that mistrust and violence and thus contribute to a peaceful resolution of the situation in Northern Ireland.

H. CON. RES. 25

Concurrent resolution calling upon the Government of the United Kingdom to ban the use of plastic and rubber bullets against civilians

Whereas a delegation of United States Congressmen representing the "Friends of Ireland" traveled to Ireland, visiting Dublin, Belfast, and Derry between May 29 and June 2, 1982;

Whereas serious concern about the continued use of plastic bullets by British security forces was strongly expressed to this delegation;

Whereas the delegation was disappointed by the negative response of the British authorities to their representations on the use of plastic bullets in Northern Ireland;

Whereas the European Parliament has voted overwhelmingly in favor of a ban on the use of plastic bullets against civilians in the member states of the European Community;

Whereas in recent years eleven people, many of them children under fifteen, have been killed in Northern Ireland by plastic bullets fired by British security forces and over one hundred and sixty people have sustained injuries, including brain damage, loss of eyes, and total blindness;

Whereas all of the injuries have been suffered by civilians, many of them in nonriot situations;

Whereas according to official statistics from the Northern Ireland administration thirty-six thousand plastic bullets have been used in Northern Ireland, of which approximately twenty-six thousand were used during the first seven months of 1981;

Whereas the British Home Secretary has described plastic bullets as "lethal";

Whereas in serious rioting last year in fourteen British cities, during which gasoline bombs and other potentially lethal missiles were used against police, plastic bullets were not used in any instance; and

Whereas the use of plastic bullets in the United Kingdom has been restricted to Northern Ireland alone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress condemns the use of plastic or rubber bullets in Northern Ireland and calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to ban the use of plastic or rubber bullets against civilians.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President for the purpose of informing the Government of the United Kingdom.

H. CON. RES. 26

Concurrent resolution calling upon the Government of the United Kingdom to outlaw the Ulster Defense Association, its membership, activities, and any like terrorist organization

Whereas a delegation from the United States Congress representing the "Friends of Ireland" traveled to Ireland, visiting Dublin, Belfast, and Derry, from May 29 to June 2, 1982;

Whereas serious concern was expressed to the delegation about the continued unchecked operations of the Ulster Defense Association;

Whereas the Ulster Defense Association is the largest paramilitary organization in Northern Ireland;

Whereas the Ulster Defense Association has clearly shown itself to be a terrorist organization responsible for the murder of innocent civilians, bombings in the Irish Republic, and for the illegal importation and stockpiling of arms;

Whereas over four hundred members of the Ulster Defense Association have been jailed for serious offenses and some of these have been members of the Ulster Defense Regiment which is an integral part of the security forces in Northern Ireland;

Whereas the Ulster Defense Association is allowed to operate openly in Northern Ireland, to recruit members and to raise funds, despite its crimes against the people of Northern Ireland; and

Whereas the Ulster Defense Association and other loyalist terrorist organizations have been responsible for more than six hundred deaths in Northern Ireland: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress condemns all acts of violence in Northern Ireland and calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to outlaw the Ulster Defense Association, its membership, activities, and any like terrorist organization.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President for the purpose of informing the Government of the United Kingdom.●

REPEAL THE 1975 METRIC CONVERSION ACT

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to repeal the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 and eliminate the unnecessary and detrimental programs which have been needlessly advanced as a result of the 1975 law.

Last year, the 97th Congress took a very positive step in agreeing with the President's decision to eliminate all funding for the U.S. Metric Board, one of the agencies authorized in the 1975 law. This action effectively closed down the Metric Board, but it did not halt all Federal activities aimed at the promotion or imposition of metric conversion.

Perhaps the most damaging result of the 1975 Metric Act was the endless confusion and cost it laid on the backs of the private sector and the American people.

Many Americans were led to believe that passage of the Metric Conversion Act, as the title implies, meant it was the policy of the United States to begin mandatory conversion to metric. Businesses began to wonder how soon they would be required to change their product sizes, their tools, their equipment and building materials, and the many millions of transactions they make dependent on a consistent system of weights and measures since almost every activity in this country is based on our customary, or inch-based, system used predominantly over the two centuries of our Nation's existence.

And no wonder our citizens were confused. Most of the conversion activity was being initiated in the Federal Government itself, not the private sector. Almost immediately after the 1975 law was passed, Federal agencies provoked widespread public opposition by trying to impose metric on highway signs, weather reporting, marketing beverages and other products, school materials, and so on.

All of this Federal activity was brewing, yet the fact remains that all of this conversion was supposed to be voluntary. The 1975 law itself said conversion was strictly voluntary, and the clear intent of Congress in writing the legislation was to make it optional—to leave it to the discretion of private industry, not a bunch of bureaucrats here in Washington.

But the 1975 law was entirely unnecessary because the policy of the United States, as set back in 1866, declares that our Nation maintains a dual system of customary and metric measurement as dictated by the needs and desires of the private sector.

Nothing in the 1975 law should have changed that policy. But the result has been the creation of all kinds of federally sponsored programs, and regulatory actions, aimed at encouraging and in effect imposing metric as the sole system.

The bottom line of this issue is that the American people are strongly

against changing measurement systems, and certainly are opposed to any sort of mandatory efforts by our Government to impose metric.

Further, it is neither the proper role nor responsibility of our Government to promote or encourage one system of measurement. Our private sector—small and large businesses, land surveyors, grocers, engineers, carpenters, teachers, and so forth—is fully capable of making this choice. So far, the widespread success and usage of our customary measurements—inches, pounds, gallons, et cetera—indicate the preference of the majority of our citizens. If it is in the interests of certain sectors to use metric, those industries can make that choice without the prodding of the Government.

Congress, which has the authority for determining national policy on weights and measures as stated in our constitution, has never authorized our Federal Government to impose metric measurement in any manner, and I believe it would be unwise for this body to ever do so.

The U.S. Metric Board, while no longer receiving Federal funds or operating, is still authorized by the 1975 law, and metrication activities continue to be pursued by some agencies, particularly the Department of Commerce, which issue regulations and guidelines directly affecting American private industry, as a result of the misleading 1975 law.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the legislation I am offering today to repeal the 1975 Metric Conversion Act and set forth a clear policy of weights and measures in the United States.

H.R. 674

A bill to repeal the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (U.S.C. 205a et seq.)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Metric Conversion Repeal Act of 1983".

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) the majority of the American people do not favor conversion from customary United States weights and measures to the metric system, despite United States involvement as an original signatory party to the 1875 Convention—Weights and Measures (20 Stat. 709), and the fact that voluntary use of metric measurement standards in the United States has been authorized by law since 1866 (Act of July 28, 1866; 14 Stat. 339);

(2) the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205a et seq.) has conveyed to the American public and to the business community the erroneous impression that United States conversion to the metric system is national policy, which it is not;

(3) no country in the world has converted its economy to the international system of units (SI), the wavelength-based metric system adopted by the General Conference of Weights and Measures in 1960 and cited as the optional system of metric measurement in the Metric Conversion Act of 1975;

(4) the United States Metric Board, created by the Metric Conversion Act of 1975, is an unnecessary promotional vehicle within the Federal Government, authorized to use the resources and power of the Government to influence and encourage conversion to the metric system throughout the United States in violation of the intent of Congress;

(5) Federal bureaucratic imposition of metric conversion has been fostered by the United States Metric Board's ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metric Policy (ICMP), which has promulgated Federal metric policy and guidelines (Federal Register, January 8, 1980), instructing all Federal agencies to implement increasing metric usage through Government procurement, contracting, and other policy initiatives in violation of the intent of Congress;

(6) several Federal departments and agencies have provoked widespread public opposition by attempting to impose use of metric measurement on highway signs, in weather reporting, in marketing beverages and other products, through school curriculum materials, and through internal departmental or agency guidelines, also not in keeping with the intent of Congress that use of metric measurement by any sector in the United States be strictly voluntary, as provided under the 1866 statute, and not imposed by the Federal Government;

(7) according to an exhaustive study by the Comptroller General of the United States, the cost and disruption of metric conversion to the American people would be enormous, while the purported benefits of such conversion are nonexistent or questionable in practically every area;

(8) there is no evidence that a solely metric system would be better for the United States economy, and United States economic activity and world trade have not been hampered or injured by a dual system of customary and metric measurement according to the Comptroller General's report;

(9) standardization and rationalization of measurements, and other purported benefits ascribed to metric measurement, have occurred throughout the world under the customary system without metric conversion;

(10) the United States Metric Board has failed to assist the public to become familiar with the meaning and applicability of metric measures in daily life, and has failed to coordinate metric conversion initiated in the private sector involving private industry and the Federal Government, two of its three responsibilities required by law;

(11) it is in the interests of the United States to eliminate Federal Government entities or programs, such as those continuing and expanding beyond the intent of Congress under the Metric Conversion Act of 1975, when it is clear that such entities or programs are detrimental or unnecessary to public need; and

(12) voluntary conversion to metric measurements, if desired by private industry, can be adequately assisted by privately funded organizations such as the American National Metric Council (ANMC).

(b) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States—

(1) to continue a dual system of customary and metric measurement in the United States, as dictated by the needs and desires of the private sector, and to end Federal Government promotion or imposition of metric conversion;

(2) to pursue a vigorous effort to avoid wherever possible undue or harmful socio-economic effects of Federal Government programs or actions, such as those needlessly imposed by efforts being advanced under the Metric Conversion Act of 1975; and

(3) to eliminate Federal Government entities or programs that would cause undue socioeconomic effects, or whose existence or objectives are not supported or needed by the American people.

REPEAL OF METRIC CONVERSION

SEC. 3. The Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205a et seq.) is repealed.●

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION ACT OF 1983

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, our national economy is in deep trouble and there are no clear signs of improvement. Unemployment is at the highest level since the thirties. Federal budget deficits have reached levels almost beyond comprehension and they continue to grow. Factory utilization has not been so low since the Great Depression. The agriculture, steel, automobile, and housing industries, which in the past have provided the foundation of our industrial strength, are suffering from a prolonged depression. The U.S. share of world exports has declined in the past two decades while the portion of our domestic market captured by imported goods has risen. We have strayed off the course of economic prosperity.

We must act now to restore economic growth and regain economic security.

The causes of our present economic difficulties are many and complex. Some of the problems have been developing for more than a decade and some are the result of recent shortsighted policies. There are fundamental changes taking place in the world economy, changes to which we have been slow to respond. International trade is becoming an increasingly important part of the world economy. Our economic leadership in the past has resulted in large part from our lead in technology and industrial innovation. Now other countries are realizing the important role that technological developments will play in the coming decades. Other nations, such as Japan and France, are using targeted research and development plans to challenge the United States in markets of both mature industries and high-technology industries. This fundamental change in the world economy forces us to establish new policies for both the short term and the long term to insure that the United States remains competitive in the world economy.

New policies in a number of areas will be needed in order to establish a comprehensive economic program. Three important areas for new policies are investment in people, investment in new technologies, and economic cooperation. Throughout the 96th and 97th Congresses, the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, on which I serve, has been considering the need for changes in these areas through our study on the crucial issues of innovation and productivity. Hearings have covered science and math education, engineering manpower needs, patent policy, Federal laboratory utilization, the Government's role in industrial innovation by high-technology small businesses, a focusing point for technology through a foundation, university-industry relations, and several other areas. A number of other subcommittees have also been holding hearings on these issues.

Through these hearings, we have learned that a precondition for innovation is a work force that is adequately educated and trained to function in our technological society. We have also learned that new technologies are essential both to make basic industries competitive and to expand opportunities in high-technology growth industries. We now realize that economic cooperation is required to provide an environment in which private enterprise can flourish in both the short and long term. The many hearings on innovation and productivity have made it clear that current efforts of the Federal Government to provide technically trained workers and to facilitate technology development are fragmented and are too small to provide a focus for a national economy in which innovation can thrive.

Today, I am introducing the National Technology Foundation Act of 1983, a bill designed to correct some of the problems we have found in these essential areas. The bill would establish a National Technology Foundation to facilitate the advance of technology, technological innovation, technology utilization, and the supply of technological manpower for the improvement of the national well-being. It is a revised version of H.R. 3749 introduced in the 97th Congress and H.R. 6910 introduced in the 96th Congress. Joining me as cosponsors are DOUG WALGREN, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, Science, and Technology, and MERV DYMALLY.

Responsibility for technology-related programs is now scattered throughout the Federal Government.

The programs which this bill would consolidate in a single agency might, in theory, be adequately supported in their current homes, the Department of Commerce and the National Science Foundation. This has not been the case. Support has been modest at best and even at their best they still suffer the fractionation of being in several agencies. I am reserving judgment on which course of action is best, consolidation in a new agency or strengthening in existing agencies. The bill to establish a National Technology Foundation is a vehible by which we can continue to focus the discussion of alternatives.

WHY A NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION

The population of the world is growing inexorably while its resources are inexorably being consumed. Only if there are continual major improvements in technology can the world provide for its inhabitants. By improved technology I mean not only the development of hardware but also the better organization of society to assist in the efficient use of technology, the Foundation would support development of the requisite knowledge base, the resources of high-quality manpower, high-technology small business, the promotion of technology transfer for appropriate civilian utilization and stimulation for entry into the stream of commerce, the establishment of technological standards, and the long-range planning and forecasting needed for each of these areas. In short, the Foundation would be a focal point for all that technology embodies.

While the U.S. Government has adopted a largely laissez faire attitude toward international trade in high-technology items—other than military hardware—governments in other countries—most notably Japan—have planned and provided a national atmosphere in which both technology development and the export of high-technology products are carefully nurtured.

These efforts have often been highly successful. Their products can be seen on our roads, in our homes, and in our factories and offices. The international balance of trade has been unfavorable to the United States for several years. It is likely that without a coherent and more vigorous Federal policy of technology development and promotion, the United States will not be able to compete effectively in future world trade. The National Technology Foundation would provide a focus for technology development and movement into the stream of commerce. I will soon be introducing additional legislation directed specifically at the immediate need for a forum where government, industry, and university representatives can meet to identify and establish development plans for specific economically strategic technologies.

High-technology industries have been responsible for the creation of a higher share of new jobs than low-technology industries, and the development of new jobs than low-technology industries, and the development of new technologies promises relief from the current unacceptable levels of unemployment.

The profession that takes knowledge and converts it into the design of products and processes is engineering. In the Federal Government, engineering has been overshadowed by science. Moreover, there is a shortage of engineers in the country today at all levels of training, including a shortage of the most educated, who will be needed to train future generation. Among other things, the National Technology Foundation would recognize the importance of engineering and help harness its potential.

THE SPECIFIC NEEDS ADDRESSED BY THE NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION

Links between the generation of knowledge and its use need to be strengthened. The National Technology Foundation would help tie science to useful applications.

The United States needs to insure that an adequate supply of technological manpower, training or educational institutions, facilities, and equipment is available to it. Otherwise, the manpower problem is likely to become even more severe as our industrial base grows to include more high-technology industries. The National Technology Foundation would provide this necessary planning.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The National Technology Foundation would be an independent agency with eight main branches for, first, small business; second, institutional and manpower development; third, technology policy and analysis; fourth, intergovernmental technology; fifth engineering; sixth, national (problem focused) programs; seventh, National Bureau of Standards; and, eighth, Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service. The agency would have programs transferred from NSF and from the Department of Commerce.

The National Technology Foundation Act incorporates the two main features of Public Law 96-480, passed with bipartisan support of the 96th Congress by putting the Office of Industrial Technology functions of Public Law 96-480 into the technology policy and analysis branch of the Foundation and putting the responsibility for the support of centers for Industrial Technology in the institutional and manpower development branch.

The governance of the Foundation would be handled by a Director and a National Technology Board patterned in organization, but not composition, after the National Science Board. Key functions of the Board would be to establish the policies of the Foundation and review the Foundation's budget and programs. The Director would have all powers not assigned to the Board and would be assisted by a deputy and eight assistants, one for each branch.

The bill requires close coordination between the National Technology foundation and other agencies, particularly the National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce. The National Technology Foundation and the National Science Foundation are to have interlocking directorates.

The bill contains authorizations for fiscal years 1984 ($480 million), 1985 ($670 million), and 1986 ($875 million). In each year, the eight branches plus an "other purposes" category each have a line item. Each branch grows over the 3 years of authorization.

For further information about the bill, I refer you to my introductory statement for H.R. 3749 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1981.

SUMMARY

The concept of a National Technology Foundation grows out of continuing study of innovation and productivity by the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology. This study, over the course of the 96th and 97th Congresses, has demonstrated the importance of new technologies in creating new jobs and contributing to economic growth. It has also revealed a clear need for the Federal Government to improve its programs in support of technology. The consolidation and enhancement of existing fragmented programs in a National Technology Foundation is an alternative deserving careful consideration, especially now when we urgently need to rebuild and revitalize the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome any comments on, or support for, this legislation.●

SANTA ANA NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to recognize the contributions and achievements of the Santa Ana Neighborhood Organization. Since its inception in 1976, SANO's members have worked diligently and successfully to upgrade the housing and improve the quality of living for thousands of Santa Ana families.

A nonprofit, grassroots organization, SANO represents 13 low- and moderate-income neighborhoods within the city of Santa Ana. These neighborhoods comprise approximately one-fourth of the city's total area and roughly 10,000 families.

SANO has successfully attacked the problems of overcrowding, high crime and unsafe housing in Santa Ana by energetically pursuing public works and community development funds and encouraging neighborhood residents to take a greater part in the public policy process. The key to their success has been the organization's dedicated members as well as the enthusiasm of the neighbors themselves. Those without previous experience in civic participation were quickly trained to develop the necessary confidence to speak before a city council or to articulate at other forums the pressing needs of one's family home.

The list of SANO's accomplishments attests to its great success. To cite just a few examples, I would mention, first, their input to all phases of the city's general plan revision; second, the reinvestment of at least $7.7 million in capital improvements such as storm drains, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and street lighting; third, the preservation of scarce housing stock by the relocation of 25 homes into lower income areas, thus averting condemnation after eminent domain for public use of land was declared; fourth, rezoning to save at least 89 homes from future redevelopment which the residents had not seen as essential to economic development; fifth, 6 years of participation by all neighborhoods in the city's community development block grant hearings leading to major physical improvements; sixth, the initiation of a neighborhood housing services branch as funded in part by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corp.; and seventh, successfully petitioning the city to bring in a neighborhood preservation or integrity program with rehabilitation loans, grants, or rebates.

Most of these victories won on behalf of the 13 neighborhoods and the city as a whole would not have been possible without the leadership of SANO's current president and former vice president, Sam Romero. For several years, Sam has devoted endless hours to SANO's many projects. He is easily one of the most dedicated civic leaders I have ever had the pleasure to work with during my entire career in public service.

I would also like to acknowledge his fellow officers, and certainly the other members of SANO for their 6 years of fine service to this community. Together, they have created a model organization that any other community would be well-served to emulate. I am aware that today, SANO is as strong as ever and is looking forward to many more productive years.

Mr. Speaker, in recognizing SANO before you and my colleagues, I can happily report that the spirit and genius of our democratic principles are alive, well and at work in Santa Ana as a result of the constructive efforts of the Santa Ana Neighborhood Organizations.●

LET US GET AMERICA GOING AGAIN

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter last month from one of my constituents, James R. Perry, of Central City, Ky, Mr. Perry wrote to me about the need for the Congress to get America going again by making people aware of the severe difficulties America is facing resulting from imported products, from tax increases, from abuse in our Federal programs such as food stamps, and from unemployment. I believe that my colleagues, as we begin the 98th Congress, will be interested in his timely comments. The letter follows:

CENTRAL CITY, KY.

DEAR MR. HUBBARD: I received your newsletter for Nov. 10, 1982. It comes as no surprise to me that taxes will sky rocket again next year. I am 44 years of age and very aware of how the federal government operates. More of the same as always (lower taxes in one area, 10% paycheck deductions). You fellows on Capitol Hill will probably get away with it, because most of the people are not wise. If they were, we wouldn't allow this to happen again, and again, and again.

"Cigarettes and Telephone"—It matters little which or what it may be. You will find a way to tax it, and then have the nerve to tell us what a good and noble thing has been done.

"Food Stamps"—I am sick and tired of standing in line at the checkout line, seeing people dressed better who are buying better cuts of meat and then seeing them getting into their expensive cars. Many other people and I just try to make ends meet until our next pay day.

"Social Security"—I am sick of hearing the elected in Washington talk about promises and pledges, when they themselves do not pay one cent to Social Security. I could talk for hours but you would turn a deaf ear.

"Protect Yourself"—I don't need a lock on my door, because through the legal means of taxing and the high cost of trying, I have nothing for anyone to steal—sad but true.

"Unemployment"—If you would encourage the tax paying people (not government workers because for the most part we are in a mess) to buy American made products, instead of letting people stay blind to the fact that when they buy foreign made products, the middle man is the only one who gains. They buy their products cheap and sell at American made prices, simply because the margin of profit is higher.

I am sorry that my outlook is so bleak. But so long as you people, who have been educated out of your common sense, are allowed to run our country, I won't have much, if any, hope.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. PERRY.●

WHO PAYS AND WHO PROFITS

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, last August, the Congress enacted a law that will require banks and savings institutions to withhold taxes from the interest earned on the bank accounts of most Americans.

Taxpayers will not receive their interest and then pay the taxes themselves by April 15 of the following year. Instead, the banks will subtract the taxes on that interest income directly from the taxpayer's account.

In effect, banks and savings institutions will be collecting taxes for the Federal Government, just as employers collect taxes by withholding from their employees' paychecks.

While we are making this new imposition upon the individual taxpayers of this country, some of the largest banks that will be collecting these taxes are themselves making practically no contribution at all to the Federal Government.

Last year, for example, the very largest banks in this country paid an average of only about 3 percent of their income in Federal income taxes, according to a Joint Committee on Taxation study completed for Mr. PEASE of Ohio and myself.

Meanwhile, the average individual in this country has been paying over 14 percent.

In other words, American factory workers and file clerks have been bearing over four times the Federal tax load as have banks such as Chase Manhattan and BankAmerica on the average.

With the Federal Government facing massive deficits, do we now ask these banks to start paying their share? No. Instead we tell the individual taxpayers of this country that we are going to impose upon them further.

While these largest banks have been contributing very little, they have been getting more and more.

At this very moment, the Federal Government is spending millions to bail out many of these same big banks on the bad loans they have made to Communist countries, military dictators, and others.

I am not talking about every bank in this country. I am talking about the big ones like those included in our study who seem to think that the purpose of Government is to take from everyone else in order to provide a safety net for themselves.

Indeed our smaller community banks are not treated quite the same way. Many of these smaller banks will be burdened by this new law along with their depositors. Lacking the sophisticated computers of their big city counterparts, these smaller banks face a very large bookkeeping chore just to keep track of all this new withholding.

I am aware that some Americans are not reporting all of their interest income. But the big tax avoiders are not the people who are earning interest in savings banks. They are the highfliers who have very complicated financial arrangements.

The vast majority of Americans are honest. They are reporting their income. Yet these are the people whom we are going to burden more.

Mr. Speaker, the Government keeps taking more and more from those who have less and less. It requires less and less from those who have more and more. This is not progress. It is the road backward to the dark ages of human history.

Government means justice. The people of this country are willing to pay their share. But they expect everyone else to pay their share as well.

We should not be asking the people of this country to forgo even a small portion of their savings account interest, unless we first ask the banks to pay their own fair share as well.●

A QUESTION FOR ANDROPOV

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, the President's favorite columnist, George Will, makes a most appropriate suggestion concerning some unfinished business for President Reagan before undertaking a summit meeting with Yuri Andropov. I commend Mr. Will's column to the serious attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington, Post, Jan. 6, 1983]

A QUESTION FOR ANDROPOV: WHERE IS RAOUL WALLENBERG?

(By George F. Will)

The gauze of lies that the Soviet regime wraps around reality has never been thick enough to muffle this question: Where is Raoul Wallenberg?

Now it is asked again, in the wake of the most recent in a long series of tormenting reports. A Russian immigrant in Israel says that when he was hospitalized in 1972 on the way to prison, he met a man who "looked Jewish, so I asked who he was. He answered in accented Russian that he was Swedish and was there because he helped the Jews. He said his name was Raoul Wallenberg." That occurred a quarter of a century after 1947, the year the Kremlin says Wallenberg died.

Last May, when tardily releasing documents about the Wallenberg case, a Swedish official said, "We are working on the supposition that he is still alive." (Sweden's lethargy concerning the case—lethargy born of cowardice—hardly constitutes "working.") If alive, he is 70. It is 38 years since he disappeared from Hungary into the Soviet Union.

On Jan. 17, 1945, he was seized by Soviet forces that were "liberating" Hungary from their former allies, the Nazis. Three weeks later he was in the emblematic institution of the Soviet regime, Moscow's Lubyanka prison.

At 32, representing neutral Sweden, Wallenberg was in Budapest at America's request, working with breathtaking bravery and saving scores of thousands of Jews from Adolf Eichmann's final chapter of the "final solution," the destruction of Hungarian Jews. He bought buildings and draped them with Swedish flags as diplomatically protected territory. He dressed "Aryan-looking" Jewish men in SS uniforms to protect Jewish havens. He distributed fake passports, and used sheer audacity to intimidate Nazi soldiers into opening the doors of cattle cars. Thanks to him, the 120,000 Jews in Budapest were the most substantial Jewish community surviving in Europe when the war ended.

One certainty is that Andrei Gromyko died in the 1957 memorandum asserting that Wallenberg's "sojourn in the Soviet Union"—Gromyko's words—ended with a heart attack in prison in 1947. This memorandum came after 12 years of Kremlin denials that Wallenberg had ever been in Soviet hands. Gromyko cited the evidence of two Soviet functionaries, both conveniently dead, and said the body had been cremated—a transparent fabrication, given Soviet practices.

There has been a steady trickle of reports about Wallenberg, first from returning German prisoners of war, then from released political prisoners and Jewish emigrants. The reports give dates and places—prisons, cell numbers—that trace a tantalizing trail across the years and through the gulags.

For example, in 1961 a Soviet professor of medicine told a visiting Swedish physician that he had recently examined Wallenberg in a "mental hospital." In 1977 a Muscovite just released from the gulag called his daughter in Israel and mentioned meeting in a Moscow prison a Swede "who had served 30 years." Two years later the Muscovite was back in prison because, his wife said, he wrote a letter about Wallenberg. Sources in Eastern Europe report that in 1981 Wallenberg was moved to a prison hospital near Leningrad.

Why was he arrested in the first place? The Soviet machinery of brutality operates so automatically it leaves little room for, and certainly does not require much mind. But Soviet repressors certainly did not want brave witnesses to the breaking of Eastern Europe. Why was he kept? Perhaps, in part, to show contempt for Western disapproval. Why did Soviet troops using horses and ropes drag away the statue erected to him in Budapest in 1948? Because the Kremlin disapproved of what he did.

It is prudent that we insistently ask what happened when Wallenberg ended his dance of death with the Third Reich and fell into the hands of its moral twin. When the Soviet Union gets away with such acts—acts that are as contemptuous as they are contemptible—it gets the idea that it can unleash "yellow rain" and can shoot the pope with little to fear from the West's fitful disapproval.

Besides, if this case is not America's business, what is? On Oct. 5, 1981, Wallenberg became only the second person (Winston Churchill was the first) to be made an honorary American citizen.

Signing the bill conferring this honor, President Reagan said "we're going to do everything in our power" to locate Wallenberg. But we have not done that. So before Reagan agrees to meet with Yuri Andropov, he should receive an answer, beyond the routine mendacities, to this question: Where is Raoul Wallenberg?●

GEORGE STAVROS: OUTGOING PRESIDENT OF THE LOMITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a man who has been an outstanding member of his community, and a fine example for all citizens. George Stavros, whose term as president of the Lomita Chamber of Commerce will expire at the end of this month, has presided over one of the most active periods of the chamber in recent history. As president, George Stavros served with the same great care and interest that he has shown for years in his many community activities.

George Stavros has lived in our community since he joined his family in San Pedro after service in the famous "Rainbow Division" during the Second World War. George worked for DiCarlo Baking Co. for 16 years, before joining with his brother Mike in 1963 as partners in the Wayfarer Restaurant and Hot-N-Tot Restaurant, both in the city of Lomita.

In his early years here, George Stavros was active in organizing youth groups in the Greek community, and has sponsored San Pedro and Lomita softball and little league teams. He is a very active member of the South Bay Trojan Club, being an avid Trojan football fan and supporter of all U.S.C. sports programs. Currently a member of St. Katherine's Greek Orthodox Church of Redondo Beach, he served for 10 years on the church board, holding the office of president for 3½ years. He is a member of the Torrance Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and a member of the San Pedro Lodge of the Order of AHEPA (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Associations), where he has held various leadership positions, including serving as president for 4 years.

George Stavros has been a longtime member of the Lomita Chamber of Commerce, serving in various capacities over a number of years. His dedication and ability as president of the chamber will be missed when his term expires, but I am sure he will continue to be an asset to his community. My wife, Lee, and I join in expressing our appreciation to George Stavros, and wish him, his wife Helen, and their four sons, Michael, Steve, Tony, and Chris, nothing but the best in the many years ahead.

THE NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP BOND BILL

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will provide adequate mortgage money at an affordable rate for new home construction. It will stimulate the homebuilding industry and put thousands of construction workers and workers in supporting industries, now laid off, back to work. And, it will provide a new source of private capital for lending institutions such as savings and loans, and banks. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, it will accomplish all of these necessary things without a dollar of Federal outlays, placing no new burden on the Treasury.

While the program for economic recovery has succeeded in many respects, there is still a continued high interest rate which stifles economic recovery, causing more unemployment which in turn causes more Federal outlays, causing higher deficits, putting pressure on the credit market and keeping interest rates high.

Clearly, something must be done to break the cycle of low economic output, high unemployment, high deficits, and high interest rates causing further economic deterioration. The prescription for our economic ailments is to put workers back to work, which will reduce pressure on the Federal budget, which in turn will reduce pressure on interest rates, which will lead to better economic performance, which will lead to even more employment.

However, any method prescribed for putting people back to work needs one clear aspect: It must not involve Federal outlays which will exacerbate the current spending hemorrhage which is destroying hopes for true economic recovery. The prescription for our unemployed, for the millions of people who seek decent, affordable housing at bearable interest rates is this bill which I have introduced today: The national home ownership bond bill.

Under the national home ownership bond bill, lending institutions would be authorized to issue national home ownership bonds in denominations of $1,000. These bonds would have a face yield of 8 percent, with a preferential tax treatment given to the investor making this equivalent to a 12-percent return. The lending institutions would be required to earmark the proceeds from the bonds for 10 percent traditional mortgages on new homes. The issuing period for the bonds would be 3 years, with a 5-year period of maturity. In addition, at the end of the bond period there will be no prepayment penalty upon renegotiation.

