EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP'S REMARKS TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

HON. VIN WEBER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, the current debate over fiscal and monetary policy is one which is critically affecting our country's economic future. It is essential that each member of Congress become aware of the pertinent facts. My friend and our distinguished colleague Representative JACK KEMP of New York addressed these vital matters in a speech to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors and its Chairman Paul Volcker. I must share this with my colleagues. There is no doubt that Representative KEMP has clearly recognized the present pitfalls in both monetary and fiscal policy. The Federal Reserve and Congress would do well to heed his message.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP

You cannot imagine how much I appreciate Chairman Volcker's invitation to speak to this elite assemblage—the chairman and deputy chairman of the Federal Reserve Banks and the Federal Reserve Board governors and staff. It was not an easy thing for the chairman to do, in view of my frequent criticism of the Fed in the past. But seeing that he is such a frequent visitor before the House Budget Committee upon which I serve, and is helping Congress balance the budget, it's only fair that I get this opportunity to help lower long-term interest rates.

I want you to know that I recently returned from Geneva and Naples, and the issue everyone wants to discuss is money. I am not talking, by the way, about Geneva, Switzerland, or Naples, Italy, but about Geneva, New York, and Naples, New York, in my Congressional District, which also includes the steel and auto workers of suburban Buffalo.

In fact, I believe that the debate over monetary policy is rightly emerging as the cardinal economic and political issue of our day. The general public is right to believe there is something wrong with economic policy in this country, when we alternate between severe inflation, high interest rates, and severe recessions. And they are right to put Congressmen and Federal Reserve policymakers on the spot.

It's from this perspective that I speak tonight.

For several years now, Americans have endured conventional macroeconomic policy, which is little more than an attempt to predict and regulate the spending decisions of millions of people. There are two simple tools of aggregate demand management—budget deficits and money supplies. I submit that neither simplistic approach works.

According to one theory of demand management, the decision to buy a car today is based on how much money a person had in his wallet or checking account a year ago. This is called monetarism with one-year lag. It is even supposed to work for business. If a corporate treasurer accidentally discovers an extra million dollars in the company checking account, then the company will supposedly buy more inventory or hire more workers a year later.

In its purest form, this rather implausible theory would ask monetary authorities literally to ignore prices, interest rates or exchange rates, and instead focus exclusively on the quantity of some arbitrary measure of money. There was a spurt of M1 in January to April of 1981, for example, and another from October 1981 to January 1982. In both cases, prominent monetarist economists urged the Fed to tighten—and later criticized the Fed for following that adivce.

Until recently, respectable economists agreed that experts could and should decide how much of which kinds of money was too much or too little. The only debate was whether the decision had to be revised every three months, or whether it should be settled forever and put into the Constitution. It seems that monetarists and fiscalists are always trying to get their theories enshrined in the Constitution, to make it illegal to practice supply-side economics.

The debate over rules versus authority was a sideshow. Of course, a quantity rule for money would make the quantity more predictable (ignoring technical difficulties)—but not the effects. We all agree that inflation is caused by too much money. But it is very difficult to claim that anybody knows, better than the markets, how much is too much.

The historical record is not entirely relevant to the performance of a quantity rule, because the nation was on an entirely different monetary system before 1971. Also, M1 and M2 have only recently contained accounts that pay competitive interest rates. Insured accounts that pay market rates of interest are an attractive place for savings during uncertain times. Yet the same Treasury Department authorities who want people to save more are also frightened if those savings wind up in a Super NOW or bank money market account.

We read that Treasury officials lately have decided that the "correct" increase for M1 for the rest of this year is 7 or 8 percent. The inference is that the Fed should hike the interest rate on bank reserves—the federal funds and discount rates. But M1 might well slow down without doing that. It is natural for people to want to hold more money in relation to their incomes as the outlook for inflation and interest rates improve. But after this one-time adjustment, a lower interest rate may mean that savings in M1 and M2 would not accumulate as rapidly. If velocity keeps falling at 5 percent a year, of course, a 5 percent increase in M1 means a zero increase in real GNP. We're told that velocity should turn up any day now; but should we bet the recovery on past trends?

The narrow, domestic monetarist model has simply broken down; but its adherents retain a mystical attachment to it. On February 3, 1983, Lawrence Roos, then President of the St. Louis Fed, put a table in the Wall Street Journal which proved that, because of M1 growth, nominal GNP must rise by 13 percent between the fourth quarters of 1981 and 1982. But GNP rose by only 3.5 percent. A year later, one might think that Mr. Roos at least owed the world an explanation. But instead he wrote another article called, "We'd Better Pay Attention to M1."

The monetarists are again saying that there is too much M1, as they did in May 1981 and February 1982. If so, they must know something the markets do not know. The dollar keeps rising against sound currencies, and the market for hedges against inflation, like gold or commodity futures, remains soft. The price of gold is falling toward $400, depressing the aggregate value of international reserves. Industrial commodity prices have been soft since mid-April, and are barely back to the recession levels of a year ago. Producer prices fell in both March and April.

The fact that people are holding more of their wealth in M1 rather than M3 is not a sign of inflation, but the opposite—people are beginning to trust the dollar enough to hold cash. Allowing the federal funds rate to drift again above 9 percent, as it did yesterday, might drive funds out of M1 into M3, but it would also drive investors out of stocks and bonds back into short-term investments that cannot finance mortgages and business capital.

In my judgment, it is now permissible and quite prudent to drop the discount rate to 8 percent. I would respectfully urge that this be done immediately, in order to help stabilize the value of the dollar against gold and other commodities, and against the stronger currencies of our major trading partners.

Some propose that since nobody can accurately predict the money supply or velocity, the Fed should regulate the sum of those two apparently random items—namely, nominal GNP. Frankly, I don't see how it can be done. By the time we learn that nominal GNP was too slow in the preceding quarter, money may actually be too loose in the current quarter. Besides, this central goal of demand management is chimerical. To keep the growth of nominal GNP at, say, 8 percent, prices would have to rise in recessions and might have to fall during recoveries. Firms would have to be raising prices while unloading surplus inventories, then advertise sales, rebates and discounts once business picked up.

It is no secret that I strongly believe that the dollar must again be defined and convertible into gold, in order to restore long-term credibility in the bond and mortgage markets. A gold guarantee hedges dollar assets and liabilities against sustained inflation or the default risk of deflation. It provides the world with an anchor, a reasonably predictable unit of account for making contracts across borders and between generations. A gold standard provides the issuers of currency with a prompt error signal

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

for adjusting policy—something we sorely need.

As Phillip Cagan of Columbia University recently put it, "If one is looking for some kind of long-lasting commitment (to price stability) of a constitutional nature, a convertible monetary system seems to be the only practical possibility." The distinguished chairman of the UCLA economics department, Axel Leijonhufvud, has come to the same conclusion. This reform can't be accomplished overnight. And since we live in a global economy, not a closed national economy, co-operation is vital.

Unfortunately, we abandoned our commitment to price stability a dozen years ago in an explicit attempt to use monetary policy as another tool of economic expansion. The Bretton Woods system, based on a fixed gold dollar, broke down in large part because of the attempt to apply this Phillips Curve idea. If we are to achieve price stability again over a long period of time, we will have to start by stabilizing the dollar value of our gold reserves. This proposal was put forward in September 1981 by the Chairman of the Bank for International Settlements at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington. Had his proposal been acted upon, the global deflation and recession of 1982 could have been avoided, I believe, or at least dramatically diminished.

As Professor Robert Mundell of Columbia University has observed, stabilization of the price of gold is not an end in itself, but rather it is a means toward achieving a better monetary policy. It would also reduce the damaging fluctuations in the level of international reserves that have created global economic instability.

Until we restore a dollar that is as good as gold, and a stable international monetary system to match it, there is only one second-best option. As long as money is still managed by continuous manipulation, the Fed should signal its respect for market feedback information. As the central bank for the dominant world invoice and reserve currency, the Fed cannot prudently ignore the effect of dollar exchange rates on the rest of the world—or for that matter, on the United States—nor the magnified chain reaction of other central banks on commodity prices.

Since almost everyone now realizes that foreign exchange rates affect domestic prices, we should also recognize that the idea that the dollar should simply float in any direction without limit implies that price stability doesn't matter. Some people understand that a falling dollar is inflationary and that a rising dollar is deflationary; and yet they argue that the dollar should not be stabilized. Apparently they think the dollar should neither rise, fall, nor remain stable. Fortunately, the Williamsburg summit at least began the process of rebuilding a viable international monetary system, by acknowledging the need for international cooperation and perhaps for a new and better Bretton Woods agreement.

Interest rate stability is also important, for its effects on exchange rates and on domestic uncertainly, which can paralyze production plans. But interest rates cannot be frozen at too high a level, without causing massive liquidation of commodities, assets and inventories. If rates are kept too low, on the other hand, that invites speculation in commodities and foreign currencies.

I would suggest that one way to tell if money is too tight or too loose, then, is to monitor sensitive commodity prices. The broader price indexes move too slowly, largely because of list prices set by contract or regulation. There is, of course, a need for some cyclical recovery in commodity prices that are still below cost. That would not have been necessary if the same rule had been applied between May of 1981 and July 1982, when commodity liquidation was telling us that the world demand for dollar liquidity exceeded the supply. In the recovery, the parallel task is to moderate the rate of increase in an index of commodity prices, and ultimately to put a ceiling on further increases. Gold should at least be included, since it is a forward-looking indicator of anticipated inflation which gives early warning of emerging tendencies toward inflation or deflation.