This bill will put thousands of construction workers back to work; it will put thousands of workers in allied industries back to work. It will provide affordable housing for millions of Americans who cannot now afford homes, and most importantly, it will help get our economy moving without relying on Federal Treasury outlays. This bill will, in fact, bring more back to the Treasury in additional income taxes through increased payrolls than any possible tax expenditure outlined in the bill.

Many of us who served in the last Congress remember the several attempts made to pass "make work" legislation that would have required huge outlays from a Federal budget already drowning in red ink. This bill, the national homeownership bond bill, will not "make work," it will let the pent-up desire for jobs, housing, and affordable credit work to get our economy moving again. A similar bill, introduced by myself in the last Congress was declared "far superior" by the Secretary of the Treasury to any other attempt at reviving the housing industry. It is my hope that you will join in this movement to restore the strength to our economy, that we may provide once again the blessing of prosperity that has been the heritage in this great Nation.

H.R. 675

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit banks, savings and loan institutions, and similar financial institutions to issue tax-exempt certificates for housing purposes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 130 as section 131 and by inserting after section 129 the following new section:

"SEC. 130. TREATMENT OF NATIONAL HOME OWNERSHIP BONDS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of an individual—

"(1) gross income does not include any amount received as interest on a national home ownership bond, and

"(2) there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal to 50 percent of the amount excluded from gross income under paragraph (1) for the taxable year.

"(b) NATIONAL HOME OWNERSHIP BOND.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'national home ownership bond' means any certificate of deposit issued before January 1, 1986, by a qualified financial institution if—

"(A) all of the amount of the deposit is used to provide qualified owner-financing.

"(B) the certificate has a maturity of 5 years,

"(C) the investment yield on the certificate does not exceed 8 percent compounded quarterly, and

"(D) such certificate is offered in denominations of $1,000 or any mutiple of $1,000.

"(2) QUALIFIED OWNER-FINANCING.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified owner-financing' means any financing if—

"(i) such financing is provided in connection with the acquisition of a single family residence—

"(I) which can reasonably be expected to become the principal residence of the individual to whom the financing is provided within a reasonable time after the financing is provided, and

"(II) the original use of which begins with the individual to whom the financing is provided,

"(ii) such financing is secured by a first lien on the residence being acquired with such financing,

"(iii) the effective rate of interest on the financing does not exceed 10 percent,

"(iv) such financing is assumable by subsequent purchasers,

"(v) such financing may be prepaid without penalty after the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date on which provided, and

"(vi) the amount of such financing does not exceed the lesser of—

"(I) $100,000, or

"(II) 80 percent of the cost of acquiring the residence being financed.

"(B) EFFECTIVE RATE.—The effective rate of interest on any financing shall be determined under rules similar to the rules of section 103A(i)(2)(B).

"(c) QUALIFIED FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified financial institution' means—

"(1) a bank (as defined in section 581),

"(2) any mutual savings bank, cooperative bank, domestic building and loan association, and any other savings institution chartered and supervised as a savings and loan or similar institution under Federal State law, and

"(3) a credit union,

the deposits or accounts in which are insured under Federal or State law or are protected and guaranteed under State law. Such term also includes an industrial loan association or bank chartered and supervised under Federal or State law in a manner similar to a savings and loan institution."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 6401 of such Code (relating to excessive credits treated as overpayments) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and 43 (relating to earned income credit)" and inserting in lieu thereof "43 (relating to earned income credit), and section 130(a)(2) (relating to interest on national home ownership bonds)", and

(2) by striking out "39 and 43" and inserting in lieu thereof "39, 43, and 130(a)(2)".

(c) The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 130. Treatment of national home ownership bonds.

"Sec. 131. Cross references to other Acts."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply to certificates of deposit issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

COMMON SECURITY—A BLUEPRINT FOR SURVIVAL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago, President John Kennedy directed John J. McClory, adviser to President Eisenhower, to reach an agreement with the Soviets on the fundamental principles for future disarmament negotiations. John McCloy met with Soviet Representative, Valerian A. Zorin, on three occasions. On September 20, 1961, they signed the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations, known as the McCloy-Zorin agreement. Three months later, the U.N. General Assembly adopted the agreement as the foundation for future negotiations toward general and complete disarmament.

Today, I have introduced a common security resolution based upon the McCloy-Zorin agreement, which calls for secure disarmament and a framework for the peaceful settlement of disputes. This resolution works in concert with other peace initiatives, encouraging a multilateral disarmament agreement, binding upon all nations, and verified by an international body. Disarmament would proceed in phases, insuring that no country secures a military advantage over another.

I have incorporated into my proposal concepts from a May 1982 report by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues entitled, "Common Security—a Blueprint for Survival." This report looks beyond superpower confrontations to the need to hold multilateral negotiations on nuclear arms reductions, the need to limit nonnuclear weapons of mass destruction, and the need to be concerned about the international buildup in conventional weapons. This report proposes concrete, constructive remedies, and I recomment it to anyone interested in what more can be done to achieve worldwide disarmament.

The significant contributions—including the name of this resolution—made by the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues should be a starting point in the process of achieving true international security and genuine disarmament. The Chairman of the Commission, Olaf Palme, former Prime Minister of Sweden, deserves much credit. Other notables include Cyrus Vance, former Secretary of State of the United States, George Arbatov, member of the Soviet Central Committee and Deputy of the Supreme Soviet, David Owen, former Secretary of State for Great Britain, and many other experts.

This common security resolution is but one step toward our objective. It would require verification of disarmament, promote institutions dedicated to peaceful resolutions of disputes, and require the peaceful development of space. This bill encompasses, and works in concert with, a number of legislative initiatives which have been, or will shortly be, introduced. These include Congressman MARKEY's "Nuclear Freeze," Congressman GLICKMAN's "Academy for Peace and Conflict Resolution," and Congressman MOAKLEY's "Ban on Weapons in Space."

These initiatives are not utopian dreams, but constructive proposals to insure common security and our very survival. For over 50 years, the United States has supported multilateral arms control and disarmament. Beginning with the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which prohibited the use of bacteriological warfare, the United States has steadily participated in controlling and eliminating the worst evils of war. We have not always been successful, and, at times, we have been diverted from that course, but the underlying objective of common security has remained consistent. Among the many treaties and agreements to which the United States has been a party are:

The Antarctic Treaty (December 1959) was the first post-World War II arms limitation agreement, designating the Antarctic as a zone of peace.

The Limited Test Ban Treaty (August 1963) was negotiated by the United States, the U.S.S.R., and the United Kingdom to prohibit all but underground nuclear testing.

The Outer Space Treaty (January 1967) is designed to prevent a nuclear arms race in outer space.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (July 1968) links efforts to prevent the horizontal, country to country, proliferation of nuclear weapons with promises that the nuclear powers will seek comprehensive arms controls.

The Antiballistic Missile Treaty (July 1974) restricts the development of ABM's in an effort to prevent an ABM arms race and to maintain the deterrent nature of ICBM's.

At the close of World War II when the bombed-out ruins of the cities of both victorious and defeated nations stood as mute testimony to the destructiveness of the era's conventional weapons, public support for disarmament was strong. World War II's enormous toll of human life and suffering—including the obliteration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—strengthened determinaiton to reduce armaments and thereby to lessen the probability of another catastrophic world war.

Today, we have an entire generation which has grown up under the threat

of nuclear annihilation, a generation which has been told, in George Orwell's words, that "war is peace," a generation which is now being taught that nuclear war is winnable. Yet, gradually, and with increasing conviction, the American public is again becoming aware of the magnitude of this terrifying problem.

On November 28, 1945, less than 4 months after the bombing of Hiroshima, the English philosopher Bertrand Russell rose and said in the House of Lords:

> We do not want to look at this thing simply from a point of view of the next few years; we want to look at it from the point of view of the future of mankind. The question is a simple one: Is it possible for a scientific society to continue to exist, or must such a society inevitably bring itself to destruction? It is a simple question but a very vital one.

Although science and technology made nuclear warfare possible, it was politics which demanded it. And politics must now bring us back from the brink of self-destruction. Passage of this common security resolution cannot, by itself, bring peace or remove the threat of nuclear war. The technology of global destruction is there and will not simply vanish. But we can and we must develop the means to halt the global arms race, defuse political crises, and insure the peaceful resolution of conflicts.

As Jonathan Schell explained in his book "The Fate of the Earth":

> Nuclear peril threatens life, above all, not at the level of individuals, who already live under the sway of death, but at the level of everything that individuals hold in common. Death cuts off life; extinction cuts off birth * * * In extinction, a darkness falls over the world not because the lights have gone out but because the eyes that behold the light have been closed.

The eyes of the future are our responsibility; a responsibility that we cannot ignore without risking all that makes our lives meaningful. I urge my colleagues to join me in this significant first step toward peace.●

ORPHAN DRUG ACT

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan is to be saluted for signing into law the Orphan Drug Act (H.R. 5238).

I supported this bill as a member of the House Health Subcommittee in view of the clear need for this kind of legislation that was brought out in hearings before our committee. For most drug companies it is not in their economic interests to develop drugs for rare diseases because so few people need them. This bill will make the regulatory approval process for these drugs clearer and put into place some incentives to encourage companies to manufacture them. For example, it grants limited patent-like rights when a drug is orphaned because it would be unpatentable.

There are many diseases affecting a small number of people in this country. Yet for these people the diseases are overwhelming and are hardly small problems. Examples are Huntington's disease which afflicts 14,000 persons; Lou Gehrig's disease, 9,000 persons; Tourette syndrome, 100,000 persons; and muscular dystrophy, 200,000 persons.

This bill had unanimous and bipartisan support when it passed the Congress. I commend the President for taking this humane and compassionate step toward alleviating pain and suffering for many people. I hope we will see many advances in the pharmaceutical field as a result.

I would like to share with my colleagues the letter I sent President Reagan urging that he sign the bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 3, 1983.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to urge that you sign into law H.R. 5238, the Orphan Drug Act which passed the House and Senate on unanimous votes. I believe that the bill is carefully constructed and provides needed incentives to pharmaceutical companies to produce drugs for treating rare diseases.

I would urge you to take this small step toward alleviating pain and disease experienced by hundreds and thousands of people.

Sincerely,

DOUG WALGREN,
Member of Congress.●

OMNIBUS BILLS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for January 5, 1983, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OMNIBUS BILLS

Two weeks ago, for the third time in 14 months, the federal government ground to a halt because the Congress could not pass a budget. As these crippling fiscal impasses have become more common, I have grown accustomed to federal employees asking me, only half in jest, whether they should go to work the next day. In the middle of a church service the other day I had a worshipper turn to me and ask, "Why can't you keep the government running?"

One of the principal culprits preventing the smooth and continuous operation of the federal government is the omnibus spending bill (or, as we call it, the "continuing resolution"). Unable to pass the 13 traditional spending bills in a timely fashion, the Congress now readily supplants them, or at least some of them, with an omnibus spending bill. The continuing resolution was first used a century ago, but it has evolved since then and has changed radically in character. It used to be a device to tide the government over for a few days until separate spending bills could be passed; today, it is a device that provides money for most of the government and stays in effect for most of the year. The continuing resolution is rapidly becoming one of the major instruments through which government policy is made.

There can really be no doubt that the continuing resolution performs a new role these days. For example, government financing for most of the 1982 fiscal year was provided by an omnibus spending measure that stayed in effect from March 1 to December 30. Worse still, instead of merely continuing the level of spending at current rates (and thus truly deserving the name "continuing resolution"), the measure contained hundreds of extraneous provisions, many of them new, many of them granting increases in spending, and many of them making basic changes in the law. The continuing resolution this year will make available 78 percent of all appropriated monies. In the last 20 years, the Congress has used the continuing resolution 74 times. Fully 85 percent of all appropriations bills for these years have been passed after the start of the fiscal year.

The continuing resolution has become the means by which new multi-billion-dollar programs of employment are passed, new weapons systems are approved, and vigorous debates on abortion, school prayer, busing, and public works are conducted. It is the cause of many a testy, unruly congressional session. Because it affects so many different projects and programs, it is bound to be highly controversial and very hard to enact. What is worse, the continuing resolution has apparently begun to serve as a "model" of congressional procedure. More and more of the legislative work of the Congress is done in omnibus packages: another example is the enormous "reconciliation" bill which is now being used regularly to make hundreds of changes in authorizing legislation in order to enforce the overall taxing and spending targets set every year by the budget resolution. Most of our recent legislative accomplishments, such as they are, are found in omnibus bills.

Almost everyone who is familiar with the basic principles of public administration agrees that running the federal government with these large legislative packages is not good practice. Most members of Congress, including this one, are embarrassed by it. We know that it is not a good way to manage the nation's affairs, and as a general rule many of us, myself included again, vote against these packages. It is unwise to make law under the pressure of deadlines, with the possibility of government shutdown or a disruption of the Congress' calendar looming just ahead. As it rushes the federal budget through the frantic final hours of a legislative session, Congress neglects its deliberative duties and holds itself up to ridicule.

It is not easy to explain why the Congress has become so dependent on omnibus legislative measures. Part of the explanation is that members of Congress do not want to send separate bills to the floor for fear that they may be defeated. For example, the last separate spending bill for the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services passed in 1979; members of Congress do not want to see the bill on the floor because it

raises so many disputes on social issues. The continuing resolution and the reconciliation bill testify to the fact that the Congress' consensus-building skills have deteriorated markedly. Another part of the explanation is that the issues before the Congress simply defy easy solutions. For example, it is becoming increasingly clear that the problems of the social security system are deeply rooted and will never be solved in a painless fashion. Whether the reasons be economic or social, things are just much more complex than they were a decade or two ago.

Even though the reasons for our inability to handle the budget may be understood, it is, nonetheless, a very serious matter that we are unable to enact a budget in an orderly way. The inability suggests that the Congress is paralyzed. It reflects poorly on the institution and implies simply that the Congress is not equal to its most important task—approving the federal budget. If the Congress cannot perform that task satisfactorily, what does it mean for the nation?

I have the uneasy feeling that these omnibus bills show us losing control of the legislative process. The Congress is sputtering along, its leadership unable to exert discipline. We sense that our needs are urgent, but that we are not addressing them forthrightly. Members of Congress complain that there has been a failure of leadership, that the budget process is overloaded, that the blocking actions of a few willful legislators are at fault. The question, I suppose, is whether the breakdown is temporary or permanent. It is true that we are in a transition, with political power shifting and new governmental relationships being created as a result of the November election.

I make no claim to know how to resolve all these problems. I do believe, however, that our heavy reliance on omnibus bills is a mistake, and that we should, without delay, do everything we can to return to the more traditional procedures.●

HATCH ACT REFORM

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress originally passed the Hatch Act, the intent of the statute was noble and pragmatic—remove Federal employees from the political pressures of Government which might destroy the merit system of employment and advancement for these workers. Since enactment of this legislation, however, it has become clear that Federal employees have also lost one of their most treasured rights—the right to participate in the political process. I wonder how many of my colleagues have had to tell their federally employed constituents that the law prevents them from handing out literature or from calling voters during a political campaign, regardless whether that campaign may be for local city mayor or for the President of this country.

I firmly believe that we can extend to Federal workers the protection from political interference with their jobs without sacrificing that most important constitutional right of participation in the political process. To that end, I am a strong advocate for reform of the Hatch Act.

This past December, Mr. Kenneth Blaylock, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, published, what I believe to be, an excellent commentary on the Hatch Act and the need for reforms in that statute. I am including those remarks here for the benefit of many of my colleagues who may have missed his most telling remarks.

The remarks follow:

[From the Government Standard, December 1982]

HATCH ACT REFORM IS NECESSARY TO RESTORE BASIC CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS

(By Kenneth T. Blaylock)

It's time to remove another barrier to having effective government by amending the Hatch Act.

The theme of elections for the last decade has been ineffective government. Federal workers have been made the scapegoat for all the negatives in this national debate—yet they are not allowed to participate in the debate.

Experience teaches us that laws which deny or prohibit Constitutional, human, social or economic rights for any class of Americans penalize all Americans.

As a Nation, we have suffered poll taxes, literacy tests, disenfranchised women and other Jim Crow devices. In the past, voters have been kept away from the polls because of their race, age, sex and not being landowners.

But over the decades, these barriers have been struck down. Now it is time to salvage the political rights that are being denied to federal workers simply because of their occupation. This is no more legitimate than denial of rights because of age, sex and race.

The Hatch Act may have been originally enacted—as some still claim—with the benevolent idea in mind of protecting a merit system of government and federal workers from politically-motivated management and elected officials.

But the law lingers on the books today as a set of shackles, rather than as a shield. The blunt truth we must face now is the overwhelming fact that it is being used to keep federal workers from participating fully in the democratic process. There's no way to disguise that ugly reality.

So the first reason the act should be amended is that federal workers are American citizens, and should not be denied basic rights of a free democracy.

Further, it is a basic American principle that the accused be allowed to defend himself or herself. Which leads me to my second point, and gets back to the national debate about efficiency of Government.

It also leads to an interesting question: Who is being protected by the Hatch Act in its present form?

The policies and programs that are at the core of the debate about efficiency in government are set by elected members of Congress and appointed management—not by federal workers.

Yet these elected and appointed leaders are allowed to shift the blame for policy mistakes and program failures off their own shoulders and on to the backs of the workers.

In effect, the Hatch Act is used to keep federal workers out of any public debate about government programs and agency actions. Those who could really make a worthwhile contribution to the argument—the federal workers who know what's going on—are kept out of the dialogue at election time.

It seems to me the public would be better served, if federal workers were allowed to make voters aware of agency shortcomings by being able to take part in the election process debate that eventually sets the course for government.

Previous administrations, as well as the present one, have given public lip service to the idea of federal workers being able to speak up and blow the whistle when programs go wrong, errors in managerial judgment occur, cost overruns are concealed and corruption spreads. Yet, those who dare speak out are harassed, or shunted off to inconsequential jobs or fired.

If the Hatch Act were amended to allow these same federal workers to speak up during the campaign debates, more truth about the government would come to the public's attention and wiser decisions could be made by the voters.

Furthermore, if the law were amended to allow federal workers to endorse candidates, serve on those candidates' campaigns—there might be a better balance to the ideas that are made available.

The basic concept of protecting a career merit system of government is as valid today as it was in 1939. Day-to-day services and operation of government must go on as was demonstrated during the Nixon Administration.

We cannot afford to return to the "spoils system" of government. However, the needs of government, the rights of citizens of this country and the American right to know should be balanced by strengthening the prohibition against improper use of official office or political exploitation, while allowing Federal workers basic rights of involvement in our political process.

We will not rest until those rights are restored.●

WITHHOLDING FUNDING FOR THE LAW OF THE SEA COMMISSION: I SALUTE A GOOD DECISION

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to share with my colleagues some good news to begin this New Year. On December 30, 1982, the administration decided to refuse to pay the costs of a "Preparatory Commission" that will implement the Law of the Sea Treaty. This was a sane and proper decision and I congratulate the President for his efforts.

As all of you know, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution that would, among other things, finance the Preparatory Commission under the Law of the Sea Treaty from the regular U.N. budget.

The U.N.'s conference of the Law of the Sea established a permanent commission for this Third-World grab of mineral resources at the ocean bottom. This conference just had a posh reception at the sumptuous Montego Bay facilities to inititate the 4-day-long signing ceremony.

Transportation, housing, and food costs for U.N. diplomats and secretariat staff attending the function and supporting the Commission came out of the U.N.'s general budget.

This expensive signing ceremony, and even costlier staff relocation, come at a time when the United States and many nations in the world are having severe economic difficulties. Recently, delegates from the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain met with the Secretary General of the U.N. to express their concern over the rising costs of the organization. U.N. spending has risen over 80 percent in 5 years. This has meant a rise in the U.S. contribution from $99 million in 1977 to $180 million in 1982.

Our government has fought hard to uphold fiscal responsibility in the U.N., and in this case consistently opposed this financing scheme. It is not a proper expense of the U.N. within the meaning of its own charter. The Preparatory Commission is legally independent of and distinct from the U.N. The Commission is not a U.N. subsidiary organization. It is not answerable to that body. As such, membership in the U.N. does not obligate a member to finance or otherwise support this Law of the Sea Organization.

In addition, these funds are destined to finance the very aspects of the Law of the Sea Treaty that are unacceptable to the United States—namely, having the Commission develop rules and regulations for the seabed mining regime.

The President recently ordered a thorough review of the financing plan for the Commission. He determined that the assessment levied upon the United States is improper under the U.N. charter and is not legally binding upon members. Furthermore, the activities of the Commission will be adverse to the interests of the United States. As a result of this decision, the administration will withhold its pro rata share of the cost of the U.N. budget for funding the Commission.

This decision will result in a savings to the U.S. taxpayer of between $500,000 to $700,000. During this period of fiscal austerity and economic difficulties. I believe that the President is to be commended for grabbing the bull by the horns. He said "no" to funding this improper and costly assessment for efforts that are obviously not in our Nation's interests.●

CIGARETTE TAX LAW CHANGE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will make permanent the recent increase in cigarette taxes and adjust this increase annually to reflect increases in the cost of living. During consideration of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, the Congress wisely decided to double the excise tax on cigarettes from 8 cents to 16 cents. Unfortunately the legislation provided for termination of the tax increase in 1985. My bill would make the increase permanent and would provide that the tax would be increased each year (rounded upward to the nearest cent) to parallel increases in the consumer price index.

My Speaker, each year cigarettes add billions of dollars to our national health costs. At the cost of providing care to those that suffer the adverse medical consequences of smoking increases, it is only fair that taxes on cigarettes are correspondingly increased to help offset these costs.

The Government clearly cannot stop people from smoking, but we can and should require that smokers help defray the costs associated with its consequences. I hope that this legislation will be swiftly approved by the Congress.

The text of the bill is printed below:

H.R. 698

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (c) of section 283 of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 is amended by striking out "and before October 1, 1985".

(b) Section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on cigars, cigarettes, and cigarette papers and tubes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS IN RATE OF TAX ON CIGARETTES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of cigarettes removed in a calendar year after 1983, subsection (b) shall be applied by increasing each dollar amount contained therein by the cost-of-living adjustment for such calendar year.

"(2) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost-of-living adjustment for any calendar year is the percentage (if any) by which—

"(A) the CPI for October of the preceding calendar year, exceeds

"(B) the CPI for October 1982.

"(3) CPI.—The term 'CPI' means the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Department of Labor.

"(4) ROUNDING.—Any increase under paragraph (1) shall be rounded to the nearest 1 cent."

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to cigarettes removed after December 31, 1983.●

ARE COLLEGE SPORTS WORTH THE COST?

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the community college is a relative newcomer to our system of postsecondary educational opportunities. The role of these facilities is still evolving.

Mrs. Maxine Pettit, whose expertise in this field includes eight years of service on the Board of Trustees of the North Arkansas Community College in Harrison, Ark., recently set down some thoughts about the community college concept, which were published in the Wednesday, December 29, 1982, edition of the Arkansas Gazette.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Mrs. Pettit's article to the attention of my colleagues and ask that the text be included in the RECORD.

ARE COLLEGE SPORTS WORTH THE COST?

A recent study by Dr. Michael Elliott, former director of the state Department of Higher Education, revealed that all state-supported schools, with the exception of the University of Arkansas, lost money in intercollegiate athletics. The amount was not insignificant—a combined deficit in the 1980-81 year of $4.4 million.

Is anyone surprised that varsity sports shows this large deficit? Accountability of our resources must surely lead parents, boards of trustees and educators to answer an even more relevant question: Is it worth it, especially in the light of the rapid rise in the cost of living, which means the cost of running an intercollegiate athletic program will continue to rise also?

As a board member of the North Arkansas Community College, I have been very vocal in my opposition to varsity athletics. I have called attention to the increasing costs in meetings with my colleagues and administrators, public statements and even a report that went to the North Central Association. I am obviously very much in the minority with my viewpoint. Varsity sports continue not only at my college but at all but one of the community colleges in Arkansas. Only the East Arkansas Community College in Forrest City has dropped its varsity sports program, for the reason, I would assume, that the benefits did not warrant the time, effort and money that went into it.

During the 1960s, the enrollment in higher education increased 2½ times more than in the previous three centuries. In the last two decades college costs increased twentyfold.

The community college has come on the scene in recent years, partially as an answer to the high cost of education. However, the idea behind its design is not too well understood, and, therefore, not overwhelmingly endorsed by many Arkansas citizens. I believe its unqiue characteristics make varsity sports incompatible and irrelevant.

A community college has the same obligation to provide the highest quality academic transfer programs as a junior college, but it also has potential for life enrichment in its

community service orientation that is unmatched in a traditional college program. Also, the constitutional design of a community college gives it a built-in flexibility that carries with it a very real obligation to assess the cultural, recreational and educational needs of the community and respond to them as far as budget and personnel allow. These programs require primacy in the budget.

Another unorthodox element of the community college is its existence as a commuter institution. By law it is prohibited from providing housing for students. Also, the average age level of the students nationwide is a decade or more than the average age of college students. Most of the students at North Arkansas Community College come from a seven-county area of Arkansas and several counties in southwestern Missouri.

Many are married with children; some are veterans, and others, in their 30s and 40s, are seeking new career directions. Some students carry part-time and even full-time jobs. There are, of course, the traditional 18- and 19-year-olds, working on academic transfer programs to senior institutions. This diversity greatly influences the programs, simply because the interests and needs of many students rule out any participation in varsity sports, or even any marked degree of interest in the programs. (A study at North Arkansas Community College last year revealed that less than 10 per cent of the student body attended varsity sports events.)

MAJOR CHANGES CITED

Major changes are occurring rapidly in society, and new services and activities should be offered to meet them.

Two fine examples of responding to community needs can be seen in the way the North Arkansas College administration initiated and developed a reading program for persons with reading disabilities. Also, our college has one of the best nurses training program in the state, answering major needs in the large and growing Boone County area. Responding to further community priorities, NACC has a fine arts complex on the drawing boards.

A California community college educator has defined several areas that hold serious challenges for education in the decades ahead. He predicts greater diversity of student bodies and foresees "the impact of declining academic performance of secondary schools and the matriculation of culturally handicapped minorities with great emphasis having to be given to remedial studies."

In addition, there is an awakening interest in young people for skills in recreational activities such as water sports, golf, tennis, dancing and numerous other activities that can be beneficial for health and enjoyment for literally a lifetime.

As costs of education continue to rise and considering the very short-range benefits of intercollegiate sports for a very small percentage of any student body, I suggest that perhaps responsible accountability would lead community colleges to seriously evalute recreational activity versus the traditional varsity program if the colleges feel a need for any kind of sports program.

As a parent, taxpayer and involved citizen, I would like to see the community colleges spend money on the arts and humanities rather than athletics.

One of the most profound beliefs we can have about the human personality is that we were born to be creative in some form or another. So I am led to believe that the arts, philosophy and the written and spoken word have almost a divine dimension in our search for the wholeness of life.

As we move to meeting the challenges of a technological age with its emphasis on materialism, I urge that we be aware of the enormous value of our cultural and spiritual resources in the roots of this nation. We should draw on them to help us make decisions on the value systems we wish to live by and to pass on to the next generation.

Ultimately, I perceive the bottom line in education to be not money but priorities. What do we place first is a question that must be answered by every educational institution.●

NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce to the House of Representatives that I have today introduced legislation to designate the week beginning November 20, 1983, as "National Family Week."

It has always been my belief that the family is the backbone of our country. No country can prosper without strong family units. It is through the family that our children are molded into responsible, productive citizens. A lack of family unity has brought about increased crime and corruption to our streets. It is imperative that not only legislators, but all Americans, be aware of the dangers which exist for the future of our country if the family unit is allowed to disintegrate.

This is the seventh consecutive year that I have either sponsored or cosponsored this type of legislation. In the past, this resolution has received overwhelming bipartisian support from those of us in Congress representing American families. It is widely recognized in the Congress that setting aside 1 week in recognition of the family gives every citizen the opportunity to reevaluate their relationship with their family. Family members should be aware of those individuals who are part of their family who are suffering personal failures and support them so that they, too, can enjoy the great success realized by other members of the same family unit.

A week of national observance of the family can give each of us an opportunity to put things in perspective. And, what better week to set aside than by proclaiming Thanksgiving Week as National Family Week.

In addition to sponsoring this resolution, I have also cosponsored Representative GEORGE MILLER's measure to establish a Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families for the 98th Congress. I not only supported this legislation in the 97th Congress, but cosponsored and fought for its passage. It is important that this Congress give the recognition necessary to establishment of a committee to review the special status, needs, and concerns of this vital element of our society. This is an important first step toward an increased nationwide understanding of the diverse and complex circumstances affecting children and families. Congress needs a single oversight committee whose sole responsibility is reviewing and improving the quality of life for families and children. This commitment knows no jurisdictional, philosophical, or partisan lines.

I urge my colleages to support the passage of these two important pieces of legislation.●

PAY RAISE REFORMS STILL NEEDED

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation which will reform the way in which the Congress grants itself pay increases.

The first, will simply repeal the current provision of law which allow automatic cost-of-living increases for Members without a separate appropriation. This was enacted with passage of the 1982 continuing resolution in October of 1981.

The second will amend the House rules so that any legislation which increases Members' salaries, income tax benefits, or limitations on outside earnings may only be considered under the following three circumstances: First, there is a record vote; second, the legislation is considered separately from any other legislation; and third, the change will not take effect until after an intervening election.●

NEWS THAT'S HARD TO FIND

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, all of us have wondered from time to time about those important events that somehow do not become news. The Journal Star of Peoria, Ill., recently published an editorial concerning this phenomenon, listing such real events—but non-news—as fighting in a Lebanese city and a recent change of government in a South American country. Why do events like these receive almost no media coverage and other events fill the front pages and television evening news? The Journal Star

asks: "Does 'news' have to fit present notions, an established ideological scenario, to be news?"

I suspect that half of the criticism that is made of the media comes from those who want more news, not less news—more coverage, not less. No responsible political figure wants the press to stop reporting. All most of us ask is that the full story is published and that many kinds of news stories appear, instead of the same old subjects. I know, in my case, I would prefer much more coverage of what I do—and, yes, fail to do—in the Congress. We are willing to let the people judge whether we are doing a good job. But all too often the job we are doing, in its totality, is not reported at all.

At this point, I wish to insert in the RECORD, "News That's Hard To Find" from the Journal Star, December 20, 1982.

[From the Journal Star, Peoria, Ill., Dec. 20, 1982]

NEWS THAT'S HARD TO FIND

In Lebanon's second largest city, Tripoli (bigger than Peoria), scenes like those we saw recently in Beirut have been taking place for some time. Artillery firing, rockets blasting, buildings shattering and people dying.