I was particularly pleased to receive Chairman Volcker's letter of March 17, in which he states, "I for one would recognize the relevance of such factors as sensitive commodity price indicators (not excluding prices of precious metals as a barometer of expectational considerations) and exchange rates."

So much for monetary demand management. The other theory of demand-side economics is fiscal—the idea that spending can be regulated by raising or lowering the budget deficit. The problem is that nobody seems quite sure which direction does what. According to some, budget deficits apparently both stimulate spending and crowd it out; they are expansionary and contractionary at the same time.

The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Martin Feldstein, has argued that budget deficits are inflationary, and that deficits also keep the dollar too strong. By reducing the deficits, he argues, we can sink the value of the dollar abroad and keep it stable at home.

This is the sort of confusion that comes from artificially separating domestic monetary theory from the global dollar market. Another example is the strange idea that intervention in foreign exchange markets is "price fixing," while intervention in domestic markets for Treasury bills is supposedly a "free-market" policy of quantity-fixing. Why would anyone want to fix the quantity of money except to stabilize some price? And don't exchange rates affect prices?

Fiscal theory is in as much disarray as these floating theories about floating money. Interest rates and inflation recently feel as the current budget deficit grew; at that point, fiscalists switched to worrying about estimate "structural" deficits in the distant future.

I submit that budget balance would be restored with full employment. The U.S. budget deficit was 1.3 percent of GNP in 1980, 1.0 percent in 1981, and 3.7 percent in 1982, and in none of those years was the U.S. economy at full employment. As a fiscal conservative, I'm usually found voting against large increases in federal spending. But I'm persuaded that Irving Kristol was right on target when he wrote in the Wall Street Journal recently that the best way to reduce government spending is to remove the need for government spending.

As recently as January of this year, I was greeted with disbelief for arguing in the Washington Post that the economic recovery would be far stronger than the official predictions, and that as a result, the official deficit projections would be far too high. As I recall, the Post ran an editorial alongside my article, pooh-poohing it as wide-eyed optimism.

My argument was that two events had made a strong recovery likely. The first was the shift in Federal Reserve policy away from M1-targeting; as a result of actual monetary policy since July of 1982, the low-growth Administration and Congressional numbers just didn't add up. The second factor was the implementation, in 1983, of the first net tax reduction for the American people as a result of the Reagan tax cuts. In 1981 and 1982, the small, "back-loaded" individual tax cuts were swamped by increases in tax rates due to bracket creep and Social Security tax increases.

In the Post article, I predicted that the OMB strategy would lead to a Congressional stalemate on the budget. OMB had apparently reasoned that a pessimistic economic forecast would re-establish the Administration's budget credibility, and that a huge deficit in the out-years would scare Congress into action. My argument, on the contrary, was that credibility comes from accuracy, not from making a huge error in one direction to offset an equally huge error the previous year in the other direction. Also, that an enormous deficit forecast would tend to numb the Congress into inactivity, not galvanize it into action. The reason is that no one will cut a billion-dollar program just to reduce a number on a piece of paper from $300 billion to $299 billion—especially not when the deficit is accompanied by a forecast of 9 or 10 percent unemployment as far as the eye can see. I think I was right about this. But when you consider the alternatives—such as a huge tax hike that would abort the recovery—a Congressional stalemate is not such a bad thing, if it delays action until more accurate information is available to the Congress. I think President Reagan is right in his confidence that the recovery will do more to reduce the deficit than Congressional attempts to raise taxes.

Consider what has happened since January. The Administration's economic forecast was disowned as too pessimistic the same week it was published. The April forecast was revised upward for 1983. Even the upward revision is now seen as too low.

The fiscal year 1984 Budget came up with some incredible figures that nobody has been able to explain or duplicate. Even if the economy were operating at full capacity, said the OMB, the deficit would be $181 billion in 1984, rising to $306 billion in 1988, when unemployment would supposedly be at 6.5 percent. This was the so-called "structural" deficit that still rationalizes various schemes to squeeze more tax revenues out of the beleaguered economy. The trouble is that it simply is not true.

The Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis has estimated that the structural deficit will decline to only $21.5 billion by the end of fiscal 1984. The OECD estimate includes state and local budgets, and estimates that the total structural deficit is now about eight-tenths of one percent of total output—less than in 1975, and less than half of Japan's structural deficit. Britain and France have large structural surpluses, according to the OECD, but they don't seem to be doing better than Japan.

After Larry Kudlow resigned as chief economist for OMB, he predicted that deficits are likely to be $85 billion in 1986, and acknowledged that a tax surcharge would be a "serious mistake." "The deficit problem," said Mr. Kudlow, "has been overrated."

What about those infamous "out-years," when deficits are alleged to do things that they have not done up to now? If the structural deficit is considered fixed as a share of GNP, and is overestimated by about $146 billion for 1984, the error for later years will get even bigger with inflation. The resulting deficit for 1988 becomes entirely structural only because OMB assumes that productivity rises by less than 1 percent a year. That allows unemployment to come down to 6½ percent—Dr. Feldstein's definition of full employment—with slow growth in output. If productivity rises by merely 2 percent a year, the premise of a weak recovery would instead leave unemployment above 9 percent in 1988, in which case the deficit could hardly be called "structural." In any event, the record is clear that nobody can forecast budget deficits with any accuracy beyond one year.

It makes a big difference, because a structural deficit of about $20 billion to $30 billion, as the Commerce Department estimates, or even one twice as large, could be closed with modest spending cuts. Acceptance of the myth of huge structural deficits could only stampede Congress into raising taxes, which would raise cyclical deficits by slowing or stopping economic growth.

Since the current deficit is overwhelmingly cyclical—the consequence of high interest rates and high unemployment—it cannot be the cause of these problems. Recessions obviously do cause deficits, but it scarcely follows that those deficits will "abort" the recovery. I can find no example of a recovery having been aborted by government borrowing of 5 to 6 percent of GNP. If that were true, Japan and Germany would have been in a recession throughout most of the past decade. But a recovery can be aborted by escalating tax rates. It happened in 1937, 1954, 1969 and 1974.

In a recent interview with columnists Evans and Novak, Professor Feldstein argued that "unless there is very rapid growth . . . it's going to be necessary to have an additional tax increase beginning for Fiscal Year 1986." However, he added, "it would be a mistake to have a tax increase . . . in 1986 if the economy has drifted back into recession." In other words, we should not raise taxes if the economy is either strong or weak, but only if it is expanding at the sluggish pace that Mr. Feldstein predicts. The appropriate time to raise taxes, on this theory, is when economic growth is faster than, say, 3 percent, but slower than 5 percent. Does this make any sense? Can we really base future tax policy on "assumed" economic growth, as though growth had nothing to do with tax policy?

Congress has been supplied with disingenuous estimates of revenue from various tax increases—estimates that assume that tax rates have no effect at all on economic behavior or economic growth. The government's income is somehow supposed to improve without having any negative effects on the budgets of private workers or employers. I call that "voodoo economics."

Anyone proposing a tax increase has also to explain and estimate its effects on the economy before we can guess how much revenue it might yield or what its effect on the deficit might be. When President Hoover imposed a tax surcharge and added excise taxes in June of 1932, the static estimates were that it would balance the 1933 budget. Instead, the deficit surpassed total receipts. That was the same sort of estimate we are working with today. Even if the 1933 tax increase did yield a dollar or two, it did so at a tremendous cost.

At a minimum, Congress must demand two economic forecasts—one with and one without the tax increases. That would show that the revenues gained would be small and the cost in lost jobs and added spending would be high. The Administration estimates that real after-tax personal and corporate income will rise by about $60 billion in 1985. Some of the proposed tax increases would confiscate most of that, regardless of whether they are imposed on what people earn or on what they buy with their earnings. How can real output rise if real income does not? Can people be expected to produce more simply to help Congress pay its bills?

Clearly, the economy is in poor shape to handle any tax increase, and we cannot impose taxes on the 1985 or 1986 economy in the hope that nothing will be affected. We dare not jeopardize the hopes of sustained prosperity that gave us a bull market in stocks and bonds. Otherwise, the recovery would turn into a contraction, and the cyclical budget deficit would grow larger.

It is a popular caricature to say that supply-siders think deficits "don't matter." Nonsense. Clearly, the real debt of the government cannot persistently grow faster than the real economy. But the contribution of the supply-siders is to point out that there are two sides to that relationship—a growing economy can more easily handle all debts, public and private. It makes sense for governments to borrow in hard times, and also to build schools and roads. A healthy future economy, with larger profits and payrolls, can generate much more revenue with low tax rates than can an economy that is kept small by overtaxing the few remaining employed workers and profitable firms.

If the government pays its debts with honest money, that will make it possible to roll over the debt at lower interest rates, strengthening the economy and cutting the deficit. By adopting incentive-oriented tax, trade and regulatory policies—policies that encourage people to earn more by producing more—the relative burden of government debt and spending will decline as the private sector outpaces the government. Government debt and spending is up as a percentage of GNP, after all, largely because everything else is down.