Have you seen any buildings exploding in Tripoli on the tube? Seen any of the wide-eyed children in any rubble-strewn streets? Have you read a word about the fighting there?

Tripoli is 40 miles north of Beirut. The Israeli army conquered and occupies southern Lebanon but the Israelis never swept north, and there are no multinational peace forces there—only the Syrian army, the PLO and local militias. Tripoli is essentially a Moslem city.

Ergo, neither Christians nor Israeli are involved—yet buildings have been blown up, shelling and rocketing and all the elements of war in an urban center have been going on there.

This really suggests what Lebanese have told us from the start—that the problem has always been the foreign forces in Lebanon, essentially the Syrians and the PLO, who have been there for seven years.

But who cares?

It was only a "good story" worth extensive reporting when Israel invaded to throw out the PLO and the Syrians in the south, and (offer to get out themselves if and when the PLO and Syrians depart the rest of the country.)

It was news only as long as cameras could focus from relative safety on the horrors of war in an urban center, when Yasir Arafat would pose for the cameras and when Israelis could be called the invaders.

Why is that? Especially when it serves to obliterate the real story, the seven year continuing experience sans Israel, and any real understanding of the problem?

Or take another example:

In formerly Dutch Guiana—now Surinam—a "Colonel" Douterse has taken over, executed union leaders, rival politicians, a vice president of the International Football Federation (with headquaters in Geneva,) and is in general conducting a reign of terror, flanked by Cuban and Nicaraguan "advisors," apparently.

Surinam is 63,000 square miles of territory on the strategic Atlantic coast between Venezuela and Brazil. Now, consider that El Salvador is 8,500 square miles in size on the Pacific coast of Central America, with a recently installed civilian government following general elections in which the population voted heavily in the presence of foreign observers.

We've heard a lot about it. How much have you heard about Surinam? Why is it that we have heard so mch about El Salvador and the questions about "human rights" there still standing from a previous regime . . . and so little about Surinam where the executions are still going on?

Does "news" have to fit preset notions, an established ideological scenario, to BE news?

Or is it simply that wherever authorities are sufficiently pro-American or pro-freedom to permit newsmen and TV cameras in, those newsmen and TV people then proceed to sensationalize the worst thing they can find, surmise or suspect. . . ripping up the host authorities.

But where the authorities do not give a hoot about the U.S. or the idea of freedom, and have nothing but contempt for the "free press" they can carry out murderous warfare or political pogroms ruthlessly, and there are no U.S. newsmen and no U.S. TV network people allowed.

This is a wonderful arrangement for crucifying struggling friends, seeking to be free, while giving enemies devoted to the destruction of freedom and of the United States a pass.

Why?

Simply because "show business" can't bother with events or people who refuse to cooperate in the snow?

Meanwhile the "spokes persons" for all sorts of good things like "peace" and "human rights" in some mysterious fashion seldom have any ringing pronouncements to make when socialist dictators or generals or colonels or whatever Arafat calls himself, are doing their dirty work around the world.

And the result is a lopsided view wherever there is a real struggle. Those who provide media access get the shaft. Those who lock us out escape such bad publicity.

Result: most of the time the totalitarians and their "revolutionary" trainees get attention when they want it for their propaganda, and get silence when they want it—while they are doing their dirty work.●

TRIBUTE TO HOWARD FRIEDMAN, A MAJOR INFLUENCE ON FLORIDA

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a dear friend, a trusted adviser, and a major influence in Florida—Howard Friedman—died on December 26, thus ending a remarkable career of contributions to my native State.

Howard Friedman was a native of the Bronx who first came to Florida during World War II as a soldier stationed at Camp Gordon Jackson at Carrabelle.

He remained in the State, married a Tallahassee girl, and became one of the most influential figures not only in Florida politics but within the State education system where he worked tirelessly for 35 years for greater opportunities for Florida youngsters through better education.

His first civilian job in Tallahassee was as a columnist for the Tallahassee Democrat but he left that post in 1947 to become a senior executive in the education department where he served under four commissioners and ended his career as director of information and public relations and executive assistant to the commissioner.

Job titles, however, could never do justice to the beneficial effect of Howard Friedman's efforts on behalf of education in Florida.

For decades he was the education department's chief representative before the Florida Legislature and seldom was any bill affecting legislation considered without Howard's carefully considered appraisal being sought by key legislators.

From 1947 until his death of cancer last month, Howard Friedman was a contributing factor to every session of the Florida Legislature and, indeed, became an institution in his own right.

For years Howard maintained a standing reservation at one of Tallahassee's favorite restaurants—the Silver Slipper—which was a magnet during legislative sessions for lawmakers, lobbyists, journalists and government executives.

Seldom did a major figure in Florida decide on a career move without visiting with Howard and his friends at his table which was, as much as anything in Florida, the vortex of the State's political whirlwinds.

Howard was a significant factor in my own first congressional campaign and beyond that has been a consistent friend since my freshman days in the Florida Legislature in 1958, when he was already a seasoned veteran of Florida politics.

The State of Florida was a great beneficiary of Howard Friedman's love and efforts.

He will be greatly missed by the thousands who knew and respected him.

My deepest condolences to his wife, Mary, and their three sons, Harry, Jay, and Marty.●

REPEAL 10 PERCENT WITHHOLDING MEASURE

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress, this body was responsible for passing a bill which will soon create a serious hardship on many of

our people, unless we act quickly to forestall it.

For this reason, I am supporting legislation which will repeal the provision of last year's tax act which calls for the withholding of 10 percent of our citizens' interest and dividends.

Among those who will be hit the hardest by this withholding are the poor, the unemployed, and the elderly.

We have more than 26 million people in this country who are over 65 years old and who depend on the interest from their savings to help make ends meet each month. The money the new law will take are funds that these responsible citizens have set aside to provide for the years when their income would be reduced.

I said at the time the bill was debated that it was wrong, and I say now that the prospect of withholding the savings of the elderly has not improved since that time.

No one who has the virtue of thrift should be penalized for those values. I call upon my colleagues to support legislation which will repeal this provision from our Nation's tax laws and restore the incentive to save and help our country to prosper again.●

TRIBUTE TO J. EDWARD ATKINSON

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 4, 1983, friends and colleagues of J. Edward Atkinson will gather at the Beverly Wilshire Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif., to pay tribute to this distinguished and hardworking individual on the occasion of his retirement. Knowing of his strong community commitment, and being a longtime admirer, I would especially like to take a few minutes to share with my colleagues just a few of Eddie's outstanding and unselfish contributions to his company and to his fellow Los Angeleans.

Born and raised in Denver, Colo., Eddie moved to Los Angeles, Calif., to attend Loyola University, where he received his baccalaureate degree. A dedicated scholar, Eddie took time from his busy academic schedule to make a name for himself in the athletic field as an All-American on the university football team.

After graduation, Eddie settled in Los Angeles. Compelled by the desire to contribute to the quality of life in his community, Eddie decided to run for public office. In 1958, he became the first black to run for the Los Angeles City Council, losing by less than 1,000 votes.

In 1965, Eddie began his career as public relations supervisor with the Carnation Co. at their world headquarters in Los Angeles, Calif. More than 18 years have passed and Eddie is now retiring from the company where he has been acting since 1965 as a liaison officer between the Carnation Co. and the minority community.

When not representing his company officially, Eddie can be found working in a variety of community endeavors, especially those designed to support minority art. In 1971, Eddie dedicated his energies to the publication of "Black Dimensions in Contemporary American Art" as editor and researcher of the project. This work, which chronicled the genius of 50 black American artists, was recognized by Esquire magazine and the Business Committee for the Arts for its outstanding contribution in promoting the arts.

A further example of his intense community dedication was evidenced by his involvement in the development of "Rising Voices/Voces Que Surgen," a book including inspiring stories of 52 outstanding Spanish-Americans portrayed in vivid words and photos. Not only did Eddie participate in the promotion and distribution of this project, he also coordinated and edited the book. In addition, he has authored many pamphlets on employment, prenatal care and health, and black history, whose distribution has exceeded 15 million.

Over the years, numerous individuals have been touched by Eddie's warmth and his seemingly never ending reservoir of wisdom and support. He is a committed and extremely diligent servent who has given much to the community, asking nothing in return while rejoicing in the progress and the fruits of his labor. His receipt of an honorary doctorate in 1979 from King Memorial College in Columbia, S.C., is testimony to dedication.

Throughout his professional career, Eddie has received numerous accolades from his peers. In 1974, he was awarded the Silver Anvil for his dynamic public relations program on behalf of Carnation Co. The Silver Anvil Awards are presented by the Public Relations Society of America and represent the ultimate honors that public relations professionals can receive.

In addition, he was awarded the 1978 Achievement Award from the Los Angeles Association of Advertising Women and the National Association of Market Developers' Presidential Award. In 1979, the Governor of Kentucky bestowed upon Eddie the title of Honorary Kentucky Colonel, in honor of Eddie's distinguished career.

When friends and colleagues gather on February 4 to pay tribute to Eddie, they will honor a gentleman who has given much to the community. Although Eddie leaves Carnation, Los Angeleans can be certain that his mark will continue to be felt throughout the community. As he embarks on the second phase of life, I join with his many friends in saluting this distinguished Los Angelean and wish him every success that his future is sure to bring.●

WOMEN'S HISTORY WEEK

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a joint resolution designating Women's History Week. This resolution, like those before it, calls upon the country to recognize the valuable contribution women have made to the history of this Nation. As you know, we celebrated Women's History Week last year with ceremonies and activities across the Nation. We want to do that again in 1983.

Just as women who are half of the population of this country have not been written into the Constitution, they have also not been written into our history. And yet, they were there, beside their husbands, their fathers, their brothers, and their friends. They sailed the seas, tilled the soil, built the cities, and raised families.

Women's History Week is one step forward in the evolving recognition of those values, and of those rights. Women's History Week says to people across this Nation, "Women are achievers, women are important, women are half of all this country is."●

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ANN SMARTT EVINS

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, sad news came to Members of the Tennessee delgation in the midst of Monday's swearing in ceremonies. That afternoon, Mrs. Ann Smartt Evins, for 47 years the beloved wife of former Representative Joe L. Evins, was killed in an automobile accident. At this difficult time, the sympathy of my family and the people of my district, many of whom were represented by Mr. Evins during his years in Congress, goes out to Mr. Evins and the family.

Mrs. Ann Evins was a gifted person with boundless energy and enthusiasm for life. She was an integral part of Congressman Evins' 30-year career of distinguished service as a Member of this body. Her compassion and caring for others was best illustrated again for me the last time I saw her. I

stopped by the Evins' home in Smithville, Tenn. unannounced, hoping to spend a few minutes with Congressman and Mrs. Evins as I traveled between open meetings in the district. Mrs. Evins graciously received me but apologized for having to leave as I was arriving. She was on her way to teach handicapped children. I suppose my last memory of Mrs. Evins will be of her running out the door, arms full of books, keeping her appointment with the children as a volunteer teacher in remedial reading.

This is a fitting memory of Mrs. Evins. As a person, a mother, and the wife of one of the most powerful men in Congress, Ann Evins was the kind of person of whom it will be said by all who knew her that our lives are richer because she lived.

The Tennessean of January 4, 1982, reported in part:

Mrs. Evins was the daughter of the late Circuit Court Judge R. W. Smartt and Anne Fancher Smartt. She was born in Smartt Station, Tenn., near McMinnville, in a community named after her father—who was a Circuit Court judge for 32 years.

She and the former Congressman were married 47 years ago.

Rep. Evins, 72, served 30 years in Washington, representing Tennessee's old 4th and 5th Congressional districts. He did not seek re-election in 1976 from the House of Representatives, at a time when he was widely considered one of the most powerful men in Congress.

Wilkes Coffey Jr. of Murfreesboro, an attorney who served as administrative assistant to Evins in Washington, said he "had an opportunity to observe closely the enormous contribution that Mrs. Evins made to the most distinguished record of service compiled by Congressman Evins over 30 years."

"She was calm and serene, whatever the demands of public life, and made a unique and lasting contribution to her husband's career and to many who were associated with him," Coffey said.

Mrs. Evins and her husband lived in Smithville the 47 years they were married. She taught school for two years at Smithville High School, shortly after moving to Smithville following her graduation from Maryville College.

She had graduated from Warren County High School and was a member of the Smithville Church of Christ.

Survivors in addition to her husband include three daughters, Jane Leonard, Washington, Mary Overton, Berkeley, Calif., and Joanne Carnahan, Dallas; a sister, Cornelia Hodges, Knoxville; three brothers, John M., Knoxville, Robert W., and Diemer L. Smartt, McMinnville; and five grandchildren.

In an editorial the Tennessean added:

MRS. ANN SMARTT EVINS

Mrs. Ann Smartt Evins, the wife of former Tennessee Rep. Joe L. Evins, died Monday in an automobile crash near Lebanon. The tragedy is deeply felt by all who knew her.

Mrs. Evins, who was 72, was the epitome of graciousness among political wives. Having grown up as the daughter of Circuit Court Judge R. W. Smartt of Smartt Junction, Mrs. Evins was well acquainted with the demands of political life. For 30 years in the nation's capital, from 1946 until the year Mr. Evins retired, she distinguished herself as a careful, courteous woman who gave liberally of her time and energy and who was well-liked by the wives of presidents, Cabinet officials and congressmen. She was devoted to her husband and his career and to her family.

What perhaps sustained her was her abiding religious faith. A member of the Church of Christ, she regularly attended Sunday night services in Washington, as well as semi-monthly "prayer breakfasts," held by Capitol Hill wives, that coincided with identical events hosted by the president for their husbands.

Conscientious to a fault, Mrs. Evins once mused to a reporter. "Every woman has to decide what comes first. I sometimes wonder if I'm putting first things first." Mrs. Evins needn't have worried. There were never any complaints, only praise, for her efforts to be her husband's ambassador. She will be sadly missed.

The Nashville Banner wrote in an editorial:

MRS. JOE L. EVINS: "GRAND LADY"

Mrs. Joe L. Evins will be remembered as a "grand lady," as her friends and family described her. She will also be remembered as the strong right arm of former Rep. Evins, one of Tennessee's most illustrious members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Her tragic death Monday in an automobile accident near Lebanon brought to an end a life that was both rewarding and unselfish. Rep. Albert Gore recalled that on a recent visit to the Evins home in Smithville, he was greeted by Mrs. Evins carrying books under her arm, on her way to one of her many volunteer projects—tutoring children who were having difficulty reading.

Mrs. Evins' life was one of giving. She was the guiding force behind many civic and charitable endeavors, and she was the guiding force behind the remarkable political career of her husband, who was long considered one of the nation's most effective and powerful congressmen.

Mr. Evins retired in 1976 without suffering a defeat in 16 campaigns for Congress. Much of that success he attributed to Mrs. Evins, who was at his side throughout the rigorous campaigns and lent him her strong support throughout his 30 year congressional career.

Mrs. Evins was devoted to her husband and his career. She loved her family and her community. She gave unstintingly of herself to helping others, most of whom she did not know. She knew only that they needed help, and she gave it unselfishly.

The niche she carved for herself was not in the spotlight; that she gladly reserved for her husband. Her place was by his side. And she was always there.

Ann Smartt Evins was indeed a "grand lady." She will be remembered for a long, long time, as will her abundant works and influence.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. DANIEL JORDAN, EDUCATOR AND RELIGIOUS LEADER

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, I wish to pay honor to the memory of Dr. Daniel Jordan, whose recent tragic death has resulted in a great loss to the world.

Dr. Jordan was dean of the school of education and professor of education at National University in San Diego, Calif. He was also one of nine members of the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'i faith, and had served twice as chairman of that board.

He dedicated his life to the Baha'i principle of universal education. His distinguished career as an educator was truly exemplary of his belief in the application of knowledge in the service of all mankind.

A Rhodes scholar, Dr. Jordan held an M.A. degree in music from Oxford University, and a Ph.D. in human development from the University of Chicago. He had been director of the Center for the Study of Human Potential and professor of education at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst, where he was the founder and director of the American National Institute for Social Advancement (ANISA), a comprehensive model of education designed to develop the human capacity to learn, act and communicate.

The author and editor of numerous articles and books on education and human development, Dr. Jordan had lectured throughout the Nation and the world, appearing on more than 200 radio and television shows. He had served as an educational consultant to the U.S. Office of Education, the Department of State, and many national and international agencies, schools, and institutions of higher education. He also directed and administered many governmental grant programs.

Dr. Jordan's commitment to education, accompanied by wisdom and vision, as well as his commitment to religious freedom, peace, and world brotherhood will be sorely missed by this Nation. Our hearts cry out against the cruelty of having one of our finest young leaders viciously robbed of life in his most productive years. I want to formally express my sadness over this loss, and ask my colleagues in Congress to join with the members of the Baha'i faith worldwide in prayers for Dan Jordan and his family.●

A TRIBUTE TO STUART J. ORBACH

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Stuart J. Orbach for the outstanding job he did as president of the Burbank Chamber of Commerce for the year 1982.

Mr. Orbach was the youngest president in the 65-year history of the Burbank Chamber and he was the only chamber staff member in the Nation to be elected a chamber president.

As a businessman and newspaper columnist, he has been active in the local business and civic communities. He is a man of great energy and vitality and he has worked with singular dedication to maintain those characteristics in the southern California business community.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Stuart Orbach and all men like him who are concerned enough to get involved, who care enough to assume responsibilities, and who are bright and able enough to make meaningful contributions to our society.●

HANK DRANE, REPORTER; A DISTINGUISHED CAREER ENDS

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Hank Drane, of the Florida Times-Union in Jacksonville, concluded a distinguished 36 years as a reporter at the beginning of this year and I feel compelled to enter this heartfelt tribute to his contributions to Florida, the South, and the Nation.

I have known Hank Drane since the earliest days of my political career, when I was a freshman State legislator in Tallahassee and Hank was already a veteran State political reporter.

That was in 1958 and during that 25 years I have never known Hank Drane to be less than an honorable gentleman and a dedicated, hardworking, factual reporter.

During his 36-year career, Hank has watched the State of Florida move from a sleeping and somewhat backward southern State to become not only a giant in population, but a vital, vibrant political and economic factor in the Nation.

While Hank had the style and temperament to gain friendship with many of the great figures in Florida and national politics, he never lost the ability, even compulsion, to talk to the people in barbershops and along backroads to gain insight into what the average person wanted from his government and its leaders and how they felt about decisions already made.

In his farewell column last Sunday, Hank said he was retiring "chiefly because I would like to experience the feeling of working at some other pursuit before the old bones become too arthritic and the enthusiasm for life begins to ebb; to become, as it were, a part of what is going on inside the arena rather than sitting on the rim to observe and report what is happening inside."

While I understand Hank's wish to participate in other endeavors, I cannot help but advise him that his contributions to government and the public life of Florida have been no less important than those of many who held elective office.

As a journalist of outstanding perception, Hank's regular commentary of life in Florida, the South, and the Nation, will certainly be missed.

But as an historian, a walking encyclopedia of Florida history and folklore, and as a human being, I am confident that his talent and his knowledge will continue to keep him active and the rest of us informed through one medium or another.

While I congratulate Hank on his career and wish him well in his retirement, I also anxiously await the beginning of whatever new career he enters and look forward to his continued contributions to understanding and betterment of our American way of life.●

AFGHAN REFUGEES IN PAKISTAN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we, as free American citizens, do not lose sight of the plight of helpless Afghan refugees huddled together on their border inside Pakistan. The famous actor Kirk Douglas, at the request of his Government and the President of Pakistan, journeyed the long distance to these refugee camps to draw attention to the misery suffered by the homeless citizens of a once-free Afghanistan.

I am inserting into the RECORD a report from Gilbert Robinson, Acting Director of the USIA, to his superior, Mr. Charles Wick, Director of the USIA, describing in human terms the accomplishments of Kirk Douglas' trip. Kirk Douglas is a good friend of mine and I am proud to document his achievements on behalf of his country.

To: Director Charles Wick.

From: Gilbert Robinson.

MEMO

In November Kirk Douglas accepted an invitation from the Government of Pakistan to visit Afghan refugees in that country in order to bring international attention to their plight and to the brutal Soviet war against the Afghan people. I want to give you a report of his visit and its effect.

Kirk spent the five days around Thanksgiving—November 23-27—in Pakistan, talking with officials concerned with refugee affairs and visiting refugee camps near the Afghan border. At one camp, he shared a Thanksgiving meal of mutton stew and unleavened bread with the refugees.

He visited refugee schools, saw camps for widows and orphans, and toured the Red Cross hospital for war-injured Afghans in Peshawar. In the hospital he talked with men and women with bullet and shrapnel wounds and, most tragically, children whose legs had been blown off by the gaily colored plastic mines shaped like toys which the Russians drop from helicopters.

In Islamabad on Thanksgiving evening, he met for an hour with President Mohammad Zia-ul Haq, who had been very pleased by Kirk's public comments about Pakistan's extraordinary generosity toward the refugees.

Illness prevented Kirk from staying for dinner, but the following evening, learning that he had visited another refugee camp, the President broke protocol by calling on him at his hotel. (The two met again at the White House State dinner in honor of President Zia. There the President warmly embraced Kirk, and all members of his entourage commented very favorably on the positive effects of the visit.)

Wherever he went, Kirk was warmly received by the Pakistanis and the Afghans alike. He was struck by the generous hospitality of Pakistan in receiving the refugees as guests, and by the unbroken spirit of the refugees in their determination to continue resistance to the Soviet invaders until their country is restored to them.

In Pakistan, close on-the-spot coverage of Kirk's activities and several press conferences generated more than a hundred very favorable stories in the domestic press and daily items on the evening television news. Pakistan Television subsequently did an excellent one-hour program on Kirk, his career, and the visit.

Day-to-day coverage of the visit plus reporting from a press conference which Kirk gave in Washington after his return was widely played in the United States and internationally, in countries as dissimilar as Japan and Chile, the Philippines and Saudi Arabia.

The visit was the subject of a seven-minute segment with Kirk on "Good Morning America," December 7.

USIA has produced an excellent 15-minute documentary on the visit which will be shown by our posts to worldwide audiences.

Kirk's visit to the refugees was arduous. To fit it into his schedule, he flew without rest directly from Los Angeles to Islanabad, some twenty-three hours, and returned again without stopover. In Pakistan, he refused to let illness deter him. He deserves the highest commendation for the humanitarian and patriotic spirit which led him to undertake this important mission and for the intelligence, sensitivity and professionalism which made it such a profound success in reminding the world of the continuing Afghan tragedy.●

A TRIBUTE TO BARBARA LEARNARD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor a woman who has, for the past year, served with distinction as president of the Women's Division of the Lomita Chamber of Commerce. Barbara Learnard, whose term as president expires at the end of January, has been an inspiration to the citizens of her community, both through her career and her volunteer work.

Barbara Learnard has a history of helping people, especially those with special needs. With a degree in education from Fresno State College, a master's degree from California Lutheran, and diplomas in physically handicapped, elementary, and special education, Ms. Learnard has made great accomplishments in both regular and special education. When, in 1980, she retired from teaching after over 37 years, she was known as a specialist in the fields of home and hospital education, and was considered a pioneer of teleclass teaching. She is a past president of Chapter 357 of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Besides her career of service, Barbara Learnard has also devoted her time to many local concerns. She is active in her church choir, has been a Girl Scout volunteer, a den mother, and handled publicity for the Lomita Little League. She has been a community correspondent for the Lomita Headlight, and is a member and past chaplain of the Post 1622 Lomita VFW Auxiliary.

Barbara Learnard has been a vital force in the founding of many local organizations. She was a founder of the Lomita Historical Society in 1975, where she has since served as president for 2 years, and also as vice president and treasurer. She is a charter member of the Lomita Sister City Association, for which she has been publicity chairman. Barbara is also a charter member of the Friends of the Lomita Library, where she has spent 11 years on the board of directors, including 2 years as president. She has been the Lomita representative to the Los Angeles County Southwest Regional Library Council.

Barbara Learnard has also set an example in fulfilling her civic duties. She served on the city of Lomita's Community Development and Rehabilitation Commission from 1974 to 1981, and was bicentennial chairman and time capsule chairman. She has also been chairman of Lomita's Arts, Humanities, and Culture Committee, and, since spring of 1981, a member of the Planning Commission. Before her current term as president of the Lomita Chamber of Commerce Women's Division, Barbara Learnard had served the chamber as recreational secretary and as vice president. For her many contributions, in 1979 Barbara Learnard received the South Bay YMCA Award of Merit.

I am pleased that my district has someone as active and committed as Barbara Learnard, and I hope that she will, after her term as president is over, continue to serve in the same fashion. My wife Lee joins me in wishing Barbara, her husband Lew, and their two children, Celia and Brian, all the best in their many years ahead.●

PUBLIC SERVICE: GETTING YOURS

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, Reagan administration officials themselves appear to be the main beneficiaries of what passes for an economic recovery program. Private jets, inside deals, lavish office redecorating, $58,000 a year woodchoppers, are just some of the examples to date. The administration has given new meaning to the concept of public service.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 1983]

DUBIOUS DEALS OF REAGAN'S CROWD: BEHAVING LIKE THE PUBLIC TRUST IS YOUR PRIVATE CORPORATION

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

If you don't live in Richmond (where the Times-Dispatch put the story on the front page) you probably don't know about Dennis E. LeBlanc, who earns $58,500 of your tax dollars each year for official duties that include chopping wood and sweeping out the barn at President Reagan's ranch.

Improbable? Not in this administration.

LeBlanc is a former California highway patrolman who served on Gov. Reagan's security detail in Sacramento, and later worked for Ronald Reagan, private citizen, handling affairs at his ranch. He came to Washington with President-elect Reagan, worked in the White House's office of special support services, then last June moved over to the Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration. LeBlanc became "associate administrator for policy analysis and development," a top-level job that pays $58,500.

LeBlanc spent two of his first five months on this job in Santa Barbara, at the Reagan ranch, cutting wood, cleaning stables, building fences and "coordinating" the work of Secret Service security and communications personnel on the ranch, whose facilities LeBlanc helped build in his earlier, White House job.

"I feel perfectly at ease with it," LeBlanc said on the phone last week. "I look at it as just a detailee to the White House." Lots of government officials get detailed to the White House, he added.

Earlier, LeBlanc told John Hall of the Media General news service in an interview published in Richmond: "Chopping wood may seem like a vacation to some people. But the total amount of time I spend during the year is considerable."

What about the time away from telecommunications policy analysis? "This is not a day-to-day hotbed of activity," LeBlanc told Hall, speaking of the telecommunications office at Commerce. "I do call in and find out how things are going."

Obviously, LeBlanc is a crony of the president's; Reagan likes to have his company when he is out chopping brush on the ranch. But he is a crony earning top dollar on the peoples' payroll.

In other times, an arrangement like this might have been called a scandal. But in Ronald Reagan's Washington, it gets a shrug.

To some extent Richard Nixon deserves the credit for this. One of Nixon's most baleful legacies to his countrymen was the "I-am-not-a-crook" plea. Somehow Nixon managed to establish the idea that if a public figure can stay out of the pokey, everything else is okay.

But could Nixon have stood before any audience and said, with a straight face, "I am not a sleazy, conniving rogue?" Probably not. He wanted the world not to care about the sort of thing, and to an incredible degree he got what he wanted. Americans no longer seem capable of outrage at behavior that is simply improper or dubious. We seem to demand the smoking gun—as in the case of Labor Secretary Donovan—that will put a fellow in the clink before we'll ge mad.

Well, that's a theory, anyhow. You need some kind of theory to explain the apparent public indifference to the cases of embarrassing behavior in the Reagan administration. These are not "cases" in the police-blotter sense; none of the embarrassed members of this administration has been charged with a crime—not Richard V. Allen, or William J. Casey, or Raymond J. Donovan, or Max Hugel, or William French Smith, or James G. Watt, or Robert P. Nimmo, or Nancy Harvey Steorts, or William F. Harvey, or Donald Bogard, or Frederic N. Andre, or Thomas C. Reed, or John F. Lehman, or any of the others. No, these cases raise questions about other kinds of abuses—greed, corner-cutting, or cynical misuses of power. Many of these cases suggest a willingness to treat the federal government like one's own private corporation. They are "cases" in a political sense—cases of people in high position who have engaged in behavior that raises doubt about whether they deserve high position.

It isn't easy to read the long newspaper articles that describe instances of questionable behavior by high officials. They are detailed, complex and written under the eyes of lawyers who rarely help clarify a story. It is harder still to remember the details of particular cases, especially after some Senate committee or the Justice Department has concluded that the person in question is not guilty of any crime or "not unfit to hold office," in the felicitous phrase the Senate Intelligence Committee found to express its confidence in Casey, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

But rereading earlier stories about all of these individuals now, and doing it all at one sitting, creates a powerful impression. What follows is a selective review of some high points of the record up to now:

William J. Casey. Casey, who helped run Ronald Reagan's presidential campaign, sought to become his secretary of state and settled for CIA director, has had a long

career as a businessman and lawyer that has involved numerous lawsuits and a series of confirmation fights when he was appointed to high office in the Nixon, Ford and Reagan administrations. A thorough review of Casey's past would fill the Outlook section. Two instances, neither very well publicized, raise relevant questions about Casey.

The first is an old story—23 years old. Here is how the Associated Press has told it:

"A plagiarism suit brought by Harry Fields in 1959 contend[ed] that a tax booklet edited by Casey had used, without authorization, 2½ pages of a manuscript that Fields had written on employee benefit plans.

"According to court records, Fields gave Casey the manuscript to relay it to a New York publishing house, but Casey first showed it to one of his assistants who was editing an article for Casey's tax booklet on the same subject. Casey said he was unaware the assistant had copied the manuscript and used a portion of it in the booklet.

"A jury awarded Fields damages of $40,425, including $12,850 in punitive damages from Casey. Subsequently, Fields agreed to accept an immediate payment of $20,500 and to allow the verdict to be expunged from the record and to have the transcript sealed.

"In 1971, Casey told the Senate Banking Committee the settlement came about after the case, Judge J. Braxton Craven, told attorneys that the verdict was not supported by evidence and that he intended to set it aside.

"However, when Judge Craven was asked about Casey's claim, he denied making such a statement and told the committee that on the contrary, he felt the jury's verdict was 'amply' supported by the evidence."

A second item is just six months old. The Associated Press again tells the story:

"The CIA has established a 'screening arrangement' to keep tabs on Director William J. Casey's stock transactions and prevent him from official steps that would enhance his holdings.

"The new system still allows Casey to buy or sell stocks at his discretion.

"CIA officials said the new arrangement took effect May 28, [1982], after Casey reported selling more then $600,000 in oil stocks in 1981, a year oil stock prices plummeted in response to a worldwide glut.