We cannot tax ourselves into prosperity. We cannot inflate ourselves out of our obligations. The world does not need a weaker dollar, but a predictable dollar, an anchor that countries like Mexico and France can once again rely upon as an objective standard of value.

In a way, there is nothing more important that a government and its central bank can do for its people than to provide us with a reliable standard of value, a predictable unit of account. Without it, all our plans, our savings, the measure of our wealth and production, are thrown into constant turmoil. For most of our history, our government provided us with such a constant—a more reliable standard than any other on earth—and with it we attained new heights in the wealth of nations.

Under this government, this President, I think we're finding our way back to the correct path, the supply-side path of sound money and high incentives. Only such a policy can help secure the future of our economy and our country, and provide the full employment and price stability so necessary to the American dream.●

A TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH BLANCHARD

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Elizabeth Blanchard, an outstanding lady dedicated to serving the people of Santa Paula and Ventura County in my congressional district.

This week Elizabeth Blanchard is being recognized by the Santa Paula Chamber of Commerce as Citizen of the Year. There is no doubt this recognition is well deserved.

She recently retired after 22 years of service on the County Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Commission. Additionally, she has served 9 years on the Santa Paula Elementary School Board and 8 years on the Santa Paula Union High School Board. Elizabeth also recently retired from many years of service on the Santa Paula Housing Authority Board of Directors.

In her community work, Elizabeth Blanchard is deeply involved in the needs of youth—developing a self-evaluation survey for the Santa Paula Boys and Girls Club, working for the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, assisting the local youth employment service, and providing ongoing work as a member of the board of the Santa Paula Union High School Education Foundation.

Recognized for her many long hours of hard work for the Blanchard Community Library, she also has contributed substantially to the comprehensive historical and architectural building survey and for service to the Santa Paula Memorial Hospital.

Elizabeth Blanchard has not been one to seek the limelight and public attention, but rather is one who, without acclaim, gets the job done. She is a fine lady and a dedicated citizen contributing her talents to the benefit of a multitude of agencies, organizations, and individuals. Her leadership and hard work serves as a catalyst in our community, making it a better place for us all.●

YELLOW RAIN AND REFUGEES

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of weeks we have seen numerous articles on the matter of yellow rain discussing the various theories of how the toxins are transmitted. On June 13, the New York

Times ran a letter to the editor which I think merits reprinting because it goes to the heart of the matter. Chemical warfare is occurring; people are being forced from their homes, fleeing for their lives and finding refuge in camps along the Thai border. Whereas some of these people seek to be resettled in other countries as refugees because there is no hope for a life in their homeland, others will wait for an indeterminable amount of time in temporary camps until it is safe for them to return. At a time when Congress is considering the reauthorization of the Refugee Act, we must pay close attention to all contributing factors that force these people to leave their countries. Chemical warfare—yellow rain—is such a factor.

The editorial follows:

"YELLOW RAIN" IS A WEAPON

To the Editor:

We represent a diverse group of scientists, independent researchers, physicians, political scientists and members of other professions who have followed the issue of the use of chemical weapons in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan for several years.

Individually we have examined much, if not all, of the publicly available evidence; some of us have conducted research used by the U.S. Government or others in publicly released findings; some of us have conducted other independent research or investigated the issue by personally visiting Southeast Asia and Pakistan, interviewing and examining refugees and visiting areas where use of chemical weapons has been reported.

On the basis of our review of the evidence, the analyses that have been done and the absence of any credible alternative explanation, we conclude that lethal chemical weapons have been and are being used in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan.

Although a number of questions remain to be answered about all the actual agents being used as well as some details and ambiguities needing clarification, we do not believe that the basic, most important conclusion remains a question; namely, that chemical warfare is indeed being waged.

Furthermore, we wish to underscore that there has been no alternative hypothesis—including either the Russians' "elephant grass" theory or the recently expounded bee feces theory—which provides an adequate explanation for the clear-cut evidence of chemical warfare; nor do we believe the pursuit of fanciful theories adds greatly to our knowledge of the tragedy.

The propounders of the bee-excrement theory themselves have noted that it does not explain a number of kinds of evidence, including the presence of trichothecene mycotoxins in environmental samples (including water), in samples of blood, urine and tissue of victims and on the surface of a Soviet gas mask; nor the numerous reports of illness and death, nor the great number of reports by refugees and others.

Their theory also does not address other kinds of evidence such as photographs, reports of defectors and the conclusions of physicians who have examined victims in refugee camps. Nor does it take into account the fact that not all samples which have shown the presence of toxins have contained pollen, and that polyethyleneglycol is certainly not found in nature.

A conclusion that chemical warfare has been and is being waged in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan is fully justified.●

WHAT IS "INDUSTRIAL POLICY?"

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, as the 1984 elections grow closer, there appears to be developing an irresistable urge to jump aboard the industrial policy bandwagon before all the seats are taken.

Everyone seems to have or want an industrial policy. For some, it simply means more efficient and coordinated Federal tax, trade, antitrust, and regulatory policy, or perhaps the creation of a more congenial business climate. Others, fearing that American industry has somehow lost the ability to compete in the global marketplace—a proposition, by the way, which should not be automatically accepted—look to cooperative entities, perhaps made up of business, labor, and Government representatives, for the answers. Many Democrats simply see a catchy and popular concept which can be presented as an alternative to "Reaganomics," yet which is broad and vague enough that no interest group or sector need be offended.

All of this is relatively harmless and, in fact, may be beneficial if the debate serves to stimulate some real thinking about the ways in which Government policy is often intended to achieve conflicting results, business practices are shortsighted and reactive, and labor proceeds in a self-centered and adversarial fashion. Certainly, fundamental questions such as the transformation of the U.S. economy, changing international trading relationships, productivity growth rates, and capital formation are important to closely examine.

The danger, however, is that in our rush to rationalize the economy through the application of industrial policy, we risk a further undermining of that much maligned engine of our unparalleled economic success: the free market. When industrial policy means, as it does for many, the subsidization, the protection, the bailing out of industrial sectors or specific companies, we inevitably get into an area where economic judgments become subservient to political influence; where economic decisions are made for political reasons. If this is industrial policy, we can best do without it. If anyone has any doubts in this regard, the experience of Great Britain over the last 35 years is instructive.

In this regard, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a perceptive editorial which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.

WHAT IS 'INDUSTRIAL POLICY?'

Five of the Democratic Party's six presidential candidates (Reubin Askew is the exception) advocate some form of "industrial policy." But what is it? The candidates talk of things from trade policy to tax reform, but the distinctive proposals can be put into two groups: collaborative decision-making by different segments of society (business, labor, government) and investment or direction of the flow of investment by government.

Collaborative decision-making has become more attractive since nations like Japan and France applied it and attained higher growth rates than the United States in the 1970s. Candidates Gary Hart, Ernest Hollings and Walter Mondale all call for action. Sen. Hart wants "long-term agreements to help industries become more competitive"; Sen. Hollings wants government "to act as a catalyst" to "make our industrial base competitive again"; Mr. Mondale wants "cooperative agreements" to "restructure and revitalize ailing industries."

It is interesting that these Democrats seem to be calling for an end to what has been Democratic (and national) policy since 1935: the conduct of relations between management and labor on an adversary basis with government acting, if at all, as referee. Many people agree that such adversary relations don't always serve the public interest. But few have grappled with the difficult question of how to convince managers and labor leaders, not to mention public officials, to discard the habits of a lifetime.

Regarding government direction of investment, some proposals here are sensible: John Glenn's and Gary Hart's call for increased public and private funding for research and development. Others are more dubious, like Walter Mondale's proposal to steer capital away from mergers and toward R&D. The history of government attempts to control private capital flows is not a happy one.

Alan Cranston has called for a new Reconstruction Finance Corp. and Sen. Hollings and Mr. Mondale advocate, vaguely, government investment in key industries. Sen. Cranston gives first priority to "sunset industries"—older industries in trouble. Candidates give lip service to the need to invest in "sunrise industries"—new industries that might grow. But it is sunset industries with their existing work forces, unions and managers that have the political clout. Nearly half the members of Congress are members of the Steel Caucus. Only a handful indentify with the microchip industry.

This country already has a variety of policies in place that you could call industrial policies, from the interstate highway system to agricultural subsidies to the Chrysler loan guarantee. The successes of some of them should not obscure their cautionary lessons. If the Democrats center their presidential campaign on industrial policy and then win, there will be terrific incentive for ailing industries to seek public money. Scandals like those that tarred the RFC in the 1940s are the least of the problem. There is a danger that what is called an industrial policy will mainly prop up inefficient industries and retard economic growth.●

TRIBUTE TO W. CARL RODGERS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to pay tribute to W. Carl Rodgers, former councilman and two-term mayor of Hawaiian Gardens who passed away on Sunday, May 29, at the age of 80.

Born in Indiana, Carl moved to California 65 years ago where he and his wife Evelyn raised their 4 children: Lorraine, William, Johan, and Mary Jane. Carl was the owner of the Quality Meats Market until his retirement in 1974 as well as a founder of the former Garden State Bank, now the Commercial Bank in Hawaiian Gardens. He was a member of the Knights of Columbus, the Holy Name Society, the Aloha Senior Citizens Club, the Lions Club—president 1961-62—and the Chamber of Commerce—president 1965.