"The CIA director is among a handful of top officals with broad access to U.S. intelligence information, including secret estimates of world oil supplies. Casey is the only senior Reagan administration offical with such access who neither set up a blind trust nor divested some of his holdings before taking office. . . ."

Max Hugel should follow Casey, because they have been friends for more than 20 years, and because Casey (over the objections of others in the White House and the CIA) gave Hugel one of the most sensitive jobs in the intelligence agency, chief of its clandestine operations.

Hugel only held that job for a few months—until The Washington Post reported allegations against him by two brothers who had once been Hugel's business associates. The brothers had made tape recordings that appeared to show Hugel engaging in blatantly improper stock dealings with them. Hugel proclaimed his innocence (he has since filed a libel suit against the two brothers). When he heard the tape reordings he said he recognized his voice, but didn't know what to make of the conversations he was hearing.

Among the things the tapes recorded was Hugel telling one of the two brothers: "If you do [*what I ask*], *I'll kiss you on both cheeks.* And if you don't I'll cut your [obscenity] off. You got no choice anyway. I'll get my Korean gang after you and you don't look so good when you're hanging by the [obscenity] anyway." Hours after The Post revelations hit the street, Hugel resigned from the CIA.

One has to wonder how the head of the CIA could turn to a man like Hugel to run the agency's most sensitive, dangerous operations. Hugel had no experience in intelligence, no experience in foreign policy, no experience in government, and no expertise on international affairs. His decision to give Hugel this job, Casey said later, was "a mistake" for which he took "full responsibilty." However, it was Hugel who resigned; Casey is still on the job.

William French Smith. On Dec. 11, 1980, Ronald Reagan announced his intention to make his longtime personal lawyer, Smith, the attorney general. Twenty days later—more precisely, just eight hours before the end of the 1980 tax year—Smith invested $16,500 in an oil and gas tax shelter from which he would claim $66,000 in tax deductions. In other words, Smith claimed $4 in tax writeoffs for every $1 in cash he invested, or at least twice as much as the Internal Revenue Service (whose "lawyer" Smith was about to become in his new job) then regarded as permissible, as the attorneys for Smith's tax shelter deal knew. They advised the investors that the deduction was adventurous, and said an IRS audit could be expected.

Thirteen days later, on Jan. 13, 1981, the Earle M. Jorgenson Co.—headed by Jorgenson, who, like Smith, was a member of Reagan's "kitchen cabinet"—said farewell to their board member, the new attorney general-designate, with a golden handshake. The Jorgenson board made Smith a "severance payment" of $50,000, which was more than Smith had earned in all the six years he had served on Jorgenson's board and the three years he had been on its audit committee. A company spokesman said this was the first such cash severance payment ever made to a Jorgenson director.

Had Smith inquired at his new place of employment, the Justice Department, he would have learned that in earlier cases, the department had ruled that incoming government officials could not accept such severance payments. But Smith did not inquire; he just took the money.

Stories in The Post last May revealed these matters, which Smith had included in financial disclosure reports filed earlier in the spring. The newspaper stories created quite a furor, and within days Smith announced that he would limit the tax deduction he took on the oil and gas deal to the amount he actually invested, and would return the $50,000 to the Jorgenson firm.

In a public statement explaining these decisions on May 28, Smith announced: "Although I earnestly believe that none of these actions are required by propriety or law, public service often invites the use of an even stricter standard. I intend to apply the strictest of standards."

Richard V. Allen. Allen's three watches and the ten $100 bills in his office safe got plenty of publicity, and led to his resignation as President Reagan's national security advisor. But in the furor over those matters, less attention was paid to a deal Allen made with Peter D. Hannaford, who bought out Allen's consulting business.

Hannaford was Michael Deaver's partner in a California public relations firm before Deaver joined the Reagan White House staff. Hannaford then moved his operations to Washington. (In the capital, Hannaford's firm apparently prospered. Public records showed Hannaford quadrupling his business as a lobbyist for domestic and foreign clients.) He also took over Allen's Potomac International Corp., agreeing to pay Allen $160,000 in installments for the firm's assets. Allen collected this money while serving as Reagan's NSC adviser.

But what are the assets of a consulting firm? Not much that is tangible, as the parties asknowledged. Apparently the only asset that could justify such a selling price was a list of clients that Hannaford could expect to retain. But why would a client who signed on with Allen—purportedly an expert on international security and trade issues—stick with a firm now run by a California P.R. man?

A White House report on the Allen affair released last January included this paragraph:

"Mr. Allen continued to have contacts with former clients of Potomac [his old firm, now owned by Hannaford] after Jan. 21, 1981 [inauguration day]. These included 'social' or 'courtesy' meetings at the White House, as well as luncheons and dinners at which a former client may have paid for Mr. Allen's meal. Some of the luncheons were hosted by Mr. Allen at the White House staff mess. Both Mr. Allen and his former clients indicate that no 'business' was discussed at these meetings, lunches, or dinners. The circumstances, including the reciprocal nature of the entertainment and the long friendship between Mr. Allen and these individuals support the conclusion that personal friendship was the motivating factor for the contact. Mr. Allen had no contacts with clients of the Hannaford company."

Nancy Harvey Steorts. Steorts, chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, ordered renovations to her office soon after she moved in. She had $10,000 spent on carpets, curtains and new paint, and on a new office entryway so she would have her own private reception area instead of sharing one with another commission member.

Soon after taking office, Steorts instructed the mailroom clerk who also served as her chauffeur to wear a uniform and hat whenever he drove her official car. Agency lawyers told her she could not give such an order, so she modified it, telling her driver to wear a suit. The clerk, a GS-4 earning less than $14,000 a year, said he didn't own a suit and couldn't afford to buy one. But agency accountants said government funds could not be used for a suit. In the end, two agency officials chipped in to buy the man a suit to protect his job.

According to The Wall Street Journal, Steorts used her car to go to lunch at the Mayflower Hotel, two blocks from her office, and also had her driver take her college-age daughter to visit friends.

Robert P. Nimmo. A protege of Edwin Meese III in the White House, Nimmo is a former California state legislator whom President Reagan named to run the Veterans' Administration. Nimmo spent $54,183 redecorating his office (he sent the old furniture to the office of Mary Nimmo, a spokesman for the Commerce Department who is his daughter). He also leased a big Buick as his offical car, though the rules said he should have a compact model. And he used the VA's chauffeur to take him to

and from work in violation of government regulations. When this was discovered, Nimmo repaid the government $6,641 of his own money for his luxurious commute.

Last October, shortly before the GAO was expected to release a report criticizing Nimmo for misusing chartered military aircraft and first-class air travel and for misusing his government chauffeur, Nimmo resigned.

William F. Harvey. The temporary chairman of the board of the Legal Services Corp.—his appointment lapsed when Congress adjourned—collected $25,028 in consulting fees from the government during the first 11 months of 1982. This, of course, got a lot of publicity, but the details of what Harvey was collecting for were buried on the inside pages.

For example, Harvey apparently disliked airplanes, so he drove to Washington from his home in Indianapolis for meetings of the Legal Services board. He charged the government at the rate of $221 a day to which he was entitled for the time it took him to make this drive. Sometimes he billed a one-way trip (615 miles) as two full days of consulting—$442.

Harvey billed the government $194.22 for postal expenses in connection with a two-day board meeting at the end October. Last May, during a five-night stay in Washington, he ran up a taxi bill of $147.05. (That would require about 70 trips within the first taxi zone, assuming he gave 20 percent tips.)

The list stops here for purely arbitrary reasons. There are many more cases of questionable behavior in this crowd, from James Watt's parties at the Custis-Lee Mansion (the Republican National Committee finally picked up the $6,517.30 tab for them) to the First Lady's acceptance of fancy clothes from American designers. That practice was dropped when the White House realized the implications of reporting gifts of clothes to Mrs. Reagan valued at thousands of dollars. Those she had accepted she gave away to museums as examples of historic creations by American couturiers.

What does this all add up to? "Ruled by shady men, a nation itself becomes shady," wrote H. L. Mencken many years ago, a nice aphorism that isn't easily digested in the real world. It doesn't seem fair to say that this crew is dramatically shadier than all of its predecessors. After all, it includes some wealthy men whose compliance with the new disclosure and conflict-of-interest regulations makes them look like paragons of upright behavior: George Shultz and George Bush are two, according to lawyers who deal with these matters.

But whatever the moral significance of all this, there are disturbing practical implications. It can only deepen the American public's cynicism about its governing institutions, and about the rules of fair play that Americans pretend to take seriously.

Eventually these embarrassments may add up to a serious political problem for Reagan. The White House is already distressed that many Americans perceive its policies as "unfair." Slippery behavior and selfishness in the upper reaches of the government cannot but make this perception sharper.

Two years ago, when the Reagan administration was taking shape, we were introduced to the "kitchen cabinet," that group of California millionaires who were Ronald Reagan's oldest backers and closest pals. These men are not big industrialists, but self-made entrepreneurs and small businessmen. They are the kind of rich Americans we associate with country clubs and conspicuous consumption.

Ed Meese, the president's counselor, may have revealed their view of the world with poetic clarity at a reporters' breakfast in Washington last May. "The progressive income tax is immoral," Meese said then. "I don't think we should penalize someone because he's successful."

In other words, wealthy men have no greater obligations to society than poorer ones; wealth is not a privilege but an entitlement. From there it is not a long jump to the conclusion that government service is a noble sacrifice whose fiscal pain should be kept to a minimum. And from there it is no jump at all—just a hop or a skip—to the kinds of behavior that have embarrassed the Reagan administration during its first two years in office.●

NUCLEAR WEAPONS REDUCTIONS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this new Congress I introduced, along with Congressmen SAM STRATTON, BILL CARNEY, and MELVIN PRICE, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, House Joint Resolution 4, which expresses the support of Congress for the objectives of the ongoing arms reduction negotiations in Geneva. It is critical that this body supports our Government's current efforts to achieve substantial, verifiable, equitable, and militarily significant reductions in the nuclear arsenals of both superpowers.

The President recently described nuclear arms control as "one of the most important tasks of our age." In a world which is armed to the teeth and seemingly awaiting Armageddon, real progress in arms control negotiations has never been more important than today. I believe that substantial reductions, below the current levels of the superpowers' nuclear arsenals, must be given thoughtful and serious consideration in the strategic arms control process.

Our negotiators at the strategic arms reduction talks are now seriously considering proposals which would reduce the quantity of ballistic missile warheads, the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and the aggregate of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles in each nation's arsenal below both current and SALT II levels.

Just recently, Soviet leader Yuri Andropov announced that the Soviets are now prepared to reduce their strategic arms by 25 percent. This proposal in itself goes beyond the maintenance of nuclear arsenals at current levels.

If the United States is to be successful in these arms reduction talks, the Soviets must be convinced that the U.S. proposals to reduce nuclear arms represent the firm commitment of Congress and the American people. The Soviet Union will simply refuse to negotiate seriously in Geneva with a U.S. delegation whose position has been repudiated by us here in Congress. Any efforts to propose substitute negotiations, including negotiations to freeze nuclear weapons, at current levels, would send the wrong signal to the Soviets and cripple our current negotiating efforts.

Dramatic reductions of nuclear arms to comparable levels for both the United States and the Soviet Union, which is the prime objective of the ongoing Geneva negotiations, should receive the full support of Congress. Your support for House Joint Resolution 4, will move the world closer to the lasting peace which all of us devoutly seek on this fragile planet.●

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE HOMELESS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to alert my colleagues to the fact that during the first week back in January I will be proposing legislation to allocate $50 million for emergency food and shelters.

During the lameduck session, the House passed a "jobs bill" that included $50 million for emergency food and shelters, but this program died when the job provisions were deleted.

But as you know, money for the estimated 2 million homeless is still desperately needed this winter, and I invite Members to join me in sponsoring legislation to provide $50 million in emergency relief.

Mayors and State health officials at an emergency conference in November described in painful detail the Nation's growing dependence on soup kitchens and public shelters. Local communities are being literally overwhelmed with requests for food and shelter. Unfortunately the cuts made in social welfare programs have come just in time to make things tougher for millions of formerly hard-working citizens suddenly out of jobs. Too many of these "new poor" are losing their homes and becoming part of the wandering poor living in their cars or tents. In my own State of California homeless families are living in the State parks and even on the margins of the Los Angeles Freeway.

The need for emergency shelters for victims of domestic violence has also greatly increased because of rising tensions brought on by the stress of unemployment and hard times. It is estimated that only 30 percent of the women and children seeking services

can now be serviced because of lack of shelters. Funding for domestic violence has been exacerbated by the budget cuts. In 1980 there were 13 separate federally funded programs that in some way provided assistance to local shelters and related projects. Today, five of the programs have been totally abolished, three block granted and doing less than Congress had originally hoped, and two more targeted for abolition. The remaining programs that have survived are now able to offer only paper hope.

Private charities cannot bridge the gap because as the urban Institute points out some 300,000 private charities will lose $33 billion in Federal aid between 1982 and 1985. The U.S. Catholic Conference concluded that "the stark reality is that the private resources are not sufficient."

My proposal is designed to authorize $50 million for emergency shelter and related assistance for: First, individuals and families who are without any form of regular shelter and food and have been determined by an appropriate public or private agency to be in need of emergency life-protecting shelter and food and/or; second, parents and their children who have suffered spousal abuse which has necessitated leaving their homes and are in need of emergency shelter.

Funds would be available on a 100-percent Federal basis through fiscal year 1983. State welfare agencies may contract with private nonprofit charitable organizations or other public agencies to administer the funds, determine need and/or provide assistance.

I invite groups interested in this legislation to call or write my office for copies of the draft proposal during the recess.●

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two pieces of legislation which I believe can be major influences on the direction that federally assisted housing programs will take in the future. Those proposals are the Residential Rental Housing Tax Incentive Act and a bill to coordinate the housing programs of HHS and HUD.

As a member of the Banking Committee's Housing Subcommittee for 12 years I have had the opportunity to study the existing public housing programs and to assess their successes and failures. I yield to no one in my compassion for those people in this country who are not able to find decent shelter at an affordable price. Decent housing is not a choice between the "haves" and the "have-nots."

Those people who are financially able to afford housing should be able to find something decent priced within their means. This category includes millions of lower income American families who do not want to depend on Government assistance but who are forced by housing shortages either to live in substandard units or to pay unconscionable rents. These people need to have a hope for the future and I propose to give it to them.

My two bills are not direct handouts to either the renter or the landlord. The Residential Rental Housing Tax Incentive Act addresses the extreme need for more private sector production of rental housing through a tax incentive approach. I believe that we must act now to restore rental housing to at least the bare margin of profitability, and that tax advantages are essential to that margin. We must also act immediately to contain the subsidy costs of the assisted housing programs, which can no longer be directly supported by the Federal Government. The savings associated with a tax incentive approach to producing new and rehabilitated rental units affordable by low-income people are obvious when you compare these indirect costs with the frightening costs of direct subsidy programs. Even if Congress never authorizes a single additional unit for subsidization, annual housing assistance outlays under existing commitments will be at least $9.6 billion by 1986. Clearly, we must develop more efficient approaches.

Consequently, I propose shortening the period for straight-line depreciation—the method most preferred for housing development—to 10 years for newly constructed or rehabilitated rental housing, and to 8 years for new buildings in which at least 20 percent of the units are leased to low-income families at affordable rents. The 20-percent standard developed by the Mortgage Bond Subsidy Act and tandem financing of section 8 projects insured under section 221(d)(4) of the National Housing Act appears a more realistic and workable approach to providing low-income rental units. I would also broaden the definition of low-income rehabilitation which qualifies for 5-year writeoff under existing law to the 20-percent standard and increase to $40,000 per unit the maximum which may be depreciated without any of the complex restrictions in the current law.

Finally, this bill includes financial incentives for owners of rental properties in which 20 percent of the tenants are low income both to maintain the property and continue to own it after most of the usual tax benefits have been taken. Specifically, I propose an investment tax credit to kick in after 5 years of occupancy. Landlords would receive a $1 reduction in taxes for each $1 spent on maintenance, up to 5 percent of the adjusted basis in the building. The credit would kick in just at the point when the building typically requires new paint and the inevitable small but costly repairs. In addition to creating more low-income housing, this provision should help to extend the useful, rental life of many buildings.

Our experience with the section 8 program clearly illustrates that the major problem of housing low-income families cannot be resolved by throwing money at the problem even if we had the funds. It is for that reason I argue that only through tax incentives will we be able to maintain our commitment to an adequate supply of rental housing but without increasing Federal outlays. The Residential Rental Housing Tax Incentive Act will restore that vital element of profit incentive to the development and maintenance of rental housing for all income groups. If Federal housing policy is to shift away from direct subsidies, new techniques must be developed to close the construction and maintenance gap. This proposal will do that immediately.

The second bill I am introducing is a demonstration program to improve the quality of housing paid for by Federal Government under the HHS/AFDC program. It encourages the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Health and Human Services to work together—instead of working against each other—in an effort to provide better housing for needy Americans. It may surprise many of my colleagues to learn that these two agencies are at odds, and I should emphasize that this circumstance is by no means intentional. However, I view it as one of the major problems facing our housing policy. Let me explain.

Traditionally, we think of HUD as the primary agency which provides housing assistance. Indeed, HUD has a wide variety of programs, most of which require landlords to meet minimum housing standards for rental units.

At the same time, however, the Department of Health and Human Services spends at least $5 billion a year on housing assistance. This assistance takes the form of direct payments to AFDC recipients who, in turn, use that money to purchase housing on the open market. Unlike HUD, however, HHS mandates no minimum standards to be met by landlords who house these recipients. As a result, landlords can and do receive the full amount of this assistance money regardless of the condition of their buildings. In a tight rental market, this system there-

by sustains a demand for substandard housing and assures a steady cash flow to landlords who rent substandard units. It is estimated that 50 percent of the housing units occupied by recipients of the AFDC program are considerably below accepted standards for safe and decent housing.

The legislation I am introducing today is intended to end this contradiction in which HUD is working to improve our housing stock while HHS is subsidizing a substandard stock. It would accomplish this goal by authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to encourage States and units of local government to develop programs which encompass both HUD and HHS funds to assist lower income families. Policy and program development would be developed at the local level, where the housing needs of the poor are known and where the programs needed to remedy housing problems are best understood. While local programs could differ, they must all provide for the improvement of housing quality for lower income families.

Once plans are developed, States and localities can apply to the HUD Secretary for the funds needed to carry out the proposal. The legislation provides an authorization of $25 million for the Secretary's discretionary fund, which should be used to fund at least 20 local demonstration projects. Once these projects have been completed, it is my hope that Congress will get about the business of straightening out this housing debacle once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, our rental housing crisis is simply too critical to let the existing conflict between HUD and HHS continue. It is the cornerstone of our Nation's housing policy to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for all Americans. And yet, we are funding a $5 billion program which effectively frustrates this goal. I submit that we can correct this insanity through a modest financial incentive for States and localities. In return for this incentive, we will take a giant step toward the realization of our stated housing policies.

This demonstration program was included in the housing bill reported by the Banking Committee in the 97th Congress; it was included in the substitute amendment developed by the committee during the "lameduck" session and has been given a friendly review by my friends on the Senate Banking Committee.

Mr. Speaker, both of my proposals are needed urgently by the disadvantaged renters in this country. They will help provide more and better rental housing for low-income Americans but without worsening the budget situation. These are tough times economically, but with innovative approaches such as the HUD/HHS coordination program and the Residential Rental Housing Tax Incentive Act this Congress can meet its housing obligation.●

IN HONOR OF THE RETIREMENT OF JOHN C. BRIZENDINE, PRESIDENT, DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT CO. AND CORPORATE VICE PRESIDENT, McDONNELL DOUGLAS CORP.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we are indeed fortunate to be in the unique position to develop close friendships with a number of men and women both inside and outside of Government. One such friend, who stands out among the rest, and who I admire not only for his keen business sense, but also for his friendship, is John Brizendine. John, who late this past year announced his retirement as president of Douglas Aircraft Co. as well as from his position as corporate vice president of McDonnell Douglas Corp., will be honored at a testimonial dinner on January 20. I would like to take this opportunity to briefly relate to my colleagues some of the many accomplishments of John these past years.

Born August 3, 1925, in Independence, Mo., John was a naval aviator in the Second World War and attended the University of Kansas, where he received both his B.S. and M.S. degree in aeronautical engineering.

He began his illustrious career at the McDonnell Douglas Corp. in 1950 as a flight test engineer at Santa Monica, Calif. It was here John began his long, steady climb to the top of the corporate ladder. Some of the positions John subsequently held were flight test engineer, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif. (1951); flight test engineer, Patuxent River Naval Air Test Center, Md. (1953); flight test engineer and test project engineer, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif. (1953-54); test project engineer—DC-8 FAA certification (1958); DC-8 program manager, Santa Monica, Calif. (1960); special assignment: Project "Forge" (1961); DC-9 program manager, aircraft division (1965); vice president/general manager, DC-10 program, aircraft division (1968); executive vice president (1971); corporate vice president, McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1972); president, Douglas Aircraft Co. (1973); and board of directors, McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1982).

As you can see, John's rise to the top can only be described as spectacular. His widespread knowledge in the complex field of aeronautical engineering as well as his ability to understand the intricacies of internal corporate affairs won him widespread respect and support.

John made the time to become involved in a number of professional organizations. Among these are: Conquistadores del Cielo; American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics—fellow; Air Force Association; Navy League; National Defense Transportation Association; and, National Council for United States-China Trade, chairman 1978-82.

Also, through John's accomplishments at Douglas Aircraft and his involvement in community affairs, he has been the recipient of numerous awards. These include: Tau Beta Pi (national engineering fraternity); Sigma Gamma Tau (national honorary aeronautical engineering society); National Management Association Silver Knight Award, 1965; Boy Scouts of America Distinguished Eagle Award; University of Kansas Distinguished Alumnus Citation, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to John's triumphs in the field of aviation in this country, he served—in a sense—as our unofficial ambassador: to numerous foreign countries. His extensive travels throughout the world on behalf of our airframe industry gave him the opportunity to extend American goodwill to the four corners of the globe. To me John Brizendine epitomizes the very best that America has to offer to our allies; this applies not only in his technical ability but also his business skills as well as his high moral standards.

I must also say that my wife and I have enjoyed getting together with John and his lovely wife, Shirley, on numerous occasions. They are two of the finest people that we have had the privilege of knowing and, although John is retiring for a well-deserved rest, I am sure that we will continue to see them active in the community.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating John on his many accomplishments and on his unblemished career at Douglas Aircraft. We wish him and his wife, Shirley, and their two children, Suzanne and John, all the best in their future endeavors.●

UNIVERSAL COVERAGE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation that would require Members of Congress and employees of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government to participate in the social security program.

There has been much talk recently about what we are going to do to save

the social security system, and in the course of this talk, many citizens outside the Federal Government have come to realize that most Federal employees do not participate at all in social security. In becoming aware of this fact, most people's first question, logically enough, is: If the social security system is such a wonderful program, why do not Federal employees and those in Congress—which after all was the originator of the system and is now responsible for making desirable changes in it—participate in social security and come under its coverage? Is their own retirement system better and more beneficial?

It seems rather strange that the social security system, which supposedly is good enough to cover 116 million working Americans at the present time, is apparently not good enough for Congress or even for the Commissioner of Social Security himself.

We made a commitment in the 95th Congress to improve the social security system, and yet little action has been taken to fulfill that commitment. The Social Security Amendments of 1977, which passed in the 95th Congress, established a National Commission on Social Security to study the social security system and make recommendations for improving it. The National Commission on Social Security delivered its report to President Reagan on March 12, 1981. The research, field hearings, and factual findings of this prestigious, bipartisan commission provided an excellent basis for considering the future of social security. However, I was advised that the comprehensive 1981 report of the National Commission on Social Security was totally ignored after its delivery to the White House. Instead of considering its recommendations and taking action on the issue, President Reagan appointed another commission which began the study process all over again. The Reagan commission will presently report its findings and recommendations, although much disagreement remains among its members as to what action should be taken on social security.

Both commissions, however, have agreed on one point—the question of universal coverage. And, I can think of no better way for those of us in Congress to demonstrate that we fully recognize our commitment to act on the social security issues than by placing ourselves under mandatory participation in the social security system, thereby tying our own personal finances into the future of a program which already affects 90 percent of the country's working population, because they are paying into the system, and over 35 million, because they are receiving monthly benefits from it. It is our responsibility to take decisive action now, because the wheels of change have already been set in motion.

The 1981 report of the National Commission on Social Security recommended that social security coverage be made compulsory for all Federal, State, and local government employees not now covered by any retirement system, and for the President, Vice President, Cabinet members, Social Security Commissioner and Members of Congress, and employees of nonprofit organizations. The Commission also recommended that by 1985, all new Government employees joining civil service be included on a mandatory basis. Furthermore, according to press reports, President Reagan's advisory commission also recommends bringing into the system all future Federal employees and current Federal employees with less than 5 years of Government service.

I believe required participation in the system by Members of Congress and other Federal employees would go a long way toward sensitizing the Congress and the executive branch as to what must be done.

After all, if the present system is so good, why should not we all pay for it and benefit from it? On that basis alone, I would confidently anticipate speedy and overwhelming passage of this legislation so that U.S. Representatives and Senators would be able to avail themselves of the social security system's present advantages and opportunities, providing, of course, that Members of Congress really do think that the program as it now exists is a good investment to make for one's future.

On the other hand, if enthusiastic congressional support for this legislation does not materialize after all, we should in all fairness explain to our constituents just why what is good enough for them is not good enough for us. We can certainly be quite confident that such an explanation will be requested, if not demanded, by our constituents. And if it is sought by enough people, the only justifiable and defensible response we can give will be to enact either this bill or the necessary remedial legislation.

In sum, I believe that all of us in the Congress will have more incentive promptly to improve the social security system if we ourselves become part of it.●

TRAVEL EXPENSE DEDUCTIONS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the rules for deducting travel expenses to and from temporary job sites. The purpose of this clarification is to insure that the travel expenses construction workers incur in order to practice their trades may be deducted in the same way that lawyers, accountants, and professionals are allowed to deduct their business travel expenses.

The background is as follows: Section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code authorizes taxpayers to deduct their ordinary and necessary business expenses including travel expenses incurred for business reasons. On the other hand, travel expenses incurred for personal reasons are not deductible. For example, a person with a regular job in a city who chooses for personal reasons to live in a distant suburb cannot deduct the costs of driving to and from the regular job each day.

The courts have attempted to distinguish business from personal travel expenses through the use of the so-called temporary job doctrine: If the job is temporary, then the travel costs are deductible. The Internal Revenue Service, however, has been applying this doctrine without regard to its purpose of distinguishing travel undertaken for business purposes from travel undertaken for personal purposes. As a result, thousands of construction workers around the country are being denied the ability to deduct expenses that, by any rational standard, constitute ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Here is a typical example. A construction worker has lived and worked in a particular community for many years. His primary business contacts are in that community. He has a home in that community; his children attend school there; he and his wife vote and pay taxes there. His wife may have a job there. If construction work becomes temporarily unavailable in the home community—and in the current economy this is happening more and more often—the worker has only two choices. He can look for work in more distant areas and work away from home until a job in his community becomes available, or he can remain unemployed. If he takes a distant job, he must either move his home and family to that job or incur substantial additional expense, either by traveling many miles each day or by renting temporary lodging near the job.

For most workers, moving home and family is either impossible or contrary to good business judgment. Housing near the job may be unavailable or prohibitively expensive. More importantly, however, construction work is inherently uncertain; workers are well aware that they are likely to be laid off without warning at any time. Furthermore, the worker in this situation fully intends to take work closer to his traditional work area as soon as a job

opens up. The worker therefore has only two choices; remain unemployed or incur travel expenses in order to practice his trade.

The travel expenses are therefore clearly necessary to the worker's trade. Nevertheless, the IRS automatically disallows most such expenses. In fact, the IRS has conducted mass audits at large construction projects for the purpose of disallowing travel expenses. On the other hand, the IRS allows professionals and businessmen to deduct, without question, the expenses they incur when they have to travel to practice their trade.

The IRS uses the so-called 1-year rule as the basis for its arbitrary action. Under this "rule," a job that has lasted for more than 1 year is automatically regarded as not temporary, and travel expenses are disallowed. This hindsight test ignores the crucial fact that the worker could have been laid off at any time throughout the year. The 1-year rule has been expressly rejected by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, but the IRS has announced that it will refuse to follow the eighth circuit's holding.

The IRS also uses as a ground for disallowance the fact that the worker's job is indefinite, but it is the very indefiniteness of the job that makes deductibility appropriate. A worker's decision to avoid travel expenses by moving his family makes economic sense only if he has some assurance the job will last for a substantial period of time; it makes no sense if he is uncertain whether the job will last much longer. And, if it is not reasonable for the worker to move closer to the job, then his travel expenses are the result of business necessity, not personal choice, and they should be deductible.

Mr. Speaker, equity and efficiency require that something be done. The current IRS interpretation unfairly penalizes the working men and women of this country, and has led to expensive and needless litigation. Construction workers deserve to have the special problems of their industry recognized. Their travel expenses to distant job sites are certainly more necessary to their jobs than an executive's three-martini lunch is to his.

My proposed bill institutes an easily administered rule that will eliminate the need for litigation in the vast majority of cases. Construction workers will be recognized as being temporarily away from home for the first 2 years of employment at any job site more than 30 miles from their home. This will eliminate the disputes in the vast majority of cases. In those few cases that are not resolved by the 2-year rule, the deductibility of the travel expenses will be determined case by case. In making this determination, the IRS and the courts will be prohibited from using either the 1-year rule or the "indefinite employment" rationale, but will make their decision according to whether the expenses are incurred because of business necessity rather than personal convenience.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

H.R. 700

To define the circumstances under which construction workers may deduct travel and transportation expenses in computing their taxable incomes for purposes of the Federal income tax

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

(a) TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES OF CONSTRUCTION WORKERS.—Section 162 of the Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deductions for ordinary therein the following new subsection:

"(h) SPECIAL RULE FOR CONSTRUCTION WORKERS.—

"(1) DEFINITION OF TEMPORARY JOB SITE.—For purposes of applying subsections (a)(1) and (a)(2) to travel and transportation expenses incurred by construction workers, a job at a site located more than 30 miles from a construction worker's principal place of residence—

"(A) shall be deemed to be temporary for the first 2 years that the worker is employed at that job, and

"(B) shall be determined to be temporary or not temporary with respect to periods following the first 2 years of employment based on an examination of all the facts and circumstances, subject to the rules set forth in subparagraphs (2), (3), and (4).

"(2) EFFECT OF FIRST 2 YEARS ON SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION.—In determining whether or not a job is temporary under subparagraph (1)(B), the worker's employment at the job during the period specified in subparagraph (1)(A) shall not be taken into account.

"(3) INDEFINITE EMPLOYMENT.—No deduction shall be disallowed, by reason of section 262 or any other provision of law, solely because a construction worker's employment at a job site is of indefinite duration.

"(4) PROHIBITION ON APPLICATION OF 1 YEAR RULE.—In making the determination specified in subparagraph (1)(B), no length of time shall be deemed, either automatically or presumptively, to make the job other than temporary. The '1-year' rule set forth is Revenue Ruling 59-371, or in any similar ruling or regulation, is expressly disapproved as a grounds for disallowing deductions.

"(5) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'construction worker' means any individual employed, whether as a skilled, semiskilled, or unskilled laborer, in the building or construction industry, but does not include clerical or management employes.".

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subsection 162(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "(h)" and inserting therefor "(j)".

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE

This section shall be effective upon enactment.●

WPPSS DISASTER DEMANDS IMMEDIATE FEDERAL ACTION

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the following letter again requests timely action by appropriate Federal officials to maximize public protection in the impending economic disaster involving the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS):

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1982.

Mr. DONALD HODEL,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: Recent developments in the continuing crisis of the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS) lead me to write you again to renew the urgent request that officers of the Federal Government convene a meeting for the purpose of apportioning by agreement financial obligations to prevent the total collapse of the entire WPPSS system and the consequent damage to the economy of the Northwest.

As previously discussed, by virtue of your office as Secretary of Energy you are certainly an appropriate person to call such a conference. However, since the judge in King County, Washington, has ordered trial on the matter of the participation contracts and surrounding issues, there will soon come a time when I can no longer ethically urge my constituents, who are signators to the agreement, to cooperate in seeking an extrajudicial compromise to the economic calamity of WPPSS.

When the King County judge denied the right of step-up to the plaintiffs in the Chemical suit, he guaranteed that any judicial settlement will be inequitable to someone. Unless there is rapid action to bring the parties together while there is still time to do so, the situation will continue to deteriorate. Since the bond underwriters are maintaining their obdurate silence on who owns the bearer bonds, there is little doubt that the actions of the WPPSS management and their advisors within and outside government will have to be subjected to intense scrutiny.

A mediated solution to the collapse of WPPSS will certainly mitigate the concerns of members of Congress, the ratepayers of the Northwest and the people in general that the government is not in the posture of protecting special financial interests as an antagonist to the welfare of its own citizens.

In view of the continuing demands I have made for the bond underwriters on the WPPSS project to come forward with the facts on who retains ownership of those bonds, I am dismayed at recent statements which seem to emanate from federal officials suggesting that the Congress should bail out WPPSS on WPN 2. It is my view that until the agencies of the Federal Government charged with the management of electricity in the Northwest force the disclosure of the facts on the current financing of WPPSS, no consideration of any kind can be given to the financing by the taxpayers of the completion of any part of WPPSS.

There is already question as to whether the co-ops and utilities have been financing

WPPSS or Wall Street, but direct financing of the underwriters by the government can only be described as outrageous.

Since the January 10th court action is fast approaching, please let me know your intentions as soon as possible regarding my suggestion that you act as mediator to more quickly and fairly salvage the WPPSS situation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE HANSEN,
Member of Congress.●

CURBING WORLD HUNGER

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress, we moved on several fronts to insure that foreign aid really worked and served truly needy recipients.

Yet foreign aid remains very controversial and the number of hungry and dying children grows with each passing day.

A recent article in the Washington Post by Stephen S. Rosenfeld suggests a sensible way to help break hunger's stranglehold on poor children.

Rosenfeld cites the plan recommended in the annual report of the United Nations Children's Fund. The report outlines a simple and promising program to cut in half the number of children who die from malnutrition and infection each day.

If developed nations could work together and invested only $1 billion per year for 20 years they could help save 20,000 children each day. A sound investment for human dignity and world peace.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 31, 1982]

BILLION-DOLLAR BARGAIN

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

It gives a nice glow to send or receive a UNICEF holiday greeting card: you are doing your bit for the world's children. Just how much you are doing, and how little, you can discover from "The State of the World's Children, 1982-1983," the annual report of the United Nations Children's Fund put out by its executive director, James P. Grant.

Grant, well known in Washington for his work at AID and the Overseas Development Council, is a great packager and promoter of the do-able. In his new report, he offers something eye-popping; how to cut in half, from 40,000 to 20,000, by the year 2000 the number of children who die from malnutrition and infection every day, and how to do this for a mere $1 billion a year, with existing technology and infrastructure, and without further political changes or risks for the Third World nations where the kids now die.

UNICEF's four aces:

(1) Oral rehydration therapy (ORT), a new technique developed in Bangladesh using cheap, easy-to-use materials to stop the diarrhea-caused dehydration that is the single biggest killer of children in the world.

(2) Universal child immunization, made feasible by scientific advances (more heat-stable vaccines) and by the delivery system of community organizations and paraprofessionals now increasingly in place in the Third World.

(3) Promotion of breast feeding, which has declined steeply in recent decades in poor countries, to reduce "the most unnecessary malnutrition of all."

(4) Mass use of home child-growth charts to make mothers the more knowing and participatory helpers of their children's health.

These four "low-cost, low-risk, low-resistance people's health actions," as Grant describes them, "do not depend on the economic and political changes which are necessary in the longer term if poverty itself is to be eradicated. They are available now"—given, as always, the political will.

Nor will such a children's "survival revolution" merely run up population growth rates, Grant argues. As parents become more confident that their children will survive, they tend historically to have fewer births.

I heard a roomful of development professionals dissect the UNICEF program for an evening. Basically, no one could lay a finger on it.

But so much for the hopeful side. The sobering side starts from an awareness that economic distress has halted the postwar improvement in global child health. The numbers of children living and growing in ill health are set to increase.

UNICEF's new program centers on improving the use of available food. But as many as a third of the families in need lack the requisite land, job or income. For them, UNICEF supports, with the rhetoric that is its sole recourse in this realm, "political and economic change to allow the poor to both participate in, and benefit from, the increases in production which can most certainly be achieved."

Meanwhile, UNICEF isolates the world's poorest families, finding them caught in a cycle of ill health, low energy and poverty—from which they still could be released by consumer food subsidies targeted on undernourished pregnant women and young children.

Is this getting too radical-sounding for you? Is there a bit too much of the proclivity for broad-scale social justice and social engineering that often seems to be mixed with the water up there at the United Nations?

If so, then perhaps you will accept an obligation to spell out your alternative. The unfortunate fact is that the simplest way to remain a moderate and to be regarded as "sound" in the face of great deprivation is to avert your gaze from the conditions that incline many of those who observe them closely to more far-reaching solutions.

In any event, UNICEF finesses that choice in the short run by offering a program within the ideological reach of just about everybody. Think of it: for a lousy billion dollars a year and no revolution, millions of kids can live.●

SAN PEDRO CITIZEN OF THE YEAR BOB BECK

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to pay tribute to a man who has been chosen from a field of 35 nominees to be honored by his fellow citizens. Robert F. Beck, editor-manager of the San Pedro News-Pilot, has been named 1983 San Pedro Citizen of the Year by the San Pedro Lions Clubs. On January 27, he will be honored at a community recognition dinner at Ports O' Call restaurant in San Pedro.

After graduating from California State University at San Diego in 1958, Bob Beck worked as a reporter for the News-Pilot. He was promoted to managing editor in 1965, and was named editor-manager in 1971. Bob Beck is known and appreciated for his famous "Beck 'n' Call" columns. As editor-manager of the News-Pilot, Bob is also known for being very accessible to the public. He is a man who has always placed the concerns of his community and the responsibilities of his difficult job ahead of all else.

Bob Beck has long been active in numerous harbor area organizations. He is on the board of directors of the Salvation Army, the Harbor Area Retarded Children's Foundation, San Pedro Meals on Wheels, maritime industries luncheon, Wilmington Boys Club, and the harbor division, Police Youth Foundation. He is treasurer of the San Pedro Peninsula Hospital board of directors, the treasurer of the San Pedro Peninsula Health Services Corp., and the treasurer of the San Pedro Services Corp. Bob Beck is also secretary of the Ambulatory Health Services Corp., and is vice president of the Boys Club of San Pedro. He recently became a specialist reserve police officer with the Los Angeles Police Department.

As if this were not enough, Bob Beck is also a member of the San Pedro Rotary Club, the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, the 15th Councilmanic District Advisory Council, the 4th Supervisorial District Advisory Council, the Harbor Division Police Community Council, the Citizens Planning Advisory Committee for the Harbor Area, the Harbor Association of Industry & Commerce, the San Pedro Athletic and Recreation Committee, and the Exhausted Roosters. He is also a member of several professional organizations: the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Sigma Delta Chi, the Society of Professional Journalists, the California Newspaper Publishers Association Editors Conference, and the Associated Press Managing Editors.

But Bob Beck is more than just a name on the rolls of whatever organization he is a member of. He is an outstanding worker, constantly going to meetings and helping out whenever he can. In all cases in which my wife, Lee, and I have had a chance to work with Bob, he has shown that he will get the job done. We were especially honored when he agreed to serve on the board

of directors of the Glenn and Lee Anderson Foundation. Both Lee and I would like to take this occasion to say "Thank you" to Bob for his great accomplishments in the community. We wish him, his wife Billie, and his sons Mark and David, all the best in the years ahead.●

REINTRODUCTION OF R&D TAX INCENTIVE LEGISLATION—A JOBS PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, to restore the economic prosperity of our Nation, I believe a long-term commitment must be made to encourage research and development (R&D) spending. Therefore, today Messrs. PICKLE, SHANNON, HEFTEL, and I are reintroducing legislation to make permanent certain R&D tax incentives contained in the 1981 Tax Act.

From World War II to the late 1960's, America reaped the rewards of being the world's leader in science and technology. Our superior position gave the United States a competitive edge in world markets, created new jobs and industries, and increased the Nation's productivity. I believe that large R&D expenditures were a fundamental source for many of these gains.

However, during the seventies R&D spending slackened in the United States, while it greatly increased in Europe and Japan. In fact, in the United States, R&D spending as a percentage of gross national product (GNP) peaked at 2.96 percent in 1964. By 1978, the West German and Japanese ratio of R&D to GNP was 2.37 percent and 1.93 percent, respectively, thus, in one case surpassing and in the other coming close to the 1978 U.S. R&D expenditure of 2.23 percent of GNP. And, in the United States, a large percentage of our R&D spending is focused on the space and defense programs—a significant factor since civilian R&D expenditures have a greater impact on economic growth and productivity. During the past two decades, Germany and Japan have had the highest ratios of civilian R&D to GNP in the world.

These high levels of Japanese and German R&D are a source of their export competitiveness—competitiveness which is transferring jobs from the United States to those countries and their international subsidiaries.

Between 1971 and 1978, the number of patents issued to American inventors declined 16 percent, while the number of patents to foreign inventors rose 11 percent. Over one-half of those patents distributed to foreigners were issued to Japanese and West German inventors.

If America is to maintain its leadership in high-tech industries, this trend cannot be allowed to continue.

With this in mind, I was greatly encouraged by several sections in the 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act which provided:

First, for a 25 percent tax credit for certain research and experimental expenditures, but only to the extent that current-year expenditures exceed the average amount of such expenditures during a base period. This provision expires December 31, 1985.

Second, that for 2 taxable years after the date of enactment, taxpayers must allocate or apportion all research and experimental expenditures paid or incurred in activities conducted in the United States to U.S. source income; this provision is designed to encourage R&D in the United States, rather than abroad.

Already industry leaders have pointed to these provisions as a positive stimulus for their companies' R&D spending. A recent survey done by McGraw-Hill projected a 17-percent increase in R&D spending in the United States during 1982. They also expect an expenditure increase of 37 percent between now and 1985. However, America cannot expect its industries and universities to make long range plans for R&D, when the 1981 provisions expire by 1985. Long-range R&D projects can be extremely expensive, and without this incentive they may never be started. We must make a strong and permanent commitment to R&D spending, through a removal of the termination date on the 1981 provisions.

I believe this change would help put this Nation on the road to recovery by helping create a whole new generation of clean, high-value-added products for American workers to produce.●

GAO AUDIT OF LEGISLATIVE ACCOUNTS

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, during previous Congresses, there have been numerous allegations about misconduct or abuse of funds by our colleagues in Congress. The charges, substantiated or not, have cast a shadow over the credibility of Congress in general. One very direct way I know of restoring public confidence in the honesty and integrity of elected officials is to let the Sun shine on official office accounts as provided for in legislation that I plan to reintroduce.

The Legislative Accounts Audit and Control Act, which I will introduce, requires an annual audit by the General Accounting Office of House Members' and committees' accounts. At the present time, every appropriation made by the Congress for any function of the Federal Government is subject to an annual audit by the GAO, except for the Congress of the United States. Our predecessors in the Congress established the GAO and required annual audits to insure that taxpayers' dollars were being properly spent.

In my view, the congressional exemption should never have been granted in the first place. While we cannot speak for the other body, we in the House have an obligation to the taxpayer to let him know how we expend public funds to run our individual offices and our committees.

Certainly, it is not too much to ask that those who set policy and appropriate funds for other governmental functions be subject to scrutiny on how they will spend the $1.1 billion in tax dollars appropriated to carry out the legislative function in fiscal year 1983.

Therefore, my bill would require the GAO to perform an audit of any expenditures or financial transactions of each Member, officer, or standing committee of the House of Representatives involving disbursements from the contingent fund of the House during calendar years 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982, with such audit to be completed within 9 months. Beyond that, my bill would require, beginning with calendar year 1983 and each calendar year thereafter, an annual GAO audit to be completed no later than 3 months following the close of the calendar year. Upon completion of any audit, the Comptroller General would transmit a report to the Speaker of the House with respect to the results of such audit and any such report would be available to the public for inspection and copies furnished upon request for a reasonable charge.

More than ever, Government, and certainly Congress, is being held up to public scrutiny. We resolved in the 95th Congress to open up our personal finances to public view. I can think of no reason for not letting the taxpayers see how their public moneys are being used.●

SEC ASKED TO PROBE WPPSS BOND MARKETING

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it has become necessary for protection of the public to ask the Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate the bond underwriting and mar-

keting circumstances of the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS), a $26 billion nuclear energy project. The following letters and articles describe this situation of the investigation which now has the support of the chairman of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 5, 1983]

SEC ASKED TO PROBE BOND MARKETING

Four congressmen from the Pacific Northwest are asking the Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate the marketing of bonds financing five nuclear power plants in the region.

In a statement issued yesterday by Rep. George Hansen of Idaho, the congressman said they met Monday with SEC Chairman John Shad "to present a letter expressing their concern with the growing indications of irregularities in the development and marketing" of the bonds. The others are Reps. Larry Craig of Idaho, Jim Weaver of Oregon, and Mike Lowry of Washington.

NORTHWEST CONGRESSMEN URGE SEC PROBE OF WPPSS FINANCING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A delegation of four Pacific Northwest Congressmen met yesterday with Chairman John Shad of the Securities and Exchange Commission to present a letter expressing their concern with the growing indications of irregularities in the development and marketing of bonds financing five nuclear plants in the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS) complex.

The principal reason for the meeting was to urge the SEC to investigatge the operation of the bond industry in relation to the financing of WPPSS. the four, George Hansen of Idaho, Jim Weaver of Oregon, Mike Lowry of Washington, and Larry Craig of Idaho, have most of the 88 involved participant utilities among their state constituencies. All have been actively concerned for the growing scandal of WPPSS operational and financing difficulties.

The SEC is required by law to maintain confidentiality on matters under investigation, but the Congressmen were able to reveal that their visit dealt in part with the misapprehension many people have that WPPSS bonds are government guaranteed. Taking care to emphasize that they are not, the four legislators also pointed out that the problem goes beyond marketing techniques of bond sales organizations.

A major concern discussed at the meeting was in how the bonds originated and the part played in the contract of participation and the inducements to the 88 made by or with the consent and cooperation of the bond underwriters. While sharing misgivings over the unusual financial maneuverings of the WPPSS, BPA and the underwriting partnership, each of the delegation expressed different concerns. Congressman Weaver denounced the excessive profits of the underwriters. Congressman Craig informed the Chairman that farmers in Idaho would be going out of business through inability to pay the doubled and tripled new rates if WPPSS and the financiers were successful in the suit. Congressman Lowry pointed out that, historically, large and high-yield bonds were sold in the last two years when financial liability of the power plants was in serious doubt. Congressman Hansen, in delivering the letter, expressed concern for the small investors who had innocently bought WPPSS bonds and now were in danger of being wiped out and also pointed out that if the WPPSS matter is not resolved equitably, most of the rate payers would face rate increases of several hundred percent.

The letter addressed to Chairman Shad urged the SEC to initiate a thorough investigation of the member's of the underwriting group which were involved in the WPPSS affair for conduct which has raised the possibility of material misrepresentation both in inducing the smaller utilities to enter the agreement and in marketing the bonds. The Chairman, citing his duty of confidentiality, promised to look into the matter.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. December 30, 1982.

Mr. JOHN S. R. SHAD,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, 5th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since late in 1981, a 26 billion dollar electrical generation project in the Pacific Northwest, known as the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS), has been in deep financial trouble. The project was for the construction of five nuclear power plants. The first of these plants, NP1, 2, and 3, were all that were originally planned. Apparently due to an adverse I.R.S. tax ruling, certain financing benefits from those plants were lost which jeopardized the cost-benefit feasibility.

Thereafter two additional plants, NP4 and 5, were added to the project and their financing was based upon requiring 88 small electric distributors, including many of the municipalities and cooperatives in the Northwest, to enter financing agreements involving their agreeing to pay for the plants, whether they ever produced electricity or not.

There has been active concern with the problem for a year since NP4 and 5 were terminated in the early stages of construction. The obvious result was that the participants in 4 and 5, which have come to be known as the 88, will be forced to pay 7 billion dollars for electricity which they will never receive.

We now bring this matter to your attention as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, because of disturbing developments in the litigation and in other disclosures about the entire financing situation surrounding this economic disaster.

First, it now appears that the entire scheme to build and finance NP4 and 5 was developed out of a need to protect bond underwritings on NP1, 2, and 3. There is reason to believe that the members of the financial underwriting community, which your agency supervises, had a large part in devising the strategy for involving the small utilities in the WPPSS matter, for their own and their preferred clients' benefit.

Second, there is now sworn testimony in the WPPSS litigation in King County, Washington, by a bond underwriting counsel for the consortium of bond underwriters that the underwriters knew, before they procured the signatures of the 88 on the participation agreements to finance NP4 and 5, that at least 16 of the 88 were legally incapable of binding their entities to such an agreement. They nonetheless took the lead in both drafting the participation agreement and soliciting the assent of the 88. In so doing, it appears that the financial underwriters intentionally misrepresented to the 16 lacking capacity and the 72 with apparent capacity the nature and the effect of the agreement.

Third, should the facts stated in the paragraph above be verified, every bond issued on NP4 and 5 contained a material misrepresentation of a crucial fact and every sale was infected with fraud.

Fourth, based upon information provided by representatives of the bond underwriting group which prepared and marketed the WPPSS bonds, most, if not substantially all, of the WPPSS bonds have been retained in the portfolios of the underwriters sponsoring the issues. While we do not know of any illegality involved in doing so, given the other anomalies in the WPPSS matter, such retention requires full investigation and public disclosures.

Fifth, after the collapse of 4 and 5 had become publicly known, several issues of bonds were floated which bore characteristics requiring some explanation.

(a) All the later issues were handled on a negotiated or a non-competitive basis, including the largest bond issue in history.

(b) The bonds were let on an exceptionally favorable yield, especially since the reason given for the non-competitive method was that the bidding would produce too expensive a result.

(c) Despite the troubled history of WPPSS and the facts of the situation, i.e. that 4 and 5 were terminated and that two others of the five were to be seriously delayed or even terminated, the bonds were universally rated very highly by the ratings services, S&P and Moody's.

We have indications that despite the large retentions by the underwriters, many smaller investors will be seriously hurt by the coming default on the WPPSS bonds. Our constituents include both members of the 88 and bond purchasers who can ill-afford to be the victims of financial coups by large securities firms. Each of the managing firms in the later offerings have been asked to reveal to us whether and in what amounts they have retained the WPPSS issues for their own benefit. To date none of them has responded. We do not propose to allow alleged fears for the financial community to obstruct the necessary acquisition of facts about the financing of WPPSS.

We therefore urge you in your supervisory capacity over these institutions to immediately initiate appropriate inquiries to determine the facts and whether those facts require remedial action to protect the investing public. We understand this to be your primary function and in that spirit offer you this opportunity to cooperate in resolving this affair.

Despite the pending litigation, the problems presented by the WPPSS matter cannot be solved by the judiciary alone, nor will the determination of the courts be either or timely enough to save what can and should be saved out of this disastrous situation. Your prompt consideration and cooperation is urgently requested.

Sincerely,

GEORGE HANSEN.
JIM WEAVER.
LARRY E. CRAIG.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1982.

Mr. JOHN S. R. SHAD,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In addition to the concerns expressed in the letter delivered to you today, there are an undetermined number of my constituents who have purchased bonds in the WPPSS series, some of

whom have expressed concern to me as to whether they will recover their investment. I am well aware that bond investments represent a risk and that no one can rightly guarantee recovery to an investor.

However, even on the investor side of the WPPSS problem, there are unanswered questions which require attention. Using only one such investor as an example, a couple put the bulk of their life's earnings in WPPSS bonds. They now turn to their Congressman and ask a series of trenchant questions which I am not able to answer. But I share their concern and intend to find the answers for them.

First, they had never entered the securities market before and therefore were more than ordinarily dependent on their broker and on public sources of information. The first question is how these bonds maintained AAA ratings when there was already serious internal discussion of terminating 4 and 5. Are the rating services liable for their gross inaccuracies in rating these questionable bonds? What is the source of their information? Are they really at arms length with the financial community whose work they assess?

Second, how can any bond salesman be justified in representing these bonds as government backed? If this is still a case of caveat emptor, then what purpose does the Commission serve?

Third, how, with the intimate knowledge possessed by the financial underwriters, can we explain the continued issuance of bonds on a AAA rating on all five projects even after four of them had been publicly declared terminal or indefinitely suspended?

Fourth, how do you explain that, with literally no prospect of production from four of the five and with the fifth due for on-line service no earlier than mid-1984, WPPSS have "revenue" bonds continued to be sold at a premium within the past three months?

Fifth, how does one account for the personal representations by WPPSS management personnel to bond holders that the bonds remain a "good as gold investment" and that they should be retained as a solid investment?

In essence, Mr. Chairman, both the participants—the 88—and the small individuals who invested in WPPSS bonds have been clearly victimized by those enterprises under your supervision. I think that it is time to put technicalities aside and get to the facts. Your cooperation will go a long way to shoring up the credibility of the financial industry. But with or without assistance, the facts will surface. I urge that such exposure be properly done through your good offices.

Sincerely,

GEORGE HANSEN,
Member of Congress.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1982.

Hon. GEORGE HANSEN,
Member of Congress, Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thank you very much for your recent letters expressing concern about the potential financial disaster caused by cancellation of the nuclear power plants of the Washington Public Power Supply System.

You are correct in assuming that this Committee has jurisdiction, both because of the energy aspects and because of the securities aspects of the problems facing the Northwest, and we have been closely monitoring the situation.

At the moment it appears that hasty Congressional action, as contrasted with continued oversight, would be ill-advised. Nevertheless, we are concerned and if you have some specific information which might be helpful to us, I would welcome receiving it.

Again, thank you for taking the time to express your concerns.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL, *Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1983.

Hon. JOHN S. R. SHAD,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I received the enclosed correspondence from Representative George Hansen and from Paul J. Cotugno relative to bond issues of the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS). Representative Hansen raises questions about the manner in which the bonds were structured, rated and underwritten. Mr. Cotugno has had ongoing problems with Merrill Lynch concerning WPPSS bonds purchased for his account.

I ask that you review and respond to their questions, and I would appreciate your informing me whether there are any improprieties in the issuance and sale of the bonds as described by Mr. Hansen and whether there was any improper or illegal behavior on the part of Merrill Lynch or irregularities in Mr. Cotugno's arbitration proceedings. An early reply to both would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL, *Chairman.*

Enclosure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 30, 1982.

Confidential memo to Pacific Northwest colleagues:

You will find attached the draft of a letter to the Chairman of the SEC which I plan to hand-carry to him and deliver with a personal interview. I hope that you will find the letter in agreement with your own views and join me as a co-signer. It would be even more beneficial if those of you who agree would also attend the interview or send a representative.

There are some matters which I thought best not to include in the letter but which I intend to raise. Among them is the fact that I personally will not be put off by the stonewalling tactics of the financial community on who owns the financial instruments involved in the WPPSS situation. I am prepared to tell the Chairman that we will get the facts, even if that means reducing the value of the bonds to the paper they are written on. I feel very strongly that those members of the 88 in Idaho not be sacrificed on the altar of shoring up the credibility of the investment banking group, and assume you feel similarly about your own constituents in the same boat.

We must also face the fact that the litigation in the Northwest will not really resolve anything. If the remaining members of the 88 are ordered to pay, many of them have already told me they will have no alternative but to default and go bankrupt which would further complicate the ability of the more solvent participants to pay. The indications grow daily that this whole enterprise was an exercise in financial piracy and I am shocked that so many of the agencies within and outside government are refusing to allow the facts to be aired. As recently as Wednesday, the Washington Post ran a story which, while milder than it might have been, seriously acknowledges that WPPSS is a financial disaster of national concern.

I think that a joint effort on our part will not only be beneficial but is essential, since time is of the essence if we are to prevent the collapse of the small utilities in the Northwest.

From information now available, I am convinced that the Chemical Bank suit is framed very carefully to mask the massive involvement of the financial community in the bond underwriting and forestall their being forced to sue in their own names and expose their retention of the bonds. Even the bond holders whom Chemical admits to are mainly financial institutions or are owned by such institutions. Please let me know how you feel about signing the letter and participating in the conference with the Commissioner.

Sincerely,

GEORGE HANSEN,
Member of Congress.●

RANGEL REINTRODUCES PUBLIC HOUSING TENANT PROTECTION ACT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this 98th Congress it was my honor to introduce, for the second year in a row, the Rangel Public Housing Tenant Protection Act.

This bill is designed as a bill of rights for public housing tenants.

This bill is designed to prevent the administration from balancing the budget on the backs of public housing tenants.

This bill is designed to protect the tenants of our public housing programs from the arbitrary attacks of the Reagan administration.

More than ever before, the public housing programs of this Nation need the support of Congress, because this administration is intent on dismantling the public housing system entirely. Ronald Reagan and his aides do not believe that public housing is economically efficient, and in this administration, that is the gravest flaw that can be laid at a programs' doorstep, no matter how compassionate, how humane, or how necessary that program might be.

And because the housing program is inefficient, if this administration had their way, we would see the end of the public housing program as we know it. And in its place we would see a voucher system, a program where those in need get a slip of paper which will count as a part of their rent when they find a place for themselves and their families. The problem is, however, that there are not enough places out there to find. The crisis in housing

today is not simply one of price, although goodness knows there is a price crisis as well. The crisis in housing today is an availability problem. In lots of urban areas, my own city of New York included, there is simply not enough housing, at any price. And the kind of housing that low-income families can find on the housing market is often so bad that no one ought to be forced to live in it. Decent affordable housing is simply not to be had, either with or without a voucher. And that is why we in Congress must rally behind our public housing program.

The President and his men do not seem to realize, do not seem to understand, the kind of misery that their proposals have created already and the kind of pain that their proposals will continue to inflict if more of them are adopted.

My bill would defend public housing and defend public housing tenants. It would roll back tenant rent contribution from 30 to 25 percent of adjusted income and would all for a number of exclusions to be taken from income before the rent contribution is calculated. The exclusions include: all medical and dental expenses including prescription drugs—the value of food stamps received by the family; income from any member of the family under 18 earned during the course of a summer job; income from any member of the family earned while enrolled in school; $500 for each student; $500 for each elderly person; all child care expenses related to working; and all educational expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge your support and that of our colleagues for this bill.●

TAX RELIEF FOR AN INNOCENT SPOUSE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide greater equity and justice to those innocent spouses now unfairly burdened with tax liability under section 6013(e) of the Internal Revenue Code.

In January 1971 Congress enacted an amendment to the Tax Reform Act of 1969 which recognized that joint and several liability by married couples filing joint Federal tax returns was not always a fair determination of tax liability. In seeking to relieve one spouse from liability for an erroneous understatement of gross income attributed to the other spouse the act established the concept of the innocent spouse. For purposes of the act a spouse could be declared innocent if five conditions were met: (1) a joint return was filed, (2) an amount properly includable in gross income had been omitted from the return, (3) the omitted income exceeded 25 percent of the gross income reported on the joint return, (4) the innocent spouse established that in signing the return he or she did not know of and had no reason to know of the omission from the income, and (5) taking into account whether or not the spouse significantly benefited from the items omitted from gross income and all other facts and circumstances, it was inequitable to hold the spouse in question liable for the deficiency in tax.

While Congress believed this remedial act would create equitable and just relief for an innocent spouse it has at best turned out to be only a halfway measure. Before drafting the bill, I polled attorneys in the Greater San Francisco Bay area as to the advisability and need for this type of legislation. The questions I asked were (1) including deductions and credits along with gross income in determining forgiveness and (2) on reducing or eliminating the 25 percent threshold test. A number of practitioners responded, providing specific comments and examples of the problems in the present innocent spouse rule and on the need for change.

First, there is a flaw in the existing legislation because it only provides relief with respect to taxes on amounts includable in gross income under chapter 1 of the code. However, frequently cases involved errors in deductions or credits rather than gross income and thus the innocent spouses have not been forgiven for the tax liability. Since the intent of the original bill was to grant relief where it would be inequitable to impose liability, my proposed bill represents the recognition of the obvious fact that it is possible that such an inequity could arise in the context of improper deductions or credits. Specifically, as one practitioner noted:

> This bill represents a logical step forward in the protection of the "innocent spouse" in that it extends coverage to any understatement of income whether or not it is also an omission.

Second, drawing the line at income omissions exceeding 25 percent of gross income stated on the return has proven too high and onerous a threshold test in many situations. In fact most of the attorneys polled believed the percentage threshold should be reduced. Presently the test unnecessarily excludes from coverage situations involving sizable tax deficiencies caused by erroneous deductions against income where relief would be equitably deserving. In reducing the threshold test to a "substantial understatement" of tax, i.e. those exceeding 10 percent or $500, whichever is the lesser amount, required to be shown on the return, this legislation seeks to grant more equitable relief without unnecessarily overburdening the courts and the Internal Revenue Service with suits in which the deficiency is de minimis.