Carl Rodgers service to his community was indeed exemplary. He was elected to the Hawaiian Gardens City Council in April 1966, 2 years after the city's founding, where he served two terms until 1974. He served as mayor from 1968 to 1969 and again from 1971 to 1972, following his reelection to the council in 1970 and mayor pro tem during 1967-68 and 1970-71.

He was honored in 1970 by being named "Hawaiian Gardens Citizen of the Year" by the Elks Lodge 1570, and in 1971 was named "Los Angeles County's Outstanding Senior Citizen" by the county board of supervisors for his tireless work on behalf of senior citizens.

Because of Carl's dedication to both his family and community, he will be missed by many people. Mr. Speaker, I know you and my colleagues join my wife Lee and I in sending our deepest sympathies to Carl's wife Evelyn and the rest of his family.●

PROTEST OF PAPAL VISIT PART OF ANTICHURCH PLAN

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the outrageous display of disrespect exhibited by the Sandinista followers during the Pope's visit to Nicaragua dismayed all of us who read the commentaries and saw the news reports about it. Now we learn, what we had already suspected, that the Sandinistas has orchestrated the demonstrations in an attempt to discredit the church. The comments of a defector from the Nicaraguan Intelligence Service merit careful consideration as we approach the debate on legislation affecting U.S. policy in Nicaragua.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1983]

PROTEST OF PAPAL VISIT PART OF ANTICHURCH PLAN

Demonstrations against Pope John Paul II in Nicaragua last March were carefully orchestrated as part of a wider effort to discredit the church among the Nicaraguan people and neutralize its resistance to the Sandinista regime, according to a recent defector from the Nicaraguan intelligence service.

Miguel Bolanos Hunter, 24, said the plan was to associate priests and the existing church hierarchy with "the two enemies of the Nicaraguan people: the United States and the wealthy class, the bourgeoisie."

A "mob" of handpicked activists kept devout Catholics trapped in a church and away from the pope, who was then insulted and heckled as he tried to pray, Bolanos said, in order to make him appear isolated from the people during his visit to Managua.

The overall Sandinista effort against the church, according to Bolanos, has included close surveillance of Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo and a faked sex scandal last year involving one of his priests, the Rev. Bismarck Carballo.

Bolanos said the intelligence unit called F7, which had responsibility for mobilizing citizens for demonstrations, was ordered to pick 200 block leaders who each brought five or six trusted residents to the public square where the pope was to speak in March. Anyone trying to attend independently was turned away, Bolanos said.

Catholics who did not want to heckle the pope went to the churches the night before his visit in order to pray all night, Bolanos said, intending to march together to the square the next day. Instead, he said, F7 agents organized crowds to heckle the people in the churches and to keep them inside until the pope finished speaking.

Bolanos said he was in a command post, just off the square, that coordinated the various groups, putting in the forefront groups of women carrying pictures of sons who had died during the Sandinista overthrow of dictator Gen. Anastasio Somoza in 1979. The women were urged to ask the pope to pray for their son's souls, which in the Sandinistas' eyes would have allied him with their struggle.

"He didn't want to do it because if he had, it would have meant he was in solidarity with the communist army," Bolanos said. As the pope began praying on another subject, one of the women gained control of the microphone system and begged him to pray for her son the martyr. Her act was "practically a sacrilege, an act of total disrespect," he continued.

The pope left the square without finishing the prayer, Bolanos said. The disruption "was a success, because many people thought the lack of respect was spontaneous, and that the pope was simply against the revolution."

The church in Nicaragua originally backed the Sandinista government but in 1980 Archbishop Obando y Bravo began complaining of growing censorship and repression of dissent. He became a major target of surveillance after the pope's visit, Bolanos continued. When the archbishop tried to remove a priest favorable to the Sandinistas, mobs were organized to pose as parishioners, take over the church and beat up the new priest, according to Bolanos.

Lenin Cerna, head of the Interior Ministry's department of state security, issued written orders that all existing information and all new material on the bishop was to be sent to an analysis center, and the order was posted on intelligence office walls, Bolanos said. "They are collecting all the information to design a plan to destroy him."

An earlier part of that effort involved the archbishop's spokesman, the Rev. Carballo, who initially came under Bolanos' jurisdiction because of Carballo's friendship with many Americans in Nicaragua. Bolanos said he was told that the F4 section of the security operation—assigned to keep track of the churches, unions and political parties—was planning to use a prostitute "known and used by all the Sandinista high command" to disgrace Carballo.

The prostitute, named Marixas, posed in 1982 as a penitent asking Carballos' counsel on personal problems. She tried to win Carballos' confidence, hoping eventually to seduce him, Bolanos said.

Finally, while the two were talking over lunch one day last August, an F4 agent burst into the room, pretenting to be the woman's husband. He attacked the priest, ripping his clothes off, and pushed him into the street where people organized by the F7 unit were waiting with cameras. Also waiting outside was a van with dark windows, in which Cerna and Interior Minister Tomas Borge had front-row seats from which to laugh at the naked priest, Bolanos said

Government media played up the event, claiming Carballo had been caught in a love triangle. The archbishop—correctly, Bolanos indicated—said the whole incident had been "a show to slander the church."●

SOVIET OPPRESSION OF LATVIA, LITHUANIA, AND ESTONIA

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay homage to the spirit of freedom as exemplified by the continuing struggle of the Baltic peoples in their resistance to Soviet repression.

I believe a bit of history is appropriate when speaking of the Baltics. It was mid-June 1940 that the most recent wave of oppression against the brave peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia began. From 1940 to 1945 these three States on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea suffered mass deportations, repression, and death at the hands of first the Soviets, then the Germans, and again—and still—the Soviets.

While World War II left a legacy of numbers—we will never forget the number 6 million—there were significant numbers from the Baltic States also. The first year of Soviet occupation saw mass deportations and executions. Estonia lost more than 60,000; Latvia about 35,000 and Lithuania about 45,000. Most of these persons were considered class enemies of the Soviet Union.

After the German occupation of these countries in June 1941, the area's Jews suffered particularly. The Nazis wiped out 190,000 Jews in Lithuania, about 90,000 in Latvia, and about 4,500 in Estonia.

The sacrifices did not end there, however. In the fall of 1944 the Soviets returned to the area and another quarter of a million compatriots fled before the advancing Soviet Army. Those that did not flee have been under the thumb of the Soviet Union ever since. It is a thumb that has been especially repressive as it has attempted to strip the Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians of centuries of grass roots nationalism.

Yet, as it was reported in the September 25, 1978, U.S. News & World Report:

> Spontaneous anti-Russian outbursts repeatedly emphasize how peoples of the three states oppose any and all attempts to erase their national identities in the campaign to create a single "Soviet man."
>
> Not even harsh Moscow-imposed measures and an effort to turn the Baltic region into the Soviet Union's most economically advanced area have been successful in pruning Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania from their ancient roots. Instead there has been a resurgence of anti-Russian feelings and a very stubborn burgeoning of Baltic nationalism.

It is this spirit that I applaud. And it is the continued refusal of the United States and other NATO nations to legally accept Russian authority over the Baltics that I rise to affirm.

By such resolutions as House Joint Resolution 201, which has resulted in Public Law 98-39 and the proclamation of Baltic Freedom Day, we export hope to the peoples of the Baltics and to other freedom fighters around the world that their struggles are not forgotten.●

THE DECISIONMAKERS' VIEWPOINT OF NUCLEAR POWER

HON. SID MORRISON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, despite the controversy which surrounds nuclear energy, the vast majority of decisionmakers favor continued commercial expansion of this energy resource. The one exception consists of those antinuclear spokesmen from activist and environmental organizations. These few dissenters of nuclear energy have successfully overcome the industry, regulatory, congressional, and expert decisionmakers and now seem to dominate the policy discussion on the future role of nuclear power.

This is the conclusion of a new survey conducted by Robert L. Cohen, a project director at the Research Institute on International Change at Columbia University, and S. Robert Lichter, an assistant professor of political science at George Washington University. Their conclusions were printed in the March/April edition of the American Enterprise Institute Journal on Government and Society, "Regulation."

I have become increasingly concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the nuclear power debate is being governed by appeals to emotionalism and single-issue politics, not by technical, scientific, and economic factors. The Cohen and Lichter study illustrate this point and I urge other Members to review their conclusions and the implications it has for the future of nuclear energy development.

Condensed excerpts of the Cohen and Lichter article follow:

Since the 1979 accident at Three Mile Island, there have been no new orders for nuclear plants and many well-publicized cancellations. Of all the reasons for this, one looms large. In the past decade, nuclear power has been transformed from an area in which professionals and policy makers had considerable leeway for making decisions to one in which the "nonexperts" call the shots. Increasingly, activist groups, concerned citizens and, especially, the mass media have played an instrumental role.

Here we look at another aspect of the nuclear energy debate. As public opinion on nuclear power has soured, the regulatory environment in which policy is implemented has toughened. With the increased public concern has come far closer governmental oversight. Initiatives from the nuclear industry meet with suspicious scrutiny at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and related agencies. Congressional and regulatory hearings have multiplied, and their critical tone has grown sharper. It would be easy to conclude that the decision makers in the nuclear field are now as wary of nuclear power plants as the man in the street.

But appearances can be deceiving. As a result of our survey of scientific experts, for example, we discovered them to be far more supportive of nuclear development than many had thought. The only way to find out their true opinions was to ask them. Taking the same approach with decision makers in the nuclear field, we found equally surprising results—which are reported here for the first time. It turns out that most regulators, congressional leaders, outside experts, and financiers are as united in their support of nuclear energy development as are industry executives. The antinuclear perspective is represented almost entirely by the heads of activist groups and a few scattered allies in Congress, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Energy Department. They diverged from the majority not only in their assessment of the costs and benefits of nuclear power but also in their overall perspective on the energy issue.

Clearly, a relatively few dissenters have played a major role in blocking nuclear development. Precisely what they think, how they differ from other decision makers, and what this implies for the regulatory process is our subject here.

TABLE 1.—POLICY PREFERENCES ON NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

[In percent]

	Activists (N=12)	Industry (N=127)	Financiers (N=18)	NRC (N=31)	Other regulators (N=24)	Congress (N=20)	Experts (N=42)
Proceed rapidly	0	93	94	65	54	40	69
Proceed slowly	0	5	6	35	25	40	26
Halt development	33	2	0	0	8	20	5
Dismantle plants	67	0	0	0	13	0	0

TABLE 2.—GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD NUCLEAR ENERGY

[In percent]

	Activists (N=12)	Industry (N=127)	Financiers (N=18)	NRC (N=31)	Other Regulators (N=24)	Congress (N=20)	Experts (N=42)
Risks unacceptable	100	2	0	4	37	25	12
Very confident we can solve problems	0	94	61	72	60	43	74
Plants unsafe	100	2	0	7	28	28	5
Would live near reactors	0	97	83	94	60	53	88
Energy crisis is extremely serious	75	61	39	42	35	71	48
U.S. energy needs will not increase	50	0	6	0	13	10	7

So the pattern is clear. Majorities of all decision-making sectors save the antis want to move ahead rapidly with nuclear development, would accept the risks involved, and pronounce nuclear power plants safe enough for their own "backyards." The leaders of the activist groups are unanimously opposed to all these propositions.

Every other category believes that nuclear development should be guided primarily by technical and economic considerations, and all but one (the other regulators) find moral issues least important. But the antis look first to environmental, social, and moral factors, and last to science and technology. So most decision makers approach nuclear policy from an instrumental perspective, balancing costs and benefits. For the antis, it is a moral issue to be assessed in terms of broader social values. Small wonder that these activists have little in common with other players in the regulatory game. They disagree on the very rules by which the game should be played.

IMPLICATIONS

What might these results tell us about policy making in the nuclear arena? On particular issues, the anti-nuclear and environmental group leaders find some allies in Congress and government regulatory agencies, which may go far toward explaining their success in getting their viewpoint across. Nevertheless, they differ dramatically from all other decision makers in their assessment of virtually every aspect of nuclear power. Yet their outlook need not reflect irrational or malignant distrust of the "experts," as some industry sources have charged, but simply the view that scientific, technical, and economic considerations must take a back seat to broader questions of morality and social philosophy. The implication, however, is that "cost-benefit" analyses and empirical findings on nuclear power issues will not convince the activists and their followers. Their internally coherent perspective renders such argumentation irrelevant.

All other sectors take the basically pragmatic position that the benefits of nuclear technology should be weighed against its risks and other costs, and all agree that in practice the risks are worth it. They see some problems, but in general do not find them insurmountable. Not only is this rosy view held by top nuclear industry executives, but it is shared in substantial part by the financial community, the NRC, and outside energy experts. The NRC in particular emerges as a bastion of support for nuclear power. This may represent an instance of regulatory capture—where the agency becomes the protector and booster of the industry it regulates. Yet many of the NRC's views are affirmed by the outside experts and, we should add, also by the wider scientific community. Moreover, there is considerable acquiescence, probably broader now as a result of personnel changes following the 1980 elections, from Congress and from EPA and Energy Department officials as well.

In spite of this impressive pro-nuclear consensus among key decision makers, both public opinions and the nuclear regulatory process have moved in recent years toward the preferences of the activists. This suggests that the anti-nuclear and environmental group leaders have acquired a kind of veto power over nuclear development. How they have managed it is quite another question. The explanation, discussed in the Public Opinion article, is the strength they have drawn from two circumstances—the fact that anti-nuclear scientists are much more "political" than pronuclear scientists and the willingness of sympathetic national media to convey anti-nuclear arguments to the general public.

Considering their isolation, the antis have done a remarkable job of combating the combined forces of a powerful industry, sympathetic regulators, and even outside experts who overwhelmingly favor nuclear development. What has helped them is their skill at practicing the increasingly familiar art of single-issue politics. They have stymied the traditional players on the regulatory field by not playing a traditional game. It seems increasingly clear that, in the contest for nuclear energy's future, they have won to their side the one ally that counts—the American public.●

NICARAGUA CHARGES "ZIONISM" IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview in New York City with Righidah Dirgham of Al-Hawadith, Miguel d'Escoto, foreign minister of Nicaragua, had some interesting things to say about U.S. foreign policy with respect to his country. He had some trenchant comments about "Zionism," as well. Here are some excerpts from the interview as reported by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service on June 3, 1983:

Foreign Minister D'Escoto: . . . those who sympathized and agreed with Somoza's rule cannot accept a real national democratic government. Those who support Zionist aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinians, who prevented the Security Council from shouldering its responsibilities toward the Zionist crimes, who support South Africa's racist regime, who loved the former shah and Somoza—what can be expected of them? Can we expect them to follow the course of real democracy?

Question: Is there a military link between Israel and some Central American states that actually influences the development of events in the area?

Answer: There is absolutely no doubt of that. What is the Zionist regime if not an embodiment of the U.S. infiltration and the domination that Washington intends to impose on the Middle East? They have previously used the Zionist government to carry out what the U.S. Government could not do directly. Under the Somoza regime it was difficult for the U.S. Administration to back him, so it relied on its client, Israel, to send arms to Somoza on its behalf. Now history is repeating itself. And for this reason that "horror," Sharon, visited Honduras. At the end of his visit he announced that he had agreed to sign a military cooperation agreement of unprecedented magnitude with the Honduran government.

Question: You mean that Israel's role in Central America is that active . . .?

Answer: There is without a doubt a real danger in Latin America, and particularly in Central America, actually stemming from Zionist infiltration and intrusion.

Question: How great is the Israeli military involvement?

Answer: I cannot pretend to know the figures or the extent of involvement at this moment, because I don't have them available. But I can affirm that military aid and cooperation with some Central American countries known for their repressive regimes have been and still are large in proportion. At this time in particular the proportion of such aid is greater than ever before.

There is more but the reader has probably by now got the idea.

It is plain to me that the Nicaraguan Government is becoming very defensive of late with regard to information seeping out on the activities of Libya and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in Nicaragua and other parts of Central America.●

A TRIBUTE TO POPE JOHN PAUL II

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay special tribute to the words of Pope John Paul II of this most recent pilgrimage to Poland. With courage and clarity he has reaffirmed the principles of freedom and human dignity upon which our own Nation has been founded.

Delivering a mass on Sunday the Pope chose to address the most delicate and controversial issues for all Soviet bloc countries: human freedom and national sovereignty.

The pontiff declared that:

A nation is only truly free when it can shape itself as a community determined by unity of culture, language and history. The state is firmly sovereign when it governs society and allows the nation to realize its own identity.

The sovereignty of the state is deeply linked to its capacity to promote the freedom of the nation and develop conditions that commit the nation to express all of its distinctive historical and cultural identity.

The Pope demonstrated his willingness to speak out on sensitive political and moral issues and make clear his support for the ideals of the banned Solidarity trade union.

In Katowice, Poland's industrial heartland, the pontiff proclaimed that God, not the state, gave workers the right to form free trade unions.

About the people's right to free association, he said:

This is not given to us by the state. The state has the obligation only to protect and guard it so that it is not violated. This right is given by the Creator, who made man as a social being.

Among the fundamental human rights identified by the Pope were "the right to freedom of conscience and religion to sovereignty, and the right to human work."

In bold endorsement of the efforts of Lech Walesa and the Solidarity movement, he proclaimed: "The Christian doctrine of work postulates both the solidarity of workers among themselves and the need for honest solidarity with workers."

As Americans we so often take this most fundamental right for granted. Yet, nations throughout the Soviet bloc risk their own lives and the safety of their families to bring this to bear.

The pontiff called on all Poles to take pride in their heritage and their nation's traditional struggle for such freedom.

"Perhaps at times we envy the French, the Germans, or the Americans because their name is not tied to such a historical price and because they are much more easily free, while our Polish freedom costs so much. We do not want a Poland that costs us nothing," he said.

In his statements throughout the week the Pope continually commended the work of Lech Walesa as a man who "stood up for himself with the Gospel in his hand and a prayer on his lips."

We must all similarly commend Pope John for standing up for himself, Christians throughout the world, and the Polish nation still striving for freedom. He delivered his message with conviction and courage.

Speaking of the solidarity which has drawn the Polish nation together in one voice against an oppressive government, the Pope said: "May this good thing which appeared in so many places and in many ways never cease on Polish soil."