Third, this amendment will eliminate the unfair provision requiring the innocent spouse prove that she or he did not significantly benefit from the omitted item. When the people is separated or living apart due to abandonment or desertion, it is easy enough to establish that the innocent spouse did not significantly benefit. However, as matters now stand, it is more difficult and sometimes impossible, to prove no significant benefit when the couple lives together. In removing this test we will end the inherent bias against an innocent spouse who is living with a guilty tax evader.

Lastly, my bill provides relief for innocent spouses filing separate returns under section 66 of the Internal Revenue Code, which relates to treatment of community income where spouses live apart. In a noncommunity property State, a taxpayer filing a separate return is not taxed on income earned by the other spouse. However, at present, in a community property State, like California, a taxpayer filing a separate return is charged with income earned by the other spouse. The income of each spouse is community income and 50 percent is therefore attributable to the nonearning spouse and must be reported on the latter's separate return. As a result, in a community property State an innocent spouse is liable for a deficiency attributable solely to income earned by the other spouse. As Congress has acknowledged the justice of granting relief for joint returns it seems only equitable to make relief available in a similar manner to those filing separate returns.

I would also like to point out that last year my State of California amended its innocent spouse provision (section 18402.9) of the State Tax Code in a manner similar to my proposal. The results appear to be quite favorable, and California's example should pave the way for a similar change in the Federal tax laws.

Clearly persons who are unaware of and uninvolved in the substantial understatements of tax attributable to gross erroneous items reported by their spouses on Federal tax returns deserve and need the protection from unfair tax liability which this bill is designed to provide. In closing, as one attorney wrote, "the problem is very likely to cross my desk unless legislation similar to your proposal is enacted."●

TRIBUTE TO BETTIE JO KIMES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored by this opportunity to rise before my colleagues and to share with each of you the joy and sadness which I feel because one of San Pedro and California's most esteemed public servants, Mrs. Bettie Jo Kimes, retired January 1, after 26 years of inspirational service to our communities.

Bettie Jo has served the last 2½ years of an eventful career as principal of the South Shores Magnet School for the Visual and Performing Arts. This school is particularly unique in that it shares a curriculum with the California State University, Dominguez Hills, and attracts students from throughout the Los Angeles Unified School District as part of a voluntary integration program. Under her impeccable direction since its inception in 1980, this cooperative program provides an extraordinary educational opportunity for participating students, who regularly receive instruction from the faculty of the university and have access to its facilities for the cultural and performing arts.

A firm believer in the paramountcy of academics, Bettie Jo also recognizes the value of art and other forms of cultural expression. I would only ask my colleagues to consider how recent has been this understanding in America, and with it the willingness to foster and to patronize the development of cultural arts in our own Nation. For it was not until the infant years of this century that we began to recognize the vast yet then still latent artistic talents of our people. It is with this realization in mind that Bettie Jo holds as one of her most cherished hopes the achievement by our society of a consummate understanding of and appreciation for the cultural arts.

It is in this spirit of appreciation for how far we have come as a nation aspiring to excellence in the fields of education and the cultural arts because of people like Bettie Jo, and of hope that we will continue these pursuits, that my wife, Lee, and I extend to Bettie Jo Kimes, to her daughters, Debra Dawn and Kimberlee Jo Kimes Smith, to her son-in-law, Thomas Smith, and to her grandson, Joshua Kimes Smith, our warmest wishes for continued bliss and fulfillment.●

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the budget be balanced. I have been fighting for a balanced budget ever since I came to Congress over 8 years ago.

At first, calling for a balanced budget was like a voice in the wilderness. Now, that voice crying in the wilderness has become a roar because it has become the collective voice of the American people, the administration, and, I believe, a majority of our colleagues.

The American people know that you cannot continue to outspend your income year after year without at some point reaching the day of reckoning. We have reached that point, and we have the support of the public to balance the budget.

We must now balance the budget in order to create a psychological climate which repudiates the past irresponsible spending habits of our Government and sets the stage for dealing with out most serious domestic problem—unemployment. In order to deal with this problem, we must get our economy rolling again.

The best solution to unemployment is a healthy and vigorous economy. We simply must reduce the high deficits projected by the Reagan administration. In the final analysis, jobs are provided by the private sector of our economy, not by the Government. In order for the private sector to do this we must assure that they have adequate capital to expand and provide jobs. That means lower interest rates and that in turn, means reducing the enormous Federal budget deficits which keep interest rates high.

Our Federal debt is now over $1 trillion. Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige has projected that the administration's fiscal year 1983 budget deficit will reach $140 to $160 billion.

It does not take an expert to know that deficits of this magnitude have a detrimental effect on our economy. Huge deficits force the Government to borrow money to finance these shortfalls. By competing in the credit market for available funds. Washington helps to keep the interest rates high.

A balanced budget would strengthen the economy because it would help us reduce the national debt and eliminate Government deficits. This would bring interest rates down and make more money available to private borrowers and lenders. That, in turn, translates into more housing starts, more capital expansion, and more credit for farmers. And these improvements translate into more jobs.

The time to balance the budget is now.

We have not had a balanced budget since 1969. Since that time, the Government has spent like a drunken sailor, money that we did not have to spend.

We were, in effect, charging fur coats to our grandchildren. We are paying the price for our recklessness now in astronomical interest rates, double-digit unemployment, swollen governments at all levels, and a regulatory morass created to administer the spending of the money we did not have.

Some people have said that Congress alone is the cause of increasing Federal spending. Congress certainly has played a role in the sad history. But I think it is important to point out that in almost every year since 1945, the Congress has appropriated fewer of the taxpayers' dollars than the Presidents—whether Democrat or Republican—have requested.

A balanced budget means that we are finally putting a stop to the spending spree. We are creating a psychological climate which repudiates the past and says to ourselves, to the stock and bond markets, to our trading partners, to the rest of the world, that we will put our fiscal house in order, that we will increase productivity, that we will decrease our national debt, that we will begin to act in a fiscally, monetarily, economically sound way. We will begin to set a climate of careful management of our income, careful husbanding of our resources, careful planning and tighter control of our budget.

We must send the message to the spenders in Congress and to the American people that a balanced budget is essential and attainable, and is the only way to restore fiscal sanity to our economy.

Last year, the Senate passed a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. Unfortunately, this body failed to follow suit. We cannot fail again this year. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to balance the budget.●

REA MODERATION NEEDED IN WPPSS CRISIS

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, further action insisting on REA moderation in dealing with the WPPSS crisis faced by local electric co-ops in the Pacific Northwest is most welcome in the position outlined by

the chairman of the Senate Energy Committee. The documents follow:

Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I am grateful for the copy of your letter to Mr. Harold Hunter, dated December 28, 1982. As you may be aware, several weeks ago, while the co-op people were in Washington during the period December 9 to 14, I arranged to have Mr. Hunter come to my office in order to express my dissatisfaction with both the actions and the attitude of the REA toward our electrical cooperatives.

A copy of the letter I wrote Mr. Hunter on December 14th, the day of this visit to my office, is reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 21, 1982. I am attaching a copy of the RECORD entry for your interest. Although my letter goes into somewhat more detail in what I feel is required of REA in the circumstances, it is very gratifying to receive your letter urging similar action. It is to be hoped that you can also support my demand for more adequate disclosure of the BPA and REA part in involving the constituents we share in what appears to be an increasingly scandalous situation.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., December 28, 1982.

Hon. GEORGE HANSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I am enclosing a copy of the letter I sent to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration on the subject of the R.E.A.'s position with regard to its member cooperatives that are participants in the Washington Public Power Supply System's nuclear power plants 4 and 5. It is my feeling that the remarkably complicated situation which exists regarding the WPPSS plants and debt warrants a degree of flexibility on the part of the R.E.A.

I understand that representatives of these co-ops have been in touch with you about their problems. Since your constituents are affected by this situation, I would like to suggest that you send a similar letter to the R.E.A. as well.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. MCCLURE,
United States Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., December 28, 1982.

HAROLD HUNTER, *Administrator,*
Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUNTER: Your office has issued directives to certain R.E.A. cooperatives that are participants in the Washington Public Power Supply System nuclear power plant projects 4 and 5 which they feel would have the effect of forcing them to pass resolutions requiring immediate payments under their share of the WPPSS obligation.

They are understandably concerned that making such payments at the present time in light of pending litigation on the subject would run counter to their best interests. In some cases they are in fact precluded from doing so by orders from State regulatory commissions as well as stipulations entered into with respect to pending legal actions.

Regardless of my own views as to the liability for and payment of the WPPSS debt, I feel that the unusual circumstances have in fact created a situation which warrants a degree of flexibility on your part. I would therefore hope that you would not restrain or restrict the proceeds of loans made or contemplated to be made by the R.E.A. to these co-ops. They should at least have the opportunity to have their legal position settled without the threat of additional jeopardy to their financing.

I understand that the co-op representatives are greatly encouraged after a meeting with R.E.A. attorneys in Washington earlier this month. I want you to know that I am watching the situation with great interest and concern, and I would appreciate being informed about any plans or possibilities for assisting the affected co-ops. I am very anxious to do whatever I can to help insure their stability.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. MCCLURE,
United States Senator.

REDUCING ERROR IN INCOME SUPPORT PROGRAMS ACT

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to prevent fraud and overpayment in various welfare programs by requiring State unemployment agencies to collect individual wage information on a quarterly basis.

Presently only 38 States require individual wage data be reported quarterly to State employment agencies, even though it is generally acknowledged that this data is the best wage information for verification purposes in administering Federal and State needs-based programs.

Unreported and underreported wages are two of the principal causes of overpayments in needs-based programs. Although the exact amount of overpayments caused by recipients not properly reporting income is unknown, the General Accounting Office estimates that in fiscal years 1978 and 1979, five of six major welfare programs had annual overpayments of $867 million. Without corrective action, Federal expenditures, because of overpayments in these five programs, will probably exceed $1 billion in fiscal year 1983. In addition an unknown amount of other program benefits are improperly provided to cash grant recipients who would not be eligible for such benefits if their incomes were properly disclosed.

Clearly this situation needs to be remedied. Given the current shortage of funds for public assistance programs, we must insure that funds go only to those in need, with the least amount of error or payment to those who may have other sources of income.

In addition, my bill will make available to child support enforcement agencies the wage information of delinquent parents. Even though this will not solve the problem of enforcing child support orders, it will at least provide child support enforcement agencies with another source of information to enable them to more effectively track down parents who fail to make their child support payments and who have improperly thrown their families onto the public dole.

The hard-working people of this country deserve to see an end to fraud and abuse in our welfare system. This bill, by requiring all States to collect wage data that can be used for verifying welfare eligibility, will go a long way toward ending welfare overpayments.

H.R. 926

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require State unemployment agencies to collect individual wage information on a quarterly basis, and for other purposes

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reducing Error in Income Support Programs Act".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT OF QUARTERLY SYSTEM OF INDIVIDUAL WAGE REPORTING.

(a) Subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) Requiring all persons paying remuneration submit to contributions under the State law (determined without regard to any limitation on the amount of remuneration to subject) to submit, not less frequently than quarterly, reports to the State agency charged with the administration of the State law which show—

"(A) the name and address of each individual to whom such remuneration is paid,

"(B) the amount of such remuneration paid to each individual, and

"(C) such other information as such State agency may deem appropriate to administer the State law;".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to services performed after December 31, 1984.

SEC. 3. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.

(a) CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 303(e)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(A) shall disclose, upon request and on a reimbursable basis, to officers or employees of any State or local child support enforcement agency any of the following information contained in the records of such State agency—

"(i) wage information,

"(ii) whether an individual is receiving, has received, or has made application for, unemployment compensation, and the amount of any such compensation being received (or to be received) by such individual,

"(iii) the current (or most recent) home address of such individual, and

"(iv) whether an individual has refused an offer of employment and, if so, a description

of the employment so offered and the terms, conditions, and rate of pay thereof, and".

(2) Subsection (e) of section 303 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) For purposes of section 455 of this Act, expenses incurred to reimburse a State agency for furnishing information or services pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to constitute expenses incurred in the administration of the plan described in the last sentence of paragraph (1)."

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF PLAN FOR AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN PLAN.—Section 303 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f)(1) The State agency charged with the administration of the State law—

"(A) shall disclose, upon request and on a reimbursable basis, to officers or employees of a State or a political subdivision charged with the administration of a State plan for aid and services to needy families with children approved under part A of title IV of this Act, any of the following information contained in the records of such State agency—

"(i) wage information,

"(ii) whether an individual is receiving, has received, or has made application for, unemployment compensation, and the amount of any such compensation being received (or to be received) by such individual,

"(iii) the current (or most recent) home address of such individual, and

"(iv) whether an individual has refused an offer of employment and, if so, a description of the employment so offered and the terms, conditions, and rate of pay therefor, and

"(B) shall establish such safeguards as are necessary (as determined by the Secretary of Labor in regulations) to insure that information disclosed under subparagraph (A) is used only for purposes of determining an individual's eligibility for aid or services, or the amount of such aid or services, under the State plan approved under part A of title IV of this Act.

"(2) Whenever the Secretary of Labor, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency charged with the administration of the State law, finds that there is a failure to comply substantially with the requirements of paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until the Secretary is satisfied that there is not longer any such failure. Until the Secretary of Labor is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State.

"(3) For purposes of section 403 of this Act, expenses incurred to reimburse a State agency for furnishing information pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be considered to constitute expenses incurred in the administration of the State plan approved under part A of title IV of this Act.

"(g) The State agency charged with the administration of the State law shall be furnished, upon request and on a reimbursable basis, any information contained in the records of any agency or office referred to in subsections (d), (e), or (f) to which the State agency has furnished any information under such subsections, relating to an individual and the earnings, employment, health, and address of such individual. Any information furnished to the State agency under this subsection shall be used only for purposes of determining an individual's eligibility for unemployment compensation or the amount of unemployment compensation payable to an individual. No finding of a failure to comply substantially with any of the requirements of subsections (d), (e), or (f) shall be made or enforced with respect to any such agency or office which is failing to comply with this subsection."

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 304(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) makes a finding with respect to a State or a State agency under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 303,".

(2) Section 454(20)(A) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "section 508 of the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1976" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 303(e) of this Act".

(3) Subsection (a) of section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out paragraph (16) and by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (16).

(4)(A) Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (as amended by the Job Training Partnership Act) is hereby repealed.

(B) Subsection (b) of section 508 of the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1976 is hereby repealed.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.●

FOR THE RELIEF OF MARSHA D. CHRISTOPHER

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a private bill I introduced last year to remedy an injustice suffered by one of my constituents, Mrs. Marsha D. Christopher. Mrs. Christopher, the mother of five children, was a temporary letter carrier who, through the contributory negligence of the U.S. Postal Service, was mauled by a vicious dog and horribly disfigured. Mrs. Christopher was awarded worker's compensation by the Labor Department, but because she received a settlement from the dog's owner, the Labor Department later reduced her award by nearly $40,000. This reduction left Mrs. Christopher with totally inadequate compensation for her pain and suffering, disfigurement, loss of work, future psychological and employment problems, and the trauma of 14 surgical repair operations.

The bill I have introduced would suspend the operation of 5 U.S.C. 8132, which compels the reduction of Federal worker's compensation awards where a settlement is obtained from third party tortfeasor. The Treasury would be directed to repay to Mrs. Christopher the portion of her worker's compensation award which she returned to the Labor Department, as well as the amount by which her compensation payments were reduced.

The Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations, chaired by Representative George Danielson, held a hearing on this bill in March 1982, and, after Representative SAM B. HALL, Jr., assumed the charimanship, reported it favorably on December 1, 1982. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient time to schedule a full committee markup before the 97th Congress adjourned, and the bill died, despite strong support in the Senate.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to know that this is only the second private bill I have introduced in almost two decades of service in the House of Representatives. I think that provides some measure of how strongly I feel about the unfairness of the application of the present law in the case of Mrs. Christopher and how strongly I feel about her suffering and misfortune. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill when it eventually comes before this body for approval.●

VIETNAM VETERANS VIGIL

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, at the end of formal U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia, over 1,400 American servicemen and civilians remained officially listed as prisoners of war (POW) or missing in action (MIA), with some 1,200 listed as killed in action, body not recovered. Since that time, primarily due to the determination of the families and a nucleus of concerned citizens, the Vietnamese have repatriated the remains of 78 of these men. Almost 2,500 Americans are still unaccounted for, according to the National League of POW/MIA Families, and the Communist governments of Indochina steadfastly deny holding prisoners and refuse to provide information on those whose fate remains unknown.

The influx of Indochinese refugees into this country over the past few years has resulted in additional evidence that the Vietnamese continue to hold Americans in captivity. The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), according to the national league, is currently investigating over 400 eyewitness reports pertaining to men still held captive. In fact, some sightings are as recent as December 1981.

On December 23, a group of Vietnam veterans began a round-the-clock candlelight vigil at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to call attention to the unaccounted POW's and MIA's. I visited the memorial to meet with these individuals on Tuesday, January 4, and I urge my colleagues to stop by the Viet-

nam Memorial and to talk with these men who so nobly served our country. It is important for us to remind them that they and their comrades, whose fate is not known, are not forgotten.●

IN SUPPORT OF A BELVA LOCKWOOD COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the town of Royalton and the Royalton Historical Society in Niagara County, N.Y., have submitted an application to U.S. Postal Service for the issuance of a Belva Lockwood commemorative stamp. They are seeking issuance of the stamp to mark the 100th anniversary of Mrs. Lockwood's nomination for President of the United States. The nomination was made by the Equal Rights Party in August 1884 at a convention in San Francisco.

As Julia Hull Winner, historian, the Niagara County Historical Society, notes in an article entitled "Belva A. Lockwood—That Extraordinary Woman,"

The idea of a woman aspiring to the Presidency was audacious to say the least; the more startling because she had been twice married and widowed and was nearing fifty-four years of age.

Her quest for the Presidency was a serious one. Mrs. Lockwood campaigned for equal voting and property rights for women, uniform marriage and divorce laws, ending corruption in high places, educating the masses of people, and highest development of the individual, paying the public debt, peace, civil service reform, and reviving lagging industries by encouraging commercial relations with other countries.

During her lifetime, Mrs. Lockwood was an educator, lawyer, lecturer, wife, and mother. She was and is, today, an inspiration. Ms. Winner states:

Her contribution to the cause of women's rights and equality of all people is incalculable and did not end with her passing.

An article from the Oswego Times of May 1917 describes this energetic, intelligent woman, worthy of the recognition sought. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Belva Lockwood commemorative stamp request. The Oswego Times article follows:

[From the Oswego Times, May 24, 1917]

MRS. BELVA LOCKWOOD DIES—FAMOUS WOMAN LEFT OSWEGO IN THE YEAR 1866

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE IN THE YEAR 1884, SHE WAS A LEADER IN FEMALE SUFFRAGE CAUSE, ALSO WON FIVE MILLION FOR INDIANS

Mrs. Belva A. B. Lockwood, the Emmeline Parkhurst of the early Suffrage movement in America, died on Saturday, at her home in Washington, D.C., after a long illness at the age of 87. The outstanding fact in the public mind about Mrs. Lockwood is that she, a woman, startled the country by running for the Presidency in 1884 and again in 1888. But that was just one incident in a crowded life.

The older suffrage workers of today think of her as the woman whose labors did as much to open the way to other women in industry and the professions, as much to acquire justice for the wronged of both sexes as those of any person of her time.

Previous to her marriage to Mr. Lockwood, Mrs. Lockwood, then Mrs. Belva Ann McNall, conducted a female seminary in this village. She removed from Oswego in 1866. Her last visit to this village was in August of 1909, when she was one of the guests of honor and principal speakers at the Old Home Week Celebration.

Born in Royalton, N.Y., in 1830, Belva Bennett Johnson (sic) had no easy time to get an education. She was sent to the public school, but she had to work to get money for a course in Genesee Wesley an Seminary. Her first husband, Uriah H. McNall, a young farmer of Royalton, died early, leaving her with one daughter, and in 1869 she was married to the Rev. Ezekiel Lockwood, a Baptist clergyman, whose death occurred in 1877, nine (sic) years after their marriage. She was no man hater and was heard to declare after Mr. Lockwood's death that she believed she would get married again, because she could "manage men so nicely."

A widow at 24 years of age, with a child, she was teaching school in Royalton, at a salary (of) only $3 a week. Men teachers doing the same work were getting twice as much or more.

"I kicked to the school trustees," she said, "I went to the wife of the Methodist minister. The answer I got opened my eyes and raised my dander. 'I can't help you, you cannot help yourself, for it is the way of the world.'"

The apparent hopelessness of women's cause so aroused her that she fought for more than fifty years against the exclusion of women from the rights which men enjoyed. She fortified herself with a collegiate education at Genesee College in the days when higher education was rare among women, and for successive periods was Preceptress of Seminaries at Lockport and Owego.

Her desire for knowledge was not to be kept down and in 1857 she got an A. M. at the Genesee College. She next received an LL. D., from Syracuse University and continued here study of law at the National University Law School in Washington and the University Extension, Oxford. For more than forty years she practised her profession, finding time between cases—and she had some important ones—to champion and push through Congress some bills that were well worth while.

Mrs. Lockwood forced the passage in 1870 of a measure for equal pay for women employees of the Government; in 1873 of a $50,000 appropriation to pay bounties to sailors and marines, and in 1879 of the bill admitting women lawyers to practise in the United States Supreme Court, a right which when granted she was the very first to take advantage of. She was the first Portia to appear in the United States Supreme Court.

It is Belva Lockwood whom women have to thank for retiring rooms in District court rooms and for matrons in the jails. She was one of a committee of eight appointed by the Federation of Womens Clubs to get a law changing the descent of property rights for women of the District of Columbia. She represented her Government at the Congress of Charities and Corrections in Switzerland in 1896. All this time she was writing books and pamphlets on the subjects that filled her mind—peace and arbitration, the rights of women and the rights of all oppressed people.

Mrs. Lockwood won several notable legal battles, notably that of the Cherokee Indians against the United States Government, in which she secured a settlement of $5,000,000 for the Indians. During President Garfield's administration she made unsuccessful application for the Brazilian mission.

Mrs. Lockwood was a delegate to the Universal Peace Convention at Paris in 1888 and again in 1890 to the congress at London, where she read papers on arbitration and disarmament. She lectured throughout the country and until her last illness maintained a law office in Washington.

"Suffrage is no longer an issue," said Mrs. Lockwood on the occasion of her eighty-fifth birthday. "It is an accomplished fact. Those states which have denied it to women will come around."

Andrew Carnegie was asked several years ago to aid Mrs. Lockwood financially. A delegation of Washington citizens sought him as Mrs. Lockwood was dispossessed of her home and belongings by a ruling of the District Supreme Court, at the age of 84.

It was then brought out for the first time how Mrs. Lockwood had received the retainer of the Cherokee Indians to fight their case for them in the Supreme Court. Many years before when she had been practicing before the Court of Claims, she became acquainted with a North Carolina Cherokee Indian named Jim Taylor. She had conducted several cases for Taylor, and he was so pleased with her work that he influenced a number of other members of his tribe to bring their cases. He proposed to bring her claims of the Cherokee Indians against the United States Government, he and she to divide the fees equally. The agreement was duly recorded and for several years both Mrs. Lockwood and the Indians did well with the arrangement.

A year or two later, Taylor died, and his heirs in going over his possessions found the copy of the agreement with Mrs. Lockwood. they filed suit to recover one-half of Mrs. Lockwood's fee, and won their case against Mrs. Lockwood for $9,000.

In her long career as a lawyer, she had more than 7,000 pension cases. She also had charge of the Gage insanity litigation and of other important cases. But the advancement of women was always closest to her heart.

"I am very simple minded," she said once to a newspaper reporter. "When I wish to do a thing I only know one way, to keep at it till(sic) I get it." Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, who remembers Mrs. Lockwood coming to the home of her mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, in the old days, describes her as exceedingly "sprightly, aggressive, energetic." She was the first to suggest for suffragists those so-called militant methods which are everyday jobs now and excite no comment but which even so daring a woman as Mrs. Stanton would not undertake. She sought to induce Mrs. Stanton to besiege Congress with a feminine army.

"We'll take 200 women to the Capitol," Mrs. Lockwood said, "and ask permission for two or three of us to address that body on suffrage. If it is granted the whole 200 shall talk and keep on talking. If it is refused we'll go in anyway."

"A fine plan, Belva," said Mrs. Stanton. "Go and try it." But Mrs. Lockwood never did.

She was nominated for President of the United States by the Equal Rights party in California. A description of her as she appeared during the campaign of 1884 shows her "tall, commanding, with dark curly hair and a strong soprano voice"—she had been a frequent lecturer on many topics.

A VERITABLE BARNUM

Her critics called her "a veritable Barnum for advertising," holding that she looked on her nomination merely as something to bring her business in her profession. Certainly it brought her much notoriety, and made the house at 619 F. Street N.W., Washington, where she lived with her two daughters, a marked place. She herself was a noticeable figure whether on foot or going about Washington on her tricycle, the vehicle she employed.

Her Presidential platform was advanced—woman suffrage, prohibition, arbitration instead of war, the abolition of capital punishment, various labor reforms, including equal pay for women; Government ownership for railways and the telegraph, and to make men sweet and clean by taking tobacco from them. Whether it was this last one that defeated her, history does not say.

Strong for peace though she was, author of many pamphlets in favor of arbitration, she yet helped to equip the Twenty-eighth Regiment in 1861. Seven times she crossed the ocean to attend international conferences, mostly on peace; thrice she was a delegate to conferences in this country.

When the European war began in 1914 she held that it was not necessary for the United States to prepare, because "no nation hates us enough to fight us."●

SOVIET JEWISH EMIGRATION DECLINES SHARPLY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed by recent figures provided me by the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry and the National Conference on Soviet Jewry that indicate the number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union last year was the lowest since 1970.

In fact, the number of Jews allowed to leave the Soviet Union in 1982 was a shockingly low 2,692. This compares to the 9,447 Jews who were allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union in 1981.

Even more disturbing is the alarming trend these figures represent. In 1980, Soviet Jewish emigration stood at a level of 21,471, and in 1979, the highest level of Soviet Jewish emigration was recorded, 51,320. This means that since 1979, the number of Jews allowed to leave the Soviet Union has declined by 95 percent. Clearly, this is an intolerable situation that deserves our priority attention.

During the prior Congress, I authored a resolution unanimously passed by the House that sharply denounced the Soviet Government's treatment of their Jewish citizenry. The resolution focused particular attention on the declining emigration rate. Since that time, matters have deteriorated still further.

It is obvious that stronger forms of pressure are necessary. I am hopeful that under the new Soviet leadership of Yuri V. Andropov, human rights conditions in the Soviet Union will improve. However, in order for that to happen, it is essential that President Reagan insist that the human rights issue continue to play a major role in U.S. foreign policy. Simply put, the issue of Soviet emigration must be a primary focal point during any United States-Soviet negotiations especially with respect to certain agricultural agreements which are so beneficial to the Soviet Union. We should not reward the Soviets for their repressive policies. I call on my congressional colleagues to join me in helping to realize this crucial goal.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert an article that appeared in the New York Times discussing the declining Soviet Jewish emigration rate:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 30, 1982]

JEWISH EXODUS FROM SOVIET REACHED A LOW POINT IN '82

The number of Jews allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union this year was the lowest since 1970, according to figures issued yesterday by the Greater New York Conference on Soviet Jewry and the National Conference on Soviet Jewry.

The two groups announced at a news conference at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on West 44th Street that 2,670 Jews were granted emigration visas in 1982 compared with 9,447 Jews last year, permitted to leave the Soviet Union. The highest level was 51,320, in 1979.

Seymour P. Lachman, university dean of the City University of New York and chairman of the Greater New York group, said:

"The road to freedom is now closed to Soviet Jews. The number of Jews allowed to emigrate in 1982 has plummeted by a staggering 95 percent in the past three years."

DETERIORATION UNDER BREZHNEV

He called on Western governments to "intensify their efforts on behalf of Soviet Jewry and to respond vigorously to Soviet oppression."

"The final years of the Brezhnev regime were disastrous for Soviet Jews," he said, adding that the Soviet authorities had systematically isolated Jews from the world Jewish community and from their historic, religious and cultural roots.

"It is time for the new Soviet leadership to put the Soviet Union back on the path of international law," he said.

In a statement assessing the situation of Soviet Jews seeking to emigrate, Theodore R. Mann, chairman of the National Conference, said the decline had been accompanied by threats and arrests of Jewish activists.

"Hebrew teachers are severely harassed because of their efforts to promote the historic language of their people," he said, adding that the security police had raided the homes of some, and that others had been forced to curtail their instruction after threats of arrest and harm to their families.

He said that Soviet Jews who had actively protested Soviet policies were sentenced to labor camps and prisons and some who were released this year were being threatened with re-arrest.

MEETING WITH SHULTZ IS SOUGHT

According to Jerry Goodman, executive director of the National Conference, the organization is seeking a meeting with Secretary of State George P. Shultz to discuss the issue of Soviet emigration policy.

"Our assessment of the Reagan Administration is that their pronouncements are good," he said. "We have been assured that this issue is a priority in term of bilateral relations between the two countries."

Mr. Goodman said that, in recent conversations between National Conference members and Jewish activists in Moscow, the activists were hopeful that the situation would improve under the new leadership of Yuri V. Andropov.

"We are not going to ask back idly," Mr. Goodman said. "We don't know whether Mr. Andropov will heed our voices, but we are going to escalate our efforts across the country and see to it that this issue is put at the top of the agenda when U.S. leaders sit down to negotiate with the Soviets.●

TRIBUTE TO RALPH BERRY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored by this opportunity to share with my colleagues some of the contributions and accomplishments of a true public servant, Ralph Berry.

Ralph served the year just ended as the president of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce. He will be formally stepping down from the office he has held in such an exemplary fashion at a dinner to be given in recognition of his many fine achievements as their president on Thursday, January 20, 1983. One of these, and a goal he has realized, has been to shed the "little town" image with which Wilmington was regarded prior to his assuming the presidency of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce.

Yet Ralph's contributions to Wilmington are not anomalies, they are what secured for him the request and admiration of the community and its members. As Wilmington's postmaster, a position he has held since 1980, and as a member of both the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce and the Los Angeles Harbor Kiwanis Club, he has contributed to the responsible growth and the vitality of Wilmington. His tenaciousness led to the awarding of a contract providing for the construction of a post office in Wilmington. This may seem like a small feat to some of us here who may represent bustling cities or affluent suburbia, but to many of our communities that are striving for increased self-sufficiency, it is a leader like Ralph that

enables these small wonders to occur; and occur they did.