May the words of the pontiff's bold proclamations for freedom and national sovereignty be heeded around the world as solace for nations still struggling for freedom and thanksgiving for those already having achieved it.●

BULLETS OR BALLOTS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a commentary by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which strongly endorses President Reagan's program of assistance to El Salvador. Mr. Hearst views land reform and free elections, which the United States has continually advocated, as the first step toward much-needed reform in that country. Mr. Hearst's comments are timely and should be given serious consideration.

BULLETS OR BALLOTS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—The war over Central American policy has been heating up in Congress as rebel and regime armies battle it out with mortal gunfire in the scarred, strategic regions on our doorstep. In the escalating arguments in Washington, the essential issue being debated seems to me: Should the administration be more concerned with defeating leftist guerrillas in El Salvador and their supporters in Nicaragua or try crash programs to correct economic ills?

I don't see how you can even attempt meaningful reforms unless outside threats are removed. In this respect, I wholeheartedly endorse President Reagan's program in which he told the country of the need to restructure the Salvadoran army where we have sent less than 100 specialists. The neighboring Marxist-led Sandinista junta, which has Cuban "advisers" and Soviet-run technicians, keeps infiltrating El Salvador with weapons with the goal of overthrowing its elected government.

It's a weird situation, namely, 1) let's not be overly nasty to the Communists but 2) hold off substantial assistance to beleaguered Salvadorans. So I think that it's time to take a hard look and try to understand what gives in this raindance fancy our legislators perform for the public.

There are many things wrong down in those little Central American republics which we traditionally ignored. Land reform should be a "must," giving farmers the will to fight for their own property. Then, free elections. A little over a year ago El Salvador held free elections under guerrilla guns and threats.

What happened? The people at great risk voted resoundingly, "No," to the guerrillas. The leftists, having refused to participate in the elections, bided their time. In the last few months their roaming bands have slaughtered peasants, burned villages and the other day tortured captured government soldiers before killing them savagely. Hardly a way to capture minds and hearts, I'd say.

This is the desperado outfit which the Sandinista junta supplies with so many tangled trails out of Nicaragua. Reneging on elections is nothing new to the Marxist-Leninist ideologues who run the Nicaraguan regime. After loftily promising twice free and unfettered elections for Nicaragua since taking power in 1979, masterminds down there just decided "No" again.

One of the glib reasons offered for no elections was the presence of two anti-Sandinista forces, one driving from the northwest down and the other up from the southern jungles. The regime says a national alert is, therefore, essential, so elections are out.

It also tried to strike a super-nationalist pose by charging that three American diplomats conspired to poison or incapacitate the Nicaraguan foreign minister, a self-made mediocrity until the junta gave him notoriety. The Americans were expelled. But the next day, the U.S. responded vigorously by ordering the expulsion of 21 Nicaraguan consular officials and closing all six consulates in this country. The Nicaraguan consul in New Orleans, ironically, has applied for political asylum.

The action is certain to spark partisan debate on the part of some Democrats who already are mumbling about "reckless" reaction by the administration. One of the leading double-domers I have in mind is U.S. Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif. He also happens to be what I call a rhetorical roomclearer, using innuendo but never saying what he means.

Long ago a declared candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, I have a hunch that Sen. Cranston is really trying to build himself up to run for a third six-year term as senator in 1984. His party's own polls show him consistently with 1-to-2 percent national popularity rating. Conversely, straight-from-the shoulder criticism of administration policies is cause for concern. It comes from Sen. Nancy Kassebaum, R-Kan. She usually supports the president but sincerely believes that in El Salvador there are similarities with mistakes committed in Vietnam.

Now Mrs. Kassebaum was bred into politics. Her father, Alf Landon, was the Republican presidential nominee in 1936 and had been governor of Kansas. After her election to the Senate, Sen Kassebaum led a congressional delegation last year to observe the vote in El Salvador. She also helped shape a recent partisan compromise to continue economic aid with reduced military assistance. Sen. Kassebaum is a thoughtful and thorough legislator. She doesn't try to score cheap shots but warned: "Salvadorans must learn to fight their own war."

More in sadness than in a vein of I-told-you-so, she observed: "It's hard to understand why a guerrilla force of some 5,000 troops should be gaining the initiative against more than 20,000 government troops."

Drew Middleton, respected military affairs writer for the New York Times and an old friend of mine, supplies part of the answer when he was in El Salvador some time ago. Drew wrote that the officers were "9-to-5 soldiers," and had to be hauled away from boarding planes for weekends in the capital, San Salvador. Obviously, that must be changed and that's why we have Salvadoran officers and troops being trained in nearby Honduras and some up here in the States.●

WNVC OPEN HOUSE MEDIA DAY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today is a day for celebration in Fairfax County in the 10th Congressional District of Virginia. WNVC, channel 56, the Nation's latest public television station, is having an Open House Media Day in recognition of its new broadcast capabilities which became available this month.

This Virginia station, Mr. Speaker, is an independent public television station not affiliated with the Public Broadcasting System. Operating from Fairfax County, WNVC carries live proceedings of the U.S. House of Representatives over the open air waves throughout northern Virginia and with a strong enough signal to reach the National Capital area.

Covering legislative and executive events on the Federal, State, and local level, WNVC is truly a teleivsion station operating in the public interest. Because of channel 56, my constituents and other northern Virginia residents have available to them extensive daily news and public affairs programing, a concept rarely available in any other area of the country.

On behalf of the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, I extend to the WNVC advisory committee, its management and staff, a "thank you" for beginning broadcast this month. I also congratulate the officers and directors of Central Virginia ETV Corp. for their determination to bring to northern Virginia its own public television station.●

ARCHBISHOP HICKEY COMMENTS ON SUPREME COURT'S ABORTION DECISION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest voices in protest at the United States Supreme Court's tragic re-affirmation of Roe against Wade last week is that of James A. Hickey, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington. In a letter dated June 17, 1983, which was read in its entirety at all masses on Saturday and Sunday this past weekend, Archbishop Hickey expressed the feeling of millions of his fellow citizens at the abomination of abortion. His letter deserves my colleagues' thoughtful study:

ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1983.

My brother and sisters in Christ, the June 15, 1983 decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States concerning abortion are a tragic mistake. The Court had the opportunity to invoke the honored principles of human life and dignity which are at the very foundation of this country and to defend the rights of all persons born and unborn, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The dignity of everyone is dishonored by decisions which promote less expensive or easier ways to dispose of persons created in the image and likeness of God. The common good is harmed by this increased facility to destroy human life.

Out of reverence for all human life, my brother bishops and I recently issued a strong warning with regard to the possible destruction of millions through nuclear warfare. We have deplored the senseless killings of so many in the conflicts which disfigure Central America. And as Americans and Christians, we have repudiated the dreadful slaughter of millions of Jewish and Christian victims in Hitler's concentration camps.

With even greater horror I see this new decision, reinforcing Roe vs. Wade, as granting continued legal sanction to a genocide larger and more insidious than the death camps of Europe or the nuclear bomb. To take the life of an innocent human being, to deny that child the elementary right to be born, raised and educated is an affront to every one who treasures human dignity and believes in God as the Author of Life. These decisions permit an expanded exploitation of racial minorities, of teenagers and of others who are susceptible to the economic and other social pressures of our day.

As Archbishop of Washington, I call upon each and everyone of you to unite in defense of human persons still unborn. We must defend them by those means which are ours as citizens. I pray also that all will come to see abortion for what it is: an abominable crime against God and humanity.

In the meantime, we must continue to translate our concern into an even wider range of supportive and caring services for those who choose life over death for an unborn child. May God give us all the strength to pursue the moral principled choice for life.

Sincerely in Christ,
JAMES A. HICKEY,
Archbishop of Washington.●

THE IMF BILL: IN OUR OWN INTEREST

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the House soon will be considering important legislation to strengthen the International Monetary Fund. The purposes of this bill are widely misunderstood. Some Members mistakenly view it as a bailout of big banks; others consider it a foreign aid giveaway.

The truth is, the IMF bill could be called a jobs bill for U.S. workers. A stronger IMF is essential to the functioning of a world trading system in which our country has an enormous stake. Our reports of goods and services account for more than 10 percent of our gross national product; these sales support thousands of American jobs.

Consider what happened last year when Mexico, our third largest foreign customer, reduced its purchases from the United States by $6 billion because of its debt problems and the recession. That cutback cost us, by conservative estimates, at least 120,000 jobs, helping to push our unemployment rate well above 10 percent.

We are not likely to generate a full economic recovery in this country until we sell more goods and services on the world market. And we are not going to sell more unless we help our customers and trading partners, through the IMF, to weather the recession and regain their ability to buy from us.

There are many good reasons for strengthening the IMF in these times, but we can vote for H.R. 2957, if for no other reason, because it is clearly in our own interest to do so.

In a recent article in the Journal of Commerce, Robert Solomon, a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution, explained with exceptional clarity the importance of the IMF bill to the United States. Without objection, I am inserting Mr. Solomon's article in the RECORD at this point. I commend it to anyone who wants a better understanding of this issue, or who has yet to be convinced to vote for the IMF bill.

The article follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, June 8, 1983]

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD PASS IMF QUOTA HIKE

(By Robert Solomon)

It is reported that the legislation authorizing an enlarged U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund is in trouble in the House of Representatives.

It seems hard to believe, at a time when the fact of international economic interdependence is so widely perceived, that some members of the House do not see the importance to the United States of an actively functioning IMF.

American exports of goods and services have increased, as a proportion of our gross national product, from 5 percent 30 years ago to more than 11 percent now. For many industries and for agriculture, export sales are a mainstay. Our economy and our financial system are inextricably bound up with what happens in the rest of the world.

These linkages have been dramatically demonstrated in the past year when one developing country after another encountered difficulty in servicing its debts, Mexico and Brazil, among other countries, sharply curtailed their imports, even before they approached the IMF. One result was a further decline in U.S. exports, which were already falling because of recession in the other industrial countries and the high value of the dollar.

The debt problem became critical for the world economy when the commercial banks around the world, which had been providing credit on a large scale to the advanced developing countries since the early 1970s, abruptly reduced their lending in mid-1982.

Yet countries with current account deficits cannot be expected to eliminated such deficits overnight. These countries need a continuing inflow of capital, just as the United States depended on borrowing from abroad, especially from England, in the 19th century.

The IMF proved its usefulness by requiring, as a condition for its own loans to the debtor countries, that the commercial banks increase their lending. This was a function that no individual government could have performed.

The Fund's unique role as an international monetary institution gave it the power and influence to see to it that funds continued to flow to the debtor countries. If this had not happened, enormous economic and financial disorder would have occurred in the world economy.

How does one demonstrate to recalcitrant members of the House that the functions of the IMF are so important? The very success of the Fund in preventing chaos also deprives us of the evidence to show how crucial the Fund is. If a system of health care prevents disease, doubting Thomases can always point to the absence of disease if they wish to disparage the importance of the health-care system.

While the debt problem is being handled—albeit with uncertainties—it will be with us for a number of years. Economic recovery in the industrial world, not only in the United States but also in Europe and Japan, is a necessary condition for the developing countries to increase their exports and therefore re-establish their ability to finance their vital import needs and also meet interest payments to their outstanding debts.

Worldwide recovery is far from assured, even though the United States is solidly on an upward growth path. Moreover, interest rates remain high in the industrial countries and this too burdens the balance of payments positions of the developing nations.

Thus there will be a continuing need for the IMF to lend and to use the leverage that its lending potential gives it.

How does one demonstrate to the recalcitrant congressman that the meeting of this need is in the vital interest of the United States?

One points out that American exports and therefore American jobs are at stake. But, we may be told, Brazil and Mexico have reduced their imports and this is hurting the United States. True, but in the absence of the activities of the IMF described above, Brazil and Mexcio would have had to slash their imports much more severely.

We may be told that what the IMF is doing is bailing out the banks, which are alleged to have loaned recklessly to the developing countries. This notion has a certain appeal to some American congressmen. But it can be shown to be incorrect.

First of all, the economic performance of the major developing-country borrowers was highly impressive until the last two years when recession and high interest rates in the industrial world hit them hard. The Brazils and Mexicos grew fast and exported successfully throughout the 1970s. They must have been putting the borrowed funds to good use.

Second, the commercial banks are not being bailed out. As has so often been said, they are being bailed in, since the Fund is requiring the banks to increase their exposure to the debtor countries. Not a cent of the money loaned by the IMF is going to repay debt to banks.

What does one say to a congressman who has seen cuts in non-defense federal spending in his district and is therefore reluctant to vote for an increase in funding for the IMF?

One answer is that the Fund quota increase is not in the budget and is therefore not competing with budget dollars that might be spent in his district. A related answer is that whether or not the enlarged IMF quota is authorized, there will continue to be pressure to reduce "out year" budget deficits.

The more basic answer is that an increased U.S. quota in the Fund is not some form of giveaway by the United States. We are joining with the other 150 members of the IMF in assuring that it can continue to perform its vital functions on which all countries are dependent.

The congressman's constituents will be worse off if the Fund is not able to carry out these functions because American exports will be lower, because instability in other countries will harm us, and because a healthy world economy benefits Americans in countless ways.

Write to your congressman!●

DEFECTOR SAYS SALVADORAN REBELS CLOSELY TIED TO SANDINISTAS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, Nicaraguan support for the Salvadoran rebels can no longer be questioned. A wide variety of sources have provided evidence of the Sandinista role in backing the leftist guerrillas in El Salvador. Most recently, a defector from the Nicaraguan counterintelligence agency provided extensive descriptions of Nicaraguan aid for the Salvadoran guerrillas. I urge my colleagues to consider the evidence he offers.

DEFECTOR: SALVADORAN REBELS CLOSELY TIED TO SANDINISTAS

Top commanders of the leftist rebels fighting the U.S.-backed government of El Salvador are frequently in Managua, Nicaragua, where they are in constant touch with Sandinista officials about questions of arms supply, strategy and tactics, according to a defector from the Nicaraguan counterintelligence agency.

Miguel Bolanos Hunter, echoing charges long made by the Reagan administration, said Nicaragua has been providing guns, advice, coordination and training to the guerrillas in El Salvador since they began trying to overthrow the government there in 1979.

However, "a river" of arms shipments from Cuba and the Soviet Union through Nicaragua to El Salvador has all but stopped, Bolanos said, because "they now have five times more than what we had against [ousted dictator Gen. Anastasio] Somoza."

Bolanos claimed that Nicaragua has become "a new Cuba" in training guerrilla forces from throughout Latin America. As a Sandinista official charged with working against the U.S. Embassy, Bolanos said, he met visiting guerrilla leaders from Colombia, Argentina, Chile, Guatemala, Costa Rica and El Salvador, all of which have centers of operation in Managua.

The Salvadorans have two houses in Managua's residential Las Colinas district, one a communications center and the other a "safe house" for visiting Salvadoran guerrillas and for meetings with Nicaraguan officials, Bolanos said.

Visiting Salvadorans also use houses belonging to Nicaraguan officials, and some of the guerrilla chiefs are in Managua more than they are in El Salvador, he continued. "They fly over to the mountains for a day to boost the morale of the troops and fly out again at night sometimes," he said.

Nicaragua is better than Cuba as a training base for guerrillas because it has regular commercial air transport and permeable borders, while Cuba's island status makes it hard for guerrillas to come and go without being spotted, he said.

Bolanos said he had fought during the 1979 Sandinista takeover of Managua with a Salvadoran known as "Memo," who then returned to El Salvador and became second in command of the guerrilla units fighting in Morazan province in northeastern El Salvador. Bolanos said he encountered Memo in Managua last October, "and he said they were using the same methods to get arms as we used in Nicaragua."

These methods, Bolanos continued, included twice-daily airplane flights to barricaded sections of highway in guerrilla-controlled areas. Each plane carried 30 to 40 guns, he said, and medicine and ammunition often were dropped by parachute, while other arms came concealed in trucks or overland on mules.

His cousin, Miguel Guzman Bolanos, is in charge of arms distribution in Nicaragua, Bolanos said, and told him that Luis Carrion, a member of the Sandinista directorate, had been promised in a 1980 trip to the Soviet Union that the Soviets would provide the Nicaraguans two AK47 machine guns for every weapon they gave the Salvadoran guerrillas. Those included U.S.-made guns the Sandinistas obtained from Cuba, which in turn got the guns from Vietnam, Bolanos said.

Managing the arms flow to El Salvador could be annoying, Bolanos continued. A friend of his, Richard Lugo, a navy chief, was upset one evening at being called and told to go to an Atlantic coast port at midnight to meet a Cuban boat loaded with guns for El Salvador.

"He had an arrangement with a woman friend that night and he didn't want to go," Bolanos said. "He said it was too bad that somebody always had to be standing behind these Salvadorans and taking care of them."

Bolanos described the aftermath of the murder in Managua last April 6 of Salvadoran guerrilla leader Melida Anaya Montes, which he said occurred across from the house from which Bolanos' agents were watching the nearby residence of a U.S. Embassy political officer. Bolanos' superior, Lenin Cerna, director of the Interior Ministry's department of state security, accused the Sandinista party's foreign affairs head, Julio Lopez, of having failed to guarantee the guerrilla leader's security and of failing to let Cerna know about the arrangements.

Montes was betrayed to her killers by her cook and one of her security guards, Bolanos said, and was killed for "political reasons—she was just back from Cuba and wanted to have more dialogue between the guerrillas and the Salvadoran government."●

SUPREME COURT'S ABORTION RULING

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I join all of those who support full protections for the unborn in expressing my disappointment over the Supreme Court's June 15 abortion ruling.

President Reagan is right on target when he suggests that abortion now more clearly than ever is a legislative issue for the Congress to handle. And, I intend to do everything possible to see that Congress adopts corrective legislation.

Respect for the sanctity of human life must be consistent, whether one is considering a freeze on nuclear weapons; a halt to funding for nuclear weapons systems; or jobs, health care, housing, and other forms of humanitarian assistance; equal protection under the law; or, of course, abortion.

I urge my colleagues with whom I have consistently joined in supporting measures to upgrade the quality of life for the born to join me in supporting the extension of full legal protections and safeguards to those most innocent of persons, the unborn.