During Ralph's 1-year term as president of the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, membership increased significantly. The results of his recruiting effort will inevitably prove far reaching and should be felt for years to come through increased business activity in Wilmington, a stronger association between the business and residential communities there, as well as an improved way of life for Wilmington's residents.

In acknowledging his exceptional qualities as a community leader and public servant, my wife, Lee, and I would like to extend to Ralph Berry, his wife, Lorene, and to all of his children, our wishes for a life of continued happiness and fulfillment.●

COMPUTER CONTRIBUTIONS ACT IS REINTRODUCED

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which I sponsored in the last Congress to encourage the donation of personal computers to primary and secondary schools. During the 97th Congress, the Computer Contributions Act received broad bipartisan support and, on September 23, passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 223 to 61. Unfortunately, after being favorably reported by the Senate Finance Committee, the legislation failed to reach the Senate floor.

My bill provides manufacturers of computers with a tax deduction equal to their cost of manufacturing plus one-half of their markup not to exceed twice their cost. This rule parallels a provision added by the Congress in 1981 for the donation of scientific equipment to colleges and universities for research purposes.

During the past Congress, this bill was attacked as special interest legislation designed to benefit one company. These accusations are just plain wrong. The legislation is designed to help the children and schools of America by providing them with state-of-the-art equipment which all too many schools simply cannot afford to purchase. By encouraging the donation of computers by means of a tax deduction, the Government is obtaining these computers much more cheaply than they could through outright purchases. In addition the legislation, of course, grants equal benefits to all companies that donate equipment.

Computer technology has become a major force in our lives. Our school-age children need to start learning about them as soon as possible. I hope that we will be able to swiftly approve this legislation.

The text of the bill is printed below:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Computer Contribution Act of 1983".

SEC. 2. CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT TO PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

Subsection (e) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain contributions of ordinary income and capital gain property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) SPECIAL RULE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT TO PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—

"(A) LIMIT ON REDUCTION.—In the case of a qualified contribution of computer equipment, the reduction under paragraph (1)(A) shall be no greater than the amount determined under paragraph (3)(B).

"(B) QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTION OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term qualified contribution of computer equipment means a charitable contribution by a corporation of tangible personal property described in paragraph (1) of section 1221, but only if—

"(i) the contribution is to a qualified educational organization,

"(ii) the contribution is made pursuant to a written plan of the taxpayer which shall seek to prevent undue concentrations of the taxpayer's contributions of computer equipment from the geographic standpoint or from the standpoint of the relative economic status of the donees' students,

"(iii) the property is assembled by the taxpayer and the taxpayer is regularly engaged in the business of assembling and selling computer equipment of the same kind as such property.

"(iv) the contribution is made—

"(I) not later than 6 months after the date the assembly of the property is substantially completed, and

"(II) during 1984,

"(v) the original use of the property is by the donee,

"(vi) the property is computer equipment substantially all the use of which by the donee will be at the institution directly in the education of students.

"(vii) the property is not transferred by the donee in exchange for money, other property, or services, and

"(viii) the taxpayer receives from the donee a written statement representing that its use and disposition of the property will be in accordance with the provisions of clauses (vi) and (vii).

"(C) QUALIFIED EDUCATIONAL, ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term qualified educational organization means—

"(i) an educational organization which is described in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), and

"(ii) a school operated as an activity of an organization described in section 501(c)(3) and exempt from income tax under section 501(a) if such school normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly enrolled body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on.

Such term shall not include any institution of higher education (as defined in section 3304(f)) and shall not include any organization not located in the United States.

"(D) COMPUTER EQUIPMENT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'computer equipment' means—

"(i) a data processor which—

"(I) can be programmed in at least 3 standard computer languages,

"(II) has a random access memory with a capacity for at least 32,000 bytes, and

"(III) is (or can be) connected with a screen for visual display of the data.

"(ii) if donated by the taxpayer for use in connection with a data processor described in clause (i) donated by the taxpayer—

"(I) a display screen,

"(II) a printer, or

"(III) a disc drive, and

"(iii) any installation equipment for equipment described in clause (i) or (ii).

"(E) CORPORATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'corporation' shall not include—

"(i) an electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371(b)),

"(ii) a personal holding company (as defined in section 542), and

"(iii) a service organization (as defined in section 414(m)(3)).

"(F) Gifts made under this act shall be considered charitable contributions."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by section 2 shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1983.●

MICHAEL McDERMOTT BULK AND FOREIGN MAIL CENTER

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today a bill which would change the name of the New York Bulk and Foreign Mail Center in Jersey City, N.J., to the Michael McDermott Bulk and Foreign Mail Center. This mail center is in my district, and this legislation is important to me and to the postalworkers in my district, 4,100 of whom work at this huge postal facility alone. The House passed this measure last September under the consent calendar after the Public Works and Transportation Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported favorably on this bill in a unanimous expression of bipartisan support. Unfortunately, time constraints in the press of last-minute business in the other body prevented their consideration of this bill. I am looking forward to approaching this measure now, in the new year, with a restored sense of vitality.

Michael McDermott was a 25-year-old employee at the New York Bulk and Foreign Mail Center who was killed in an accident by a faulty conveyor belt on December 15, 1979, just over 3 years ago. Safety devices meant to prevent the kind of accident that happened to Mike McDermott had been removed in order to speed the flow of mail that Christmas. Young

Mike McDermott left behind a wife and an infant daughter.

The accident touched off a wave of charges that postal management had no concern for the safety of workers at the facility. Subsequent investigations of Mike McDermott's death revealed that 5,000 accidents had occurred at this facility in the 2 years preceding the fatal accident. An onsite survey conducted by the congressional Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization 1 week after the incident turned up a number of safety violations—and that the same conveyor belt violations which caused the young father's death still existed.

There is a single important reason for the renaming of the New York Bulk and Foreign Mail Center as the Michael McDermott Bulk and Foreign Mail Center—a reminder to all that worker safety is the most important aspect of any industrial-type operation. Will Michael McDermott have died in vain? I believe it is right that Mike McDermott become a symbol of safety consciousness. Rather than provoke disharmony between management and workers, the renaming should facilitate discussion of safety consciousness. It could also be a symbol that the post office does want to make safety its first priority.

I want to make clear the function of this facility. As you know, it is traditional to name public buildings after statesmen and generals who have distinguished themselves with long records of public service. This is not a bill which would break this tradition—the Bulk and Foreign Mail Center is not a post office as we know them in our hometowns; it is an industrial-type, warehouse facility to which only postal employees go.

What is most important about this bill to me and the many men and women who have spent their lives in the frontlines of public service is the symbol for safety consciousness that Michael McDermott can become. Naming this facility after Michael McDermott will provide us a monument symbolizing the sacrifice of all working men and women who have lost their lives in public service. Let me assure you—young Mike McDermott was a hero. He is typical of the so many unsung heroes of this land—who go to work evey day to support their family and save for their dreams for the future. He was the kind of American we are proud to represent as Members of Congress.

Michael McDermott was not an uncommon man. However, to forget him now—to let his death be in vain when the sorrow we feel from his loss can be turned into something positive—would demean the struggle of American working men and women. When we honor Michael McDermott, we shall be honoring a man who represents the group which made America great, a group which is distinguished by its achievements, a group which continues to serve America well—the working men and women of this country. Their safety while working is of paramount importance. Your favorable consideration of this bill would be a strong signal to all that industry should, first and foremost, be concerned with worker safety. Thank you.●

THE FUTURE OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, during the 97th Congress the railroad retirement program was under substantial attack. Efforts were made to cut back dual benefits for current recipients and to reduce and eliminate the Railroad Retirement Board.

In the face of these attacks, Congress spoke out firmly in support of railroad retirees. We successfully reinstated the dual benefit and have resisted attempts to eliminate the Board and the district offices.

However, our actions did not fully resolve the problems facing this important program. It is now clear that the future soundness of the Railroad Retirement System is in doubt.

The Railroad Retirement System, which, throughout its history, has been financed by payroll taxes, is going broke despite corrective action taken by Congress in 1981. The reason for this is the precipitous decline in railroad employment. In less than 2 years employment has fallen almost 20 percent. It has gone from 509,000 in January 1981 to 416,000 in November 1982. This is a loss of nearly 100,000 contributing employees.

A vicious cycle has been established. As employment declines, payroll taxes have been raised. This creates a strong inducement for management to reduce employment further in order to reduce tax costs. Since taxes are high, even a small drop in employment means a big financial loss to the Railroad Retirement System, and a big drop is devastating. Taxes then are raised to make up for lost revenue. Employment is then cut to reduce costs.

However, rail employment decline has not meant a decline in the railroad industry. Deregulation of the industry under the Staggers Rail Act, the various tax reforms, and reorganizations, many made possible by legislation, have put the industry in the best condition ever. Until the current recession caught up with the railroads, they were, according to their own statements, having record years for freight traffic and profits. When this recession ends, as it will, the industry will again experience these conditions.

If rail traffic and revenues are increasing while employment is dropping, productivity must be skyrocketing. The industry is in a better financial position, not a weaker one, to finance the retirement obligations to the men and women who built it, sustained it the last half century, and put it where it is today.

In view of this situation, it is clear that a means, other than payroll taxes, at least in part, must be found to finance these retirement obligations from the record revenues which the industry will achieve. While a ton-mile tax has been suggested, it is not the sole alternative which should be considered.

For this reason, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Railroad Retirement Board, rail labor, and rail management should jointly or independently explore possible alternative methods of financing the railroad retirement program. The resolution directs that one of the alternatives that should be considered is a ton-mile tax. The resolution specifically directs joint or separate reports be made to the Congress by October 1, 1983.

I am confident that the study called for will be made in good faith, and that the report will be filed in October 1983 as requested. The rail sector, labor and management have always contributed to the solution of their retirement program problems. Congress has responded to such private initiatives with the legislation when necessary. We urgently need the private sector's cooperation today.

The failure to respond would have serious repercussions on rail retirees. We cannot get bogged down in a morass of indifference, nor can we back down from the commitments that have been made to these individuals. We urgently need the positive contribution of the rail industry, labor and the Railroad Retirement Board to maintain the commitment and protect railroad retirees today and tomorrow.●

REINTRODUCTION OF THE ERA

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the equal rights amendment be the first legislation introduced in the new Congress. Its designation as House Joint Resolution 1 demonstrates that the struggle to pass the ERA will have a top priority in the 98th Congress.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I cospon-

sored House Joint Resolution 1, and I strongly support the caucus' plans to redouble efforts to insure that the Constitution reflects most Americans' strong conviction that the equality of women is guaranteed.

Opponents are still claiming that the ERA is not needed because women can win equality through Federal laws already on the books and changes in State and local statutes.

But no statute can provide the all-encompassing protection of a constitutional amendment. Statutes can be repealed or undermined, a lesson we are learning only too well under this administration. Support for equal rights can disappear as quickly as changes occur in the White House, the Congress, or the State legislatures.

Currently, we have a President who pays lip service to women's rights but works actively to subvert the gains women have made. Nothing so dramatizes the need for ERA as the administration's pathetic record on equal rights. Antidiscrimination laws, such as the title IX prohibition on discrimination in federally funded education programs, are being weakened. Social programs that seek to equalize opportunity for women in employment, education, housing and other areas are being reduced or eliminated. Fewer women are being considered for judicial and Federal appointments than under past administrations.

Women cannot even rely on existing statutes to protect them. The Equal Pay Act, for example, was passed in 1963, but women are still paid less than men for doing the same work in every job classification in the labor force. College educated women, on the average, earn less than men with an eighth grade education. Poverty has increasingly become a female phenomenon; two out of every three poor adults are women.

ERA is not just women in the labor market. Full-time homemakers will benefit from it as well, since discrimination against women is still rampant in our tax and retirement systems, insurance policies, family law, and other areas.

Moreover, by eliminating sex as a factor in determining legal rights for all citizens, the ERA will protect men as well as women. A man should not be denied the opportunity to learn nursing, for example, any more than a woman should be denied the opportunity to learn engineering. Family law and criminal law should not treat men more harshly than women.

The ERA, in its simplicity, offers the best argument for itself: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." I am confident that those words will become part of the Constitution before another ratification deadline has passed.●

UNEMPLOYMENT IN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin this new session of Congress, our No. 1 priority must be to put our Nation's men and women back to work.

In dry economic terms, unemployment is a key cause of the spiraling budget deficit that is inhibiting any real economic recovery—every percentage point of joblessness adds $30 billion to the deficit. In human terms, unemployment is a tragedy affecting millions of Americans and their families.

Officially, nearly 12 million Americans are unemployed. The real number is much higher, for the official figures fail to count the millions of workers who are forced against their will to work reduced hours and the over 1 million jobseekers who have simply given up of ever finding work.

In my own State of Washington, the unemployment rate is 12.4 percent, far above even the 10.8-percent national average.

I believe the Federal Government can and must be an ally of the unemployed. Congress should take steps to make U.S. exports more competitive, strengthen education, training, and retaining programs, inititate a housing stimulus program, work with management and labor to revitalize our industrial base, and countless other things.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the Daily World, of Aberdeen Wash., which describes the plight—and the courage—of forest product workers in Washington.

The workers in this article are exemplary of what is occurring all across our Nation. They are real people who are struggling to feed their families, people who want to work but cannot find jobs.

I hope that stories like these will convince the Reagan administration to put aside their rigid policies and work with us during the 98th Congress toward real solutions to our Nation's No. 1 problem—unemployment.

WOODWORKERS JUST TRYING TO HOLD ON

(By Emmet Pierce)

GRAYS HARBOR.—Sitting around a table in an Aberdeen union hall, four unemployed woodworkers shared a pot of coffee and swapped stories about tough times in Grays Harbor.

"If it wasn't for unemployment compensation and food stamps, it would be worse than the Depression," said Vernon Montoure, a 54-year-old mill worker.

Montoure said he was thrown out of work when the E. C. Miller Cedar Lumber Co. closed its doors last spring. Until then he worked 30 years without taking a handout. But these days he finds himself standing in food lines.

"I never thought it would happen to me." he said. "I was young during the Depression. I stood in the commodity lines with my folks. These lines are longer."

"I'm making it mainly because of family support. I know a lot of people who aren't," said Bill Douglas, 30, a burly, bearded mechanic who formerly worked for ITT-Rayonier Inc. "I don't have unemployment compensation anymore. The last check I got was last April."

Douglas has been out of work since February 1981. Kurt Rehberg, 24, a former Mayr Brothers Logging Co. mill worker, has been out of work since August.

"I still get unemployment and I can live on it," he said with a shrug. "The wife and me will get along. We got a food basket the other day. It blew me away. I never got anything like that before."

Pride fades when you're struggling to survive, he said. He accepted the gift.

"I've been laid off since February," said Mike Degerlund, 33, who worked for Evans Products Co. "You got to know someone to get a job."

All four men belong to the International Woodworkers of America Local 374. They share a mixture of fear and optimism. There are an estimated 6,600 Grays Harbor laborers out of work. That's 17 percent of the area's work force. The timber industry's slump is expected to continue into 1983. Montoure said his age would make it hard for him to find work.

"These fellows are young," he said, gesturing toward his three companions. "At my age they don't want to train me for another job."

But the need for more training was also on young Rehberg's mind.

"I should have stayed in college like everyone told me to," he said. "I only know how to work in the mill. That's all I know how to do . . . I'll find work somehow. I've just got to hold on."

None of the men want to leave the area, but all have considered it.

"A guy might have to move if the jobs don't come back," said Montoure. "Some people made a move right off. That may help the ones who stay."

Degerlund said mill workers and loggers are used to going a month or more without work. But the timber industry's last boom year was 1979. Since then work has been sporadic at best. And three years is a long time to wait out an economic slump.

The workmen try not to let unemployment get them down. Each had his own way of dealing with anger and disappointment. Douglas played park league baseball to work off his frustration. Rehberg plays basketball and takes long walks. Degerlund cuts firewood. When Montoure gets depressed he washes his car. Jobless laborers who can't get their minds off their problems get just plain mean, Douglas said.

"You learn to roll with it," he said. "You can't keep it on your mind all the time."

Montoure said the wood products industry is tied to the housing industry. Owning one's own home is part of the American Dream, he said. Ironically, many woodworkers have never realized that dream.

"How am I going to save $5,000 for a down payment and closing costs and then make an $800 per month payment?" Rehberg asked. "There's just no way."

Montoure said the timber industry will rebound once home loan interest rates fall,

but woodworkers may be among the last people to benefit from an economic upturn.

"We always pay the price," Degerlund said bitterly. "We're the working people."

Degerlund gets angry every time President Reagan picks up a newspaper classified ads section to illustrate the availability of jobs.

"There ain't no work," he said his voice rising. "It's easy for him to pick up the paper and say, 'See all these jobs,' but they're specialized jobs."

Douglas agreed. Most job opportunities just don't apply to loggers and mill workers.

"I'd look really good coming to a house as a beauty consultant," Douglas quipped.

"It's nothing that we can control," said Rehberg. "If it was just up to going and getting a job, we'd have jobs."

There may be fewer jobs, but numerous food drives throughout Grays Harbor have kept people from going hungry, said Rehberg. Even some unemployed workers find some way to contribute.

"When you know how much you appreciate people bringing food to your house, you give some too," he said.

Everyone sitting around the table agreed Grays Harbor is meeting the challenge of tough times.

"This is a great community to live in, good times or bad," Degerlund said.●

TERRORISTS DESERVE TOUGHER PENALTIES

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish tougher, mandatory penalties for those persons convicted of terrorist attacks on Federal buildings.

The bill is intended to provide a greater deterrent to terrorists, such as those responsible for the New Year's Eve bombing in New York that seriously injured three city police officers.

Under my bill, when a person dies from a bombing attack on Federal property, those responsible would be required to face the death penalty, or mandatory life imprisonment if the death penalty is not imposed. In cases, such as the recent New York City attack, when persons are injured—but not killed—my bill would impose a mandatory prison sentence of from 5 to 20 years.

Under current law, the maximum sentence these criminals face is 20 years (for causing injury) to life in prison (for causing death), which means they are eligible for parole after only 7 to 10 years.

However, as shocking as it may sound, a terrorist who injures or kills when bombing Federal property might not ever spend a day behind bars under current law because there is no mandatory penalty or enforceable capital punishment sentence for the crime. My bill would correct this serious injustice.

The need for stiffer, mandatory penalties is clear—existing law is simply not an effective deterrent. For example, the terrorist group which New York City police believe set the New Year's Eve blast, FALN, has claimed responsibility for some 100 bombings that have killed six people, wounded dozens more, and resulted in more than $3.5 million in property damage during the past 8 years. Although 30 of their attacks have taken place in New York, the group has claimed responsibility for other bombings in Chicago, Washington, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. We must take tough and immediate actions to more effectively deal with these terrorists acts. I believe my proposal offers us that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, as one who was wounded 10 times during my 23 years with the New York City Police Department, I am especially concerned about the life-threatening dangers these terrorist bombings pose to our Nation's law enforcement community. In the New Year's Eve bombing in New York, one courageous police officer, Rocco Pascarella, went to investigate a suspicious package he thought might be a bomb. It exploded as he approached, causing him to lose his right leg. Two bomb squad detectives, Salvatore R. Pastorella and Anthony S. Senft, also suffered extremely serious injuries when another of the series of bombs exploded in their faces as they attempted to dismantle it. Detective Pastorella lost all the fingers of his right hand, suffered very serious eye injuries and may have been deafened. Detective Senft, also suffered an eye injury, as well as extensive facial and body injuries.

Every police officer knows there are certain risks associated with the difficult task of fighting crime. However, those risks can be minimized, and we can help by passing tougher laws that serve as more effective crime deterrents.

Acting in this belief, I intend to do everything possible to seek the early passage of this crucial anticrime measure and I urge my colleagues to support me in this worthy cause.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 2, 1983]

F.A.L.N. PUERTO RICAN TERRORISTS SUSPECTED IN NEW YEAR BOMBINGS

(By Robert D. McFadden)

Federal and city investigators said yesterday that a Puerto Rican terrorist group was apparently responsible for a series of bombings on New Year's Eve that rocked four government buildings in lower Manhattan and Brooklyn and seriously injured three police officers.

The blasts, which struck Police Headquarters and two Federal office buildings in Manhattan and the Federal Courthouse in Brooklyn during a 90-minute period, severed a leg of one officer and injured the eyes of two bomb squad detectives.

The detectives, one of whom also lost all the fingers on his right hand and may have been deafened, were felled when one of the bombs blew up in their faces. They might have been killed had they not been wearing armored suits, the police said. A fifth bomb, made of four sticks of dynamite, was found in lower Manhattan and dismantled before it exploded.

Authorities said the explosions were believed set by the F.A.L.N.—Fuerzas Armadasa de Liberación National, or Armed Forces of National Liberation—which has claimed responsibility for some 100 bombings that have killed six people in an eight-year campaign of terror in the name of Puerto Rican independence.

Police Commissioner Robert J. McGuire said that at 10:20 P.M., after three of the bombs had exploded, a man called WCBS Radio and said: "This is the F.A.L.N. We are responsible for the bombings in New York City today. Free Puerto Rico. Free all political prisoners and prisoners of war."

The caller hung up after making the statement, which was recorded, the commissioner said. Shortly afterward, at 10:27 P.M., a man called The Associated Press in New York City and claimed that the Palestine Liberation Organization was responsible for the bombings and that two more bombs would go off within an hour, Commissioner McGuire said.

Two more bombs were found at a Federal office building downtown. One exploded and the other was dismantled. However, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Commissioner McGuire expressed skepticism about the claim on behalf of the P.L.O.

"We are definitely investigating an F.A.L.N. link," said Joseph Valiquette, a spokesman for the F.B.I.

"The type of device used is consistent with what the F.A.L.N. has previously used and taken credit for," Commissioner McGuire said at a new conference. "The type of message given is also consistent."

As word of the blasts spread, the Police Department received scores of calls warning that bombs had been planted in various locations in the city, including in the midst of the huge crowd of revelers gathered in Times Square for the New Year's Eve celebration.

Security at all public buildings was increased and searches were conducted for other bombs, but none was found, the Commissioner said. Police at the Midtown South Precinct said that officers scanned the Times Square crowd for suspicious packages but took no other precautions.

The Commissioner gave the following details of the bombings:

The first detonated at 9:27 P.M. on the north side of 26 Federal Plaza, which houses the offices of the F.B.I. and other Federal agencies. The device, made of several sticks of dynamite and a timer, knocked out windows on three floors but caused no injuries.

Four blocks away, at 9:55 P.M., a second bomb exploded on the north side of 1 Police Plaza, the city's Police Headquarters building, which is near City Hall and the Municipal Building. Officer, Rocco Pascarella, 33 years old, who was on security detail, had heard the first blast, gone out to investigate and found the package. It exploded just as he approached, nearly severing his right leg just below the knee.

The 12-year police veteran, who is married, has one daughter and lives in Queens, was taken to Bellevue Hospital, where surgeons attempted without success to reattach the leg with microsurgery. He was listed in guarded condition late yesterday.

The third bombing occurred at 10 P.M. outside the United States District Courthouse at 225 Cadman Plaza East in Brooklyn's Borough Hall section. It shattered windows throughout the building but injured no one. "The explosion was heard all around the Brooklyn Heights neighborhood," said Officer Timothy Kane of the 84th Precinct.

At 10:45 P.M. one of two bombs exploded at 1 St. Andrews Plaza, which houses the Manhattan Federal courts and the offices of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York. The building is adjacent to the Metropolitan Correctional Center and just across Park Row from 1 Police Plaza.

The device blew up just as Detectives Salvatore R. Pastorella, 42, and Anthony S. Senft, 36, were trying to examine it after putting steel-mesh blankets over both bombs.

Detective Pastorella, a 15-year member of the force from Brooklyn, lost all the fingers of his right hand, sustained very serious injuries to both eyes and may have been deafened. Detective Senft, an officer for 10 years who lives in Suffolk County, suffered an injury to one eye and extensive facial and body injuries.

The two detectives were rushed to Bellevue Hospital, where they were listed later in stable but very serious condition. Commissoner McGuire said the two had been saved from death or more critical injuries by the protective suits they were wearing.

Other bomb-squad detectives at St. Andrews Plaza were ordered not to attempt immediately to remove the fifth bomb. When it had not detonated by 12:30 A.M., the detectives deactivated the device, placed it in a bomb-disposal truck and took it to the Police Department's firing range at Rodman's Neck in the Bronx.

Commissioner McGuire said that the timing and placement of the bombs suggested that the people who planted them had apparently not intended to harm ordinary citizens.

He said that 60 investigators assigned to the joint F.B.I.-Police Department Terrorist Task Force are working on the bombings.

While no suspects were named, the Commissioner said that investigators had some potentially important clues. He said several persons may have seen a man planting the last two bombs in the vicinity of St. Andrews Plaza at about 10:15 P.M.

The Commissioner said that the man was reported to be Hispanic, was carrying a package and had approached some Chinese neighborhood residents who were standing nearby and indicated to them that they should leave the area. Mr. McGuire said the police were looking for those people and he urged them, or anyone else who saw the man, to contact the police. He did not explain how the police had learned of the potential witnesses.

BOMBS IN INNOCUOUS PACKAGES

Investigators also had as evidence the dismantled fifth bomb. It consisted of four sticks of dynamite, each weighing about one-half pound, a blasting cap, a nine-volt battery and a pocket watch.

The other devices were believed to be similar, Mr. McGuire said. All were in "innocuous packages wrapped in newspaper," each smaller than a shoebox, the Commissioner said.

A coordinated assault on the offices of government, corporate and financial institutions has been the hallmark of the F.A.L.N., whose last bombing spree struck the New York and American Stock Exchanges, the Chase Manhattan Bank and the headquarters of Merrill Lynch & Company last March 1.

At that time, Kenneth Walton, deputy director of the New York office of the F.B.I., said that the explosions appeared to mark a resurgence of the group, which had been inactive for two years since the arrests in 1980 of 11 top members.

Since surfacing in 1974, the group has claimed responsibility for more than 100 bombings, including 30 in New York and others in Chicago, Washington, Philadelphia and San Francisco. In addition to six deaths, they have caused scores of injuries and more than $3.5 million in damage. The most devastating blast killed four persons and injured 60 others at Fraunces Tavern in lower Manhattan in 1975.●

CONDOMINIUM COST REDUCTION ACT IS REINTRODUCED

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today, Congressman ARCHER and I are reintroducing legislation which will remove the necessity for costly condominium converters.

Mr. Speaker, for many people the dream of homeownership starts with the least expensive form of housing. Because of obvious factors, such as smaller unit size, economies of scale, and considerably less land, condominiums are often the most cost-effective and energy-efficient ownership housing available today.

Present tax laws treat condominium conversion in a curious way that encourages sales to professional converters and not to present tenants. If you own an apartment building and sell units to your tenants you are considered a "dealer" in real estate and must pay taxes on your entire gain at ordinary income tax rates, no matter how long you owned the building. However, if you sell the building to a professional converter you get capital gains on the entire gain. Hence the law favors sales to a converter and not directly to tenants.

Because of this anomaly an entire conversion industry grew in the 1970's. Conversions are not an easy process. Experts are needed to handle the legal intricacies and the unique tenant-landlord problems. But instead of hiring a company on a fee basis, conversion companies bought the building from the owner who then converted the buildings.

Converters typically get short-term loans pegged above the prime. To cover the cost of carrying the loan, they many times had to upgrade the building that made it possible to charge more for the units but invariably makes it difficult or impossible for present tenants to afford the units. This has caused the kind of displacement that has helped give conversions a bad name.

If the tax laws did not so strongly discourage apartment owners to convert their buildings themselves, several positive results would occur.

First, there would be no need to carry a large short-term loan. This would keep the conversion costs down and allow more tenants during "upgrading" or to keep units empty for prospective buyers. It would be a lot easier to keep units as rentals—an entirely uneconomic situation for a professional converter. It has been estimated by the National Apartment Association that involvement of a middleman converter can raise the cost of a unit 25 percent. In addition, the presence of a professional converter purchasing a building almost always generates fear and uncertainty among existing tenants, especially the elderly. We believe the conversion problems could be significantly ameliorated if the present owner is involved in the conversions.

The legislation that I have introduced today with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) would alter the tax treatment conversions making the Code less "pro-converter." First, an owner would get capital gain up to the value of the building as an apartment rental. On sale to individuals, any amount received greater than the value of the building as appraised as a rental building, would be taxed at ordinary income tax rates.

I am confident that this bill has no revenue impact. It is only cutting out the middleman giving the owner the option to convert him or herself with a greater likelihood that the present tenants would be able to purchase the units and make more lower priced units placed on the market.

The text of the legislation is printed below.

H.R. 699

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of certain conversions of residential rental property into condominium units

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IV of subchapter P of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for determining capital gains and losses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

SEC. 1257. ELECTION TO TREAT CERTAIN CONVERSIONS INTO CONDOMINIUM UNITS AS SALES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of this title, at the election of the taxpayer—

(1) the conversion of any qualified residential real property into condominium units shall be treated as a sale of such property for an amount equal to its fair market value as residential rental property, and

(2) any gain determined under section (a)(1) shall be capital gain. Any additional gain determined upon disposition of the dwelling units shall be ordinary income. All

such grain shall be recognized as from time to time realized in the same proportion that gain in the first sentence bears to the gain in the second sentence.

(3) Expenditures incurred in connection with improvements in the dwelling units while held by the taxpayer in anticipation of their sale, or pursuant to a contract of sale between the taxpayer and the buyer, shall be treated as reducing that portion of the gain treated as ordinary income.

(b) QUALIFID RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section, the term "qualified residential real property" means and any real property—

(1) which was residential rental property (as defined in section 167(j)(2)(B)) in the hands of the taxpayer, and

(2) which, except in the case of property acquired by inheritance or devise, was residential real property held by the taxpayer for at least 5 continuous years immediately before the conversion into condominium units.

(c) FAIR MARKET VALUE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the fair market value of any qualified residential real property shall be determined as residential rental property immediately before the conversion and without regard to any substantial improvement made in anticipation of the conversion.

(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) SECTION APPLIES ONLY WHERE GAIN RESULTS.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the application of such subsection would result in the recognition of a loss.

(2) BASIS ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to provide for adjustments in basis to reflect gain recognized under this section.

(3) ELECTION.—An election under subsection (a) shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe. Such an election, once made, may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

(b) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter P of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

SEC. 1257. ELECTION TO TREAT CERTAIN CONVERSIONS INTO CONDOMINIUM UNITS AS SALES.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to conversions after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.●

DORGAN: A GOOD CHOICE FOR WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the steering and policy committee to appoint North Dakota Congressman BYRON L. DORGAN to the House Ways and Means Committee is an important step for better representation here in Congress for our agricultural interests.