Specifically, I hope we can quickly gain the necessary signatures on discharge petition 3 and bring the Respect Human Life Act of 1983 to the floor for a vote. And, I continue to work for the day when we can gain the passage of a human life constitutional amendment.●

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY CLAIMS PROBLEM

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Daily News recently had an editorial concerning the social security disability claims problem. You will recall that, Mr. Speaker, the hearing that was held on this issue last year and the legislation that we passed to correct part of this problem. I was pleased to have been in the forefront of that issue along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

The regulations recently promulgated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services will help the situation considerably. However, it does not undo the heartbreak and suffering previously caused.

I commend the article from the Springfield newspaper to the Members of this body:

DISABILITY REFORMS COMFORTING

It's too late to prevent the heartbreak and the suffering.

Yet it's comforting news that the Reagan administration has decided to exempt some 335,000 people with functional psychotic disorders and other diseases from Social Security reviews.

The question is whether this reform goes far enough in correcting the problem. Congress may have to pass laws to spell out exactly how disability claims are to be decided.

The past harsh policy, as chronicled by columnist Jack Anderson and others, led to numerous suicides. It also led to heartbreak for innocent people and sentenced others who are unable to function in society to their deaths.

Does the new policy prove the administration has a heart, after all, or is it trying to head off stronger reform that it might find distasteful?

Health and Human Services Secretary Margaret M. Heckler, who voted when she was a member of Congress for the bill that ordered periodic reviews, says steps will be taken to avoid tossing "innocent and worthy" people off the rolls.

Since March 1981, some 355,000 disability beneficiaries have lost their checks. This is 46 percent of all people given reviews. On appeal, 89,000 have been reinstated.

But those dumped earlier will not be reinstated because, according to Mrs. Heckler, they did get a fair hearing through appeals. Those with mental impairments will be rechecked—once new standards are devised.

Others will be exempted from review: people with IQs between 60 and 69 and one additional impairment; and disabled workers 55 or older with such impairments as severe arthritis, chronic brain syndrome, loss of a limb or cerebral palsy.

Even more reassuring is a new approach that randomly selects cases for review. The former policy—believe it or not—targeted cases for review that were considered most likely to lead to cutoffs of aid.

The mentally ill among the 2.6 million receiving checks comprise 11 percent of the total. But, Congress says, they have been involved in 28 percent of the cutoffs. Is it any wonder so many protests have been heard?

The savings under the new, more humane rules will be some $200 to $300 million in the next two years—nothing to sneeze at, of course.

But isn't there a voice in each of us that exclaims: The price is well worth it.●

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in announcing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that Richard E. Knie, lieutenant colonel USAF (Ret.) from Charlotte, N.C., has been selected by the National Awards Jury of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge to receive a Freedoms Foundation Award in June 1983. This award is being given as a result of his address entitled "The Greatness of America."●

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION ORGANIC ACT

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, together with several of my colleagues on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I am introducing today legislation which establishes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) as the lead, independent, civilian oceans and atmosphere agency within the Federal Government. The legislation also sets forth a national policy for the oceans, coastal environment, and atmosphere, and creates a NOAA charter with the objective of codifying existing agency responsibilities. A critical impetus for this legislation is the recent Presidential announcement of a proposal to abolish the Department of Commerce and create a new Department of International Trade and Industry. The trade initiative, which I support, was accompanied by an administration endorsement of the creation of NOAA as an independent agency. Legislation similar to the bill we are introducting today was introduced late last week by members of the Committee on Science and Technology which shares jurisdiction over many of the NOAA programs.

On several occasions in the past weeks, I have expressed the optimism with which I look at the coming age—the new decade—in oceans policy. A primary challenge of the 1980's and 1990's will be to sustain the United States continued leadership in the oceans. In order to attain that goal, we must be prepared to reassess and examine a range of critical international and domestic oceans policy issues facing the United States, with the objective of developing and articulating a comprehensive oceans policy. Such a comprehensive, long-range national oceans policy is central to realizing the potential of the world ocean and the benefits to be derived from oceanic and coastal development. I believe the need for a comprehensive ocean policy demands the establishment of an independent oceans and atmospheric agency and it is to that end that I am introducing this legislation today.

There is a clear need for a NOAA Organic Act and for the creation of an independent oceans, coastal, and atmosphere agency. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration was established within the U.S. Department of Commerce by Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970. NOAA now operates under or is affected by over 100 Federal statutes. NOAA accounts for roughly 60 percent of the budget and 40 percent of the employees of the Department of Commerce. Its responsibilities are set forth in terms of a variety of functions transferred from other Departments and agencies in the 1970 Reorganization Plan and through a number of new programs assigned to NOAA since 1970 through legislation and administration directives. The statutory authorities for NOAA are scattered throughout many different legislative acts. Enactment of these many authorities assigned to NOAA cover a long period of the Nation's history, beginning with the act of February 10, 1807 (2 Stat. 413), establishing a U.S. Coast Survey.

The 1970 organization of NOAA brought together the following agencies and programs from various Federal departments and agencies, administered under a myriad of laws and regulations:

The Environmental Science Services Administration from the Department of Commerce;

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Marine Game Fish Research program, and Marine Minerals Technology Center from the Department of the Interior;

Elements of the Lake Survey from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;

The national sea grant program from the National Science Foundation;

The national data buoy development project from the Coast Guard; and

The National Oceanographic Data Center and the National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center from the U.S. Navy.

Since 1970, other responsibilities have been assigned to the agency by new legislation and administration directives. Major acts relating to oceans and atmosphere, passed during the last decade, assigning such functions to NOAA include:

The Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972;

The Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972;

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972;

The Endangered Species Act of 1973;

The Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976;

1976 Amendments to the National Sea Grant College and Program Act;

The National Climate Program Act of 1978;

The National Ocean Pollution Research and Development and Monitoring Planning Act of 1978;

The Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act of 1980; and

The Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Act of 1980.

The creation of an independent agency accompanied by organic legislation is an affirmative effort to formulate a cohesive and coordinated policy and framework for the study, management, protection, and development of the oceans, coasts, and atmosphere.

Title I of the bill sets forth congressional findings, purposes, and policies of the act. The three explicit purposes of the legislation are to establish the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as an independent agency, to enumerate the functions, powers, and responsibilities of the administration, and to encourage the development of programs within the administration necessary for a sound national oceanic, coastal, and atmospheric policy.

Title II formally establishes NOAA as an independent agency and sets forth the internal administrative framework of the agency. It designates the principal officers of the agency and enumerates the functions and responsibilities of the Administrator. The responsibilities of the Administrator include those assigned, delegated, or transferred to him under the act or any other statute as well as those assigned or delegated by the President. Section 204 lists the functions of the Administrator. The enumerated functions describe his current responsibilities under applicable statutes and directives and also clarify the authorities for certain NOAA activities currently extrapolated from existing law. Title II also sets forth certain powers of the Administrator aimed at enhancing his ability to carry out his responsibilities and perform the functions assigned to him.

Title III addresses certain domestic and international coordination concerns of the new agency. It directs NOAA to insure that duplicative or inconsistent regulatory requirements are not placed on regulated industries or individuals. It also provides for international cooperation, including a meaningful role for NOAA in all international meetings and conferences relating to U.S. oceanic, coastal, and atmospheric interests.

Title IV rationalizes the many existing enforcement authorities of NOAA. The purpose of this section is to insure that NOAA can effectively enforce the laws which it administers.

Title V contains a series of miscellaneous provisions, including formal transfer of existing powers, functions, and responsibilities assigned to the current administration and pursuant to statutory authority or administrative or executive action to the administration established under the act. Title V also addresses transfer of personnel and interim appointments as well as the survival of administrative proceedings and suits at law. Finally, title V provides for the establishment of a more comprehensive and coordinated biennial authorization process.

Hearings are tentatively scheduled by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for later this summer on the creation of NOAA as an independent agency and accompanying organic legislation. During the committee's examination of this proposal, perhaps it is necessary to look beyond NOAA as presently constituted. It may be necessary to look at where other marine components are located throughout the Federal Government. Components of EPA and the Departments of the Interior and Transportation should be assessed to determine if they should be folded into an independent oceans agency.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the continuing dialog on the number of critical issues surrounding the establishment of NOAA as an independent agency and the enactment of organic legislation. I solicit the insights, views, and comments of my colleagues and others on this measure and urge the expeditious enactment of this very important legislation.●

MR. T—STEPIN FETCHIT REVISITED

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues about an article in the June 5 edition of the Washington Post written by Michael Wilbon entitled "Another 'Whitey' Stereotype."

The media has constantly bombarded its viewers with benighted images of black characters. The most recent example of this has been Mr. T. This article is a very enlightening analysis of televison's negative image of blacks. The parts that blacks are allowed to play on network televison are consistently limited to the comic or the thug. Mr. Wilbon examines the restrictions put upon black actors and actresses on televison and the adverse effects such restrictions have on America's viewing audience, especially children.

The article follows:

ANOTHER "WHITEY" STEREOTYPE—MR. T GIVES MEDIALAND ANOTHER PHONY IMAGE OF BLACKS

(By Michael Wilbon)

It shouldn't be too much just once every 30 years or so to ask for an enlightened black image. You keep hoping one day to switch on the tube and find a black professor, lawyer or somebody who presents himself intelligently—just anything