During the last session I served with Mr. DORGAN on the House Agriculture Committee. He did an outstanding job on that committee fighting for the interests of the family farmer. However, it was clear to us that we desperately needed representation on the House Ways and Means Committee that deals with all export issues, all tax issues, and many other vital areas.

The Ways and Means Committee last session, for example, death with over 80 bills that affected agriculture and yet there was virtually no one on that committee who represented a rural district and would be a voice for the family farmer in making those decisions.

The trade and export issues are some of the most important issues facing our farmers over the next decade. The Ways and Means Committee is responsible for our foreign trade policies, and we are glad that a farm State Representative will be part of the framing of those policies.

We need to do much more for our farmers in the area of trade. They need more and better foreign markets, and Representative DORGAN will help us reach that goal.

In summary, having BYRON DORGAN serve on the powerful House Ways and Means Committee will improve his ability to represent farm State interests. It will also give us a chance to better coordinate the efforts of the Ways and Means Committee and the Agriculture Committee to develop meaningful agricultural policies on price supports and exports that will give the family farmers a chance to see an improving agricultural economy for a change.●

AMERICA WILL SUFFER WITHOUT STUDENT AID

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor in the House, Father Robert Drinan, S.J., has had several very distinguished careers. Both before and after his service as one of the outstanding Members of the House, he has been a leading educator in America. For years he served as dean of one of our outstanding institutions, Boston College Law School. Some of his former students sit in the House today. Since leaving the House he has, among other things, resumed teaching law at the Georgetown Law Center.

Recently he wrote a compelling article on the need for continued support by Congress of comprehensive student loan programs. Father Drinan points out that making higher education financially possible for every qualified young person is important both as a matter of fairness and as an essential element in a long-term strategy for keeping America's economy competitive in the world.

I ask that his remarks be printed here so that our colleagues can once again benefit from his cogent arguments.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Dec. 26, 1982]

AMERICA WILL SUFFER WITHOUT STUDENT AID

(By Robert F. Drinan, S.J.)

Will the 98th Congress continue those programs of financial aid to college students which have helped to make it possible for 12,358,000 young people to attend college and for 3,200 institutions of higher education to survive? The answer is in doubt.

In 1978, Congress made all college students, regardless of income, eligible for guaranteed loans. During the next three years $15 billion was borrowed from the nation's banks—more than the total amount lent in the preceding 13 years. In a law that took effect Oct. 1, 1981, these loans were restricted to students whose combined parental income was under a certain ceiling. The number of loans in the following year dropped from 3.5 million to 2.7 million. The number of loans available in 1982 in Ohio declined by 24.3% and in Kentucky by 24.4%. In addition, the outright grants to students from the federal government declined nationally by 7%.

The enrollment of freshmen in September, 1982, decreased somewhat—especially in private colleges. The nation's 1,500 private colleges had 16,000 fewer freshmen in the fall of 1982 than in the fall of 1981. This 3.8% decline has brought about the first total enrollment drop in private colleges since 1971. It will mean that over the next four years there will be a loss to these private colleges of some $250 million.

This shortfall may have been due to the uncertainty about the availability of financial aid rather than the actural lack of money for tuition loans. But the same uncertainty continues, and college administrators are nervous about what to expect in September, 1983.

The Reagan administration has recommended a slashing of financial grants from $2.4 billion to $1.4 billion, a cutback in work-study funds from $528 million to $397 million and the elimination of all $178 million in national direct student loans. The House of Representatives will probably vote to continue these programs at their present level of funding, but the future of these programs is very uncertain.

The pressure to reduce student grants and loans will be intense. Deficits will remain in the $150-billion range for 1983, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) estimates that the 1984 deficit will be a staggering $185 billion.

There is abundant evidence that the cutbacks in the availability of student loans (which declined from $7.8 billion in 1981 to $6.1 billion in 1982) have had undesirable results on thousands of students and hundreds of colleges. The federal student grant and loan programs initiated in the 1970s can be compared to the monumental Land Grant College Act of 1863 by which thousands of acres of land were given by the federal government to start the great state universities and the GI Bill of Rights which educated some 12 million veterans after World war II.

About the only objection heard to the student loan program is the reported default rate. The inadequate collection procedures of the federal government as well as the colleges may have been as responsible as anything else for whatever excessive defaults

may have occurred. The problem is on its way to being resolved. This year, 436 colleges with default rates over 10% are barred from receiving loans. In 1983 the federal government will propose further tightening measures in the collection procedures, including possibly a plan by which income-tax returns or even wages may be withheld from those who have defaulted on student loans.

Aside from the uncertainty surrounding federal loans and grants, the nation's colleges and universities face problems from the declining numbers of persons reaching their 18th birthday. The 1982 total of 4,185,000 will decline to 3,772,000 in 1984 and to 3,329,000 in 1995. The total will not turn upward until the year 2000 when it will be 3,758,000.

There are undoubtedly improvements which could be made in the five major federal loan-grant-work programs. But the continual need for them is evident. States are retrenching in student assistance. Michigan, for example, economically devastated for a decade, has since 1975-76 doubled its tuition for its 15 state-related colleges and universities and phased out 150 degree programs. Some states have increased state aid for students; in 1982-83 Ohio is giving 67,000 awards totaling $33,856,000—an increase of 6.3%. But nationally, student aid last year increased 9% from all sources while tuition and fees increased 14%.

If there is any simple principle which unites liberals and conservatives when they think about the economy it is their agreement on the urgency of training more persons for careers in high technology so that the United States can meet its competition abroad from Japan, West Germany and more and more industrialized nations like Singapore and Taiwan. It is well known that one out of every five adult Americans is handicapped by "functional illiteracy" and that this unfortunate situation may cost the nation an estimated $225 billion in lost productivity.

The future of America will be determined in very significant ways by what the congress and the White House do about helping college students in 1983. The carefully integrated programs now on the books permit every qualified American youth to go to the college of his or her choice whether it is Oberlin or Ohio State. Should not that be a right which the Congress and the country should cherish?●

EVANGELICAL BAPTIST PRISONERS IN THE U.S.S.R.

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as we start a new year, we sometimes forget that the persecution of Christian believers today, is no less real than it was in the days of the Roman Empire. Christians are still suffering and dying for their belief in God and his son born on Christmas Day. Therefore, it is appropriate to remember the fate of certain Evangelical Baptist prisoners in the U.S.S.R. who are suffering and dying for their faith. A list of some of them arrested and their address in forced labor camps follows:

LIST OF EVANGELICAL BAPTIST PRISONERS IN THE SOVIET UNION, JULY 1, 1982

1. Afanaseva, Ludmila Arsenyevna.
Home address: d. Maneyevo, Bashkirskaya ASSR, Soviet Union.
b. 1958.
Arrested: March 23, 1982.

2. Alekseyev, Vyacheslav Konstantinovich.
Home address: ul. Shafiyeva 6, kv. 14, g. Ufa, Bashkirskaya ASSR 450083, Soviet Union.
b. September 1936; 3 children.
Arrested: March 12, 1982.

3. Antonov, Ivan Yakovlevich.
Home address: Neonila Ivanovna Antonova (wife), ul. Kotovskogo, 41, g. Kirovograd 316013, Soviet Union.
b. August 19, 1919; 3 children.
Arrested: May 14, 1982.

4. Antonov, Pavel Ivanovich.
Home address: Neonila Ivanovna Antonova (mother), ul. Katovskogo, 41, g. Kirovograd 316013, Soviet Union.
b. November 25, 1957.
Arrested: February 17, 1982.

5. Antropov, Pavel Nikolayevich.
Home address: Maria Grigorievna Antropova (wife), ul. Kalinina, 9, g. Mozhga, Udmurtskaya ASSR 427760, Soviet Union.
b. November 20, 1930.
Arrested: February 3, 1982.

6. Arbuzov, Ivan Grigorievich.
Home address: ul. Pavlova 18, g. Nizhny Tagil, Sverdlovskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
b. 1914.
Arrested: April 20, 1982.

7. Arnautov, Georgi Ivanovich.
Home address: Anna Mikhailovna Arnautova (wife), ul. Molodyozhnaya, 49, g. Kherson 325013, Khersonskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
b. January 10, 1922; 3 children.
Camp address: otr. 7 br. 74, uchr. YuZ 312/87, g. Gorlovka, Donetskaya oblast 338035, Soviet Union.
Arrested: August 18, 1980.
Sentence: (2nd) 2 years strict.

8. Azarov, Mikhail Vladimirovich.
Home address: Anna Petrovna Azarova (wife), ul. Ropshenskaya, 23 kv. 27, 197110 g. Leningrad, Soviet Union.
b. April 27, 1937; 4 children.
Camp address: UC 20/7 "L", g. Leningrad 195213, Soviet Union.
Arrested: August 14, 1981.
Sentence: (2nd) 4 years ordinary plus confiscation.

9. Baturin, Nikolai Georgievich.
Home address: Valentina Matveyevna Baturina (wife), ul. Sadovaya, 4 kv. 13, g. Shakhty 346500 Rostovskaya obl., Soviet Union.
b. Decementer 15, 1927; 6 children.
Camp address: YH 1612/44 "G", g. Belovo, Kemerovskaya obl. 652600, Soviet Union.
Arrested: November 5, 1979.
Sentence: (6th) 5 years strict.

10. Belan, Boris Nikolayevich.
Home address: Maria Semyonovna Belan (wife), ul. Lisunova kvartal 4,40, kv. 27, g. Tashkent, Uzbekskaya SSR 700171, Soviet Union.
b. May 28, 1954.
Arrested: January 12, 1982.

11. Beiev, Ivan Petrovich.
Home address: Zinaida Nikolayevna Beleva (wife), ul. Karla Marksa, 11/4 kv. 121, Kishinev 277045, Moldavskaya SSR, Soviet Union.
b. March 26, 1940.
Camp address: OSch 29/5 "Ye", ul. Levanevskogo, g. Kagul 278830, Soviet Union.
Arrested: January 20, 1982.
Sentence: 2.5 ordinary.

12. Berezovsky, Vasily Tarasovich.
Home address: Lilia Romanovna Berezovskaya (wife), ul. Linina, 13 kv. 21, g. Chervonograd, Lvovskaya oblst 292210, Soviet Union.
b. October 20, 1936; 6 children.
Arrested: November 24, 1981.

13. Bessonov, Vladimir Ivanovich.
Home address: Svethlana Ivanovna Bessonova (wife), ul. Poleganovskaya, 2, g. Chernovtsy, Chernovitskaya obl. 274008, Soviet Union.
b. November 27, 1949; 3 children.
Camp address: K-231/2-17, p/o/ Lesnoye, pos. Zarechny, Verkhnekansky r-n, Kirovskaya oblast 612870, Soviet Union.
Arrested: July 27, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.

14. Bogar, Ivan Biilovich.
Home address: Maria Avgustinovna Bogar (wife), ul. Tereka, 65, pos. Koroleva, Zarakapatskaya obl. 295560, Soviet Union.
b. November 24, 1952; 3 children.
Arrested: May 13, 1981.

15. Boiko, Nikolai Yerofeyevich.
Home address: Valentina Ilinichna Boiko (wife), ul. Limannya, 8, pos. Shevchenko-1, p. Krasnoselka, Odessa 272168, Soviet Union.
b. February 23, 1922; 8 children.
Camp address: YaB 257/5 otr. 8, g. Sovietskaya Gavan, Kabarovsky krai 682880, Soviet Union.
Arrested: December 29, 1980.
Sentence: (2nd) 5 years strict plus 5 exile.

16. Bondar, Lidia Trofimovna.
Home address: Marfa Semyanyuk Bondar (sister), ul. Minskaya, 31, g. Krasnodar 350006, Soviet Union.
Camp address: UVL' 315/187, ul. 1 Maya 20, g. Lvov 290007, Soviet Union.
Arrested: April 20, 1982.
Sentence: (2nd).

17. Brykova, Nadezhda Ivanovna.
Home address: Maria Fedorevna Brykova (mother), 1-aya Besh-Bala, 217, g. Fergana, Uzbekskaya SSR 712011, Soviet Union.
b. December 19, 1943.
Camp address: uchr. UO 68/3 br. 21, Ust Labinsk, Krasnodarsky krai 352310, Soviet Union.
Arrested: June 18, 1980.
Sentence: 3.5 ordinary plus confiscation.

18. Bublik, Sergei Ivanovich.
Home address: Ekaterina Dementyevna Olshevskaya (mother), per. Donetsky, 45, g. Rostov-na-Dornu 346000, Soviet Union.
b. November 13, 1957.
Camp address: p/ya 288-28 4/24, p.o. Khairyuzovka, Ilansky 4-n, Krasnoyarsky krai 663850, Soviet Union.
Arrested: January 19, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.

19. Burdeiny, Viktor Aleksandrovich.
Home address: ul. Tretiya, 101, s. Zdolbitsa, Zdolbunovsky raion, Rovenskaya obl., Soviet Union.
b. April 24, 1943; 2 children.
Camp address: p/ya OR 318/46-3, s. Ekaterinovka, g. Sarny, Rovenskaya oblast 265452, Soviet Union.
Arrested: July 20, 1980.
Sentence: (2nd) 3 years strict.

20. Bykov, Viktor Ivanovich.
Home address: Nina Petrovna Bykov (wife), ul. Gertsena, 96 kv. 1, g. Novorossiisk, Krasnodarsky krai 353912, Soviet Union.
b. December 23, 1930; 5 children.
Camp address: UO 68/1 br. 5, pos. Novosadovy, Abinsky raion, Krasnodarsky krai, Soviet Union.
Arrested: June 18, 1980.
Sentence: 3.5 years ordinary plus confiscation.

21. Bystrova, Tamara Vasilievna.
Home address: Maria Adamovna Bystrova (mother), Tallinna maante, 15-2, Narva, Estonskaya SSR, Soviet Union.
b. January 4, 1949.
Camp address: p/ya YaV 49/5 2-21, g. Chelyabinsk 454014 Soviet Union.
Arrested: January 19, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
22. Bytin, Aleksandr Fedorovich.
Home address: Nina Stepanovna Bytin (wife), 3-ii Tkatsky proezd, g. Bryansk-27, 24127, Soviet Union.
b. September 11, 1934; 8 children.
Camp address: uchr. OB 21/4-7, pos. Lokot, Btrasovsky raion, Bryanskaya oblast 242300, Soviet Union.
Arrested: November 11, 1981.
Sentence: (3rd) 3 years strict.
23. Chaban, Pavel Savelevich.
Home address: Stepanova Antonina Chaban (wife), ul. Krupskaya, 23 kv 1, g. Kovel, Volynskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
b. September 25, 1934; 5 children.
Camp address: Mkh 324/78, s. Raikovtsy, Khmelnitskaya oblast 281428, Soviet Union.
Arrested: December 29, 1981.
Sentence: 2 years ordinary.
24. Chertkova, Anna Vasilievna.
Home address: ul. Stankevicha 36, g. Alma-Ata, Kazakhskaya SSP 480056, Soviet Union.
b. November 8, 1927.
Psychiatric hospital address: spetspsikhbolnitsa otd. 11, uchr. UYa 64, g. Tashkent 700069, Soviet Union.
Confined in hospital since 1973.
25. Chigarskikh, Yuri Stepanovich.
Home address: Valentina Pavlovna Chigarskikh (wife), ul. Satyrina, 20 kv. 43, g. Kirov 610011, Soviet Union.
b. November 17, 1935; 7 children.
Camp address: otr. 5 br. 50, GSP OR 216/7, g. Kirov 610602, Soviet Union.
Arrested: March 26, 1981.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
26. Chipets, Ivan Filatovich.
Home address: Polina Nikolayevna Chipets (wife), ul. Golovka, 14, g. Nikopol, Dnepropetrovskaya oblast 322909, Soviet Union.
b. April 13, 1929.
Camp address: YuYe 312/1, pos. Mirnoye, Telmanovsky raion, Donetskaya oblast 342228, Soviet Union.
Sentence: 2.5 years ordinary.
27. Chovgan, Fedor Kuzmich.
Home address: Anna Ivanovna Chovgan (wife), ul. Mira, 30, pos. Paynytino, Lozovsky r-n, Kharkovskyya oblast 313520, Soviet Union.
b. March 31, 1932.
Camp address: YuYe 312/1 3-33, pos. Mirny, Telmanovsky raion, Donetskaya oblast 342228, Soviet Union.
Sentence: 3.5 years ordinary plus confiscation.
28. Danilyuk, Ivan Grigoriyevich.
Home address: Antonina Alekseyevna Danilyuk (wife), ul. Poletayeva, 13 kv. 64, g. Chernovitsy, Chernovitskaya oblast 274018, Soviet Union.
b. January 2, 1938.
Arrested: February 21, 1982.
Sentence: (2nd) 5 years strict.
29. Deshko, Mikhail Pavlovich.
Home address: Marta Vasiliyevna Deshko (mother), s. Deshkovitsa, 82, Irshavsky raion, Zakarpatskaya oblast 295205, Soviet Union.
b. May 26, 1956.
Camp address: p/ya OR 318-76-6, st. Rafalovka, Rovenskaya oblast 265968, Soviet Union.
Arrested: January 8, 1981.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
30. Didnyak, Gennady Vasilievich.
Home address: Svetlana Ivanovna Didnyak (wife), ul. Frunze, 44 kv. 7, g. Nikolayev 327029, Soviet Union.
b. September 16, 1956; 1 child.
Arrested: March 1, 1982.
31. Didnyak, Maria Vasilievna.
Home address: Vasily Konstantinovich Didnyak (husband), ul. Frunze, 44 kv. 7, g. Nikolayev 327029, Soviet Union.
b. April 29, 1933.
Arrested: March 1, 1982.
32. Dolbun, Liliya Iosifovna.
Home address: ul. Proletarskaya 58, g. Mogilev 212011, Soviet Union.
b. 1932; 6 children.
Arrested: August 18, 1981.
Sentence: 1 year forced labor.
33. Donchenko, Aleksandr Maksimovich.
Home address: Anna Yakovlevna Donchenko (mother), Saltovskoye shosse, 246 kv. 5, g. Kharkov, Kharkovskaya oblast 310171, Soviet Union.
b. September 6, 1960.
Camp address: US 319/56 3-33, s. Perekrestovka, Romensky raion, Sumskaya oblast 245930, Soviet Union.
Arrested: July 19, 1980.
Sentence: 2 years ordinary.
34. Donchenko, Lubov Maksimovna.
Home address: Anna Yakovlevna Donchenko (mother), Saltovskoye shosse, 246 kv. 5, g. Kharkov 310171, Kharkovskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
b. April 15, 1951.
Camp address: otr. 6 br. 9, uchr. YuG 311/74, g. Odessa 270059, Soviet Union.
Arrested: October 14, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
35. Dubovik, Viktor Mikhailovich.
Home address: Nina Ivanovna Dubovik (wife), per. Strelkovy, 36a, g. Simferopol-38, Krymskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
b. June 18, 1937; 5 children.
Address in exile: ul. Sovietskaya, 24, p. Tsentralny, Verxneketsky raion, Tomskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
Arrested: April 18, 1973.
Sentence: 5 years ordinary, 5 years exile.
36. Durksen, Yakov Frantsevich.
Home address: Ekaterina Abramovna Durksen (wife), s. Apollonovka, Isil'kul'sk r-n, Omskaya obl. 646000, Soviet Union.
b. March 9, 1924; 10 children.
Camp address: p/ya UB 14/10 "Zh", g. Zmeinogorsk, Altaisky krai 658460, Soviet Union.
Arrested: March 17, 1981.
Sentence: (3rd) 5 years strict.
37. Enns, Dmitri Petrovich.
Home address: Elena Yakovlevna Enns (wife), S. Borisovka, Uspensky raion, Pavlodarsky oblast, Kazakhskaya SSR 638143, Soviet Union.
b. November 18, 1953.
Arrested: April 17, 1982.
38. Ewert, Eduard Yakovlevich.
Home address: Ekaterina Vladimirovna Ewert (wife), ul. Chakalova, 52, g. Makinsk, Tselingoradskaya oblast, Kazakhskaya SSR 474010, Soviet Union.
b. June 27, 1949; 6 children.
Camp address: otr. 6 br. 24, uchr. RU 170/2, g. Uralsk, Kazakhskaya SSR 417901, Soviet Union.
Arrested: March 24, 1981.
Sentence: 2.5 years ordinary.
39. Faleyev, Anatoly Vasilievich.
Home address: Emiliya Timofeyevna Faleyeva (wife) ul, Fadeyeva, 345, g. Krasnodar, Krasnodarsky krai 350057, Soviet Union.
b. February 17, 1942; 1 child.
Camp address: UO 68/12 (2-21), pos. Oktyabrsky, Primorsko-Akhtarsky r-n, Krasnodarsky krai, Soviet Union.
Arrested: June 18, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
40. Fenchyak, Vasily Vasiliyevich.
Home address: Elena Yurevna Fenchyak (mother), ul. Michurina, 14, s. Velikiye Luchki, Mukachevsky raion, Zakarpatskaya oblast 295413, Soviet Union.
b. January 1, 1951.
Camp address: YuZ 17/7 12-43, Gopri, g. Kherson 326244, Soviet Union.
Arrested: November 30, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
41. Filippishin, Viktor Yakovlevich.
Home address: Evgenia Mikhailovna Filippishin (wife), ul. Livanskogo, 1, g. Khotin, Chernovitskaya oblast 275360, Soviet Union.
b. March 7, 1939; 8 children.
Arrested: March 22, 1982.
42. Firsov, Vladimir Lukich.
Home address: Valentina Konstantinova Firsov (wife), ul. Omskaya, 11, g. Barnaul, Altaisky krai 656061, Soviet Union.
b. April 16, 1928; 1 hcild.
Camp address: uchr. ZhD 158/3 3-32, g. Zhanatas, Dzhambulskaya oblast, Kazakhskaya SSR, Soviet Union.
Arrested: September 2, 1981.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
43. Freeman, Ewald Rheingoldovich.
Home address: Maria Petrovna Freeman (wife), ul. Lenina, 76, s. Olgino, Uspensky raion, Pavlodarsky oblast, Kazakhskaya SSR 638143, Soviet Union.
b. January 29, 1939; 9 children.
Arrested: April 17, 1982.
44. Golub, Vasily Andreyevich.
Home address: Olga Ivanova Golub (wife), ul. Vysotnaya, 41, Voroshilovgrad, Voroshilovgradskaya obl. 348043, Soviet Union.
b. May 16, 1930; 7 children.
Camp address: p/ya OR 318/46-5, g. Sarny, Rovenskaya obl. 265452, Soviet Union.
Arrested: September 8, 1980.
Sentence (3rd) 5 years strict.
45. Gomon, Vitaly Aleksandrovich.
Home address: Anastasiya Gomon (mother), Yanvarskaya vosstaniya, 11 kv. 79, g. Kiev-10, Soviet Union.
b. July 22, 1956.
Camp address: p/ya YaG 14/11 otr. 7, pos. Novo-Orlovsk, Achinsky raion, Chitinskaya oblast 674470, Soviet Union.
Arrested: October 15, 1981.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
46. Goroshenin, Vladimir Nikitovich.
Home address: Nadezhda Aleksandrovna Goroshenin (wife), ul. Glinki, 40, g. Kizlyar, Dagestanskaya ASSR 368800, Soviet Union.
b. June 26, 1942; 6 children.
Arrested: April 6, 1982.
47. Gotman, Leonard Genrikhovich.
Home address: Nina Gotman (wife), ul. Oktyabrskaya, 31, g. Davlekanovo, Bashkirskaya ASSR 452120, Soviet Union.
b. August 5, 1923; 8 children.
Arrested: December 17, 1981.
48. Ivashchenko, Yakov Yefremovich.
Home address: Anna Iosifovna Ivashchenko (wife), ul. Petrovskaya, 87a, p/o Petrovskoye, Kievo-Svyatoshinsky r-n, Kievskaya obl. 255203, Soviet Union.
b. May 10, 1932; 10 children.
Camp address: OU 85/8 otr. 6 br. 67, g. Simferopol, Krymskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
Arrested: May 22, 1981.
Sentence: 4 years ordinary plus 4 years exile.
49. Kabysh, Nikolai Ilich.

Home address: Vera Vasilievna Kabysh (wife), ul. Gorkogo, 36, g. Znamenka, Kirovogradskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
b. January 2, 1926; 7 children.
Camp address: YaF 306/2 otr. 4, g. Kyzyl, Turvinskaya ASSR, Soviet Union.
Arrested: January 19, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years strict.
50. Kabysh, Maiya Nikolayevna.
Home address: Vera Vasilievna Kabysh (mother), ul. Gorkogo, 36, g. Znamenka, Kirovogradskaya oblast, Soviet Union.
b. May 1, 1953.
Arrested: April 17, 1982.
51. Kalmus, Ekaterina Ivanovna.
Home address: Nina Yakovlevna Kalmus (mother), ul. Frunze, 45, Rudnik Aksu, Selintinsky raion, Tselinogradskaya oblast, Kazakhskaya SSR, Soviet Union.
b. June 22, 1956.
Camp address: uchr. LA 155/4 otr. 18, pos. Zhaugash, Iliisky raion, Alma-atinskaya oblast 483115, Soviet Union.
Arrested: August 27, 1980.
Sentence: 2 years ordinary.
52. Kalyashin, Aleksei Aleksandrovich.
Home address: Mariya Petrovna Kalyashina (mother), Privokzalnaya pl. d.1 kv. 4, g. Murom, Vladimirskaya obl. 602200, Soviet Union.
b. January 2, 1955.
Camp address: p/ya 288-28, 101-11, p/o Khairyuzovka, Ilansky raion, Krasnoyarsky krai 663850, Soviet Union.
Arrested: September 1, 1981.
Sentence: 3 years ordinary.
53. Kelier, Vladimir Genrikhovich.
Home address: Ekaterina Ivanovna Keller (mother), ul. Mechnikova, 45, g. Issyk, Alma-Atinskaya oblast, Kazakhskaya SSR, Soviet Union.
b. March 22, 1955.
Unrestricted Settlement address: ul. Lineinaya 3, st. Agadyr, Dzhezkazganskaya oblast, Kazakhskaya SSR 672140, Soviet Union.
Arrested: June 18, 1980.
Sentence: 3 years unrestricted settlement plus confiscation.
54. Khailo, Vladimir Pavlovich.
Home address: Maria Emilyanovna Klhailo (wife), ul. Severnaya, 11, g. Krasnyluch, Voroshilovgradskaya oblast 394004, Soviet Union.
b. March 15, 1932; 15 children.
Psychiatric hospital address: YaE 308 RB, ul. Chicherina 101, g. Dnepropetrovsk 320006, Soviet Union.
Arrested: November 14, 1980.
55. Kholodenkov, Georgi Fedotovich.
Home address: Tatyana Fedotovna Kholodenkova (sister), ul. Svobodny 29, g. Volchansk, Kharkovskaya oblast 312510, Soviet Union.
b. 1924; 2 children.
Arrested: February 7, 1982.
56. Khorev, Mikhail Ivanovich.
Home address: Vera Georgievna Khoreva (wife), ul. Minskaya, 28 kv. 30, g. Kishinev, Moldavskaya SSR 277015, Soviet Union.
b. December 19, 1931: 3 children.
Camp address: p/ya UKh-16/3 "B", g. Omsk 644062, Soviet Union.
Arrested: January 28, 1980.
Sentence: (3rd) 5 years strict plus confiscation.
57. Khrapov, Nikolai Petrovich.
Home address: Nadezhda Nikolayevna Khoreva (daughter), ul. Orombakhsh, 69, g. Tashkent, 700141, Soviet Union.
b. March 17, 1914; 6 children.
Camp address: uchr. GM 172/6, otr. 4 br. 41, g. Shevchenko, Magishlakskaya oblast 466200, Kazakhskaya SSR, Soviet Union.
Arrested: March 3, 1980.
Sentence: (5th) 3 years strict.●

HONORING LOUIS P. BERGNA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that we join the citizens of Santa Clara in honoring Louis P. Bergna on this, the eve of his retirement from his office as district attorney for Santa Clara.

As an extraordinarily respected leader and as a dedicated public servant, District Attorney Bergna has worked successfully to promote justice. For a quarter of this century, Louis Bergna labored at the grueling and often thankless task of a chief prosecuting attorney, and he has always excelled.

Consistently, Lou demonstrated both his diligence and his ability to innovate. During his career, Lou turned his attention to a huge array of issues, including those surrounding juvenile delinquency, medical jurisprudence, legal sentencing, grand jury reform, and the abuse of narcotics, and Lou regularly found ways for public attorneys to help reduce the crime, anxiety, and violence in our society.

Yet, Lou was more than a first-rate attorney. He was a first-rate citizen.

With the Boy Scouts, the Red Cross, the United Fund, and a score of other philanthropic organizations, Lou worked to build, preserve, and protect our community. He has served as a teacher, as an organizer, and as a glowing example. He has served us, his neighbors.

Today then, we proudly join all of those who thank Louis Bergna for his energy and his compassion, and we wish him all of the good fortune he so richly deserves.●

A SALUTE TO LOUIS RUSSO

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to salute a great American businessman who exemplifies all that is good in our country—a land of real opportunity for those who work hard to realize their dreams.

On January 26, Louis Russo of Bridgeville, Pa., will celebrate his 78th birthday. Born in Italy, Mr. Russo came to America at age 5 where his family settled in Allegheny County, Pa., where he has been, thankfully for us, ever since.

While many immigrants have come to our shores over the years and helped to make this a great, diverse nation, I am especially pleased to salute Mr. Russo because he has earned the respect and friendship of so many people in our community.

Working first as an apprentice in a machine shop in Carnegie in 1921, Mr. Russo's hard work allowed him to open up a restaurant in Mount Lebanon a few years later. There he reportedly served that last legal drink before the community went "dry." He was soon able to build his own two-story building in Bridgeville to house his restaurant and a bowling alley. Later on Mr. Russo bought the Norwood Hotel, a famous old historic landmark on Station Street in Bridgeville. As a young boy, I recall a number of always enjoyable political rallies in Mr. Louis' hotel. That building was destroyed by fire in 1962, although the tradition of excellent political rallies still continues in another building owned by the Russo family.

Owner of restaurants, hotels, bowling alleys, and other business rental properties, Mr. Russo will be honored later this month by the Bridgeville Area Chamber of Commerce. That is a very special recognition to this very special man.

Mr. Speaker, I think you might like to meet Louis Russo. For many, many years, like you he has been an avid golfer. Now retired, each day Mr. Russo meets a group of a dozen or so men at the Bridgeville Dairy Store to decide where they will go golfing that day. That no doubt has helped to keep Louis Russo in great shape to preside over his clan of five children and their offspring.

Louis Russo deserves the special salute by his community. His friends will never forget his contributions which have enriched the lives of all of us.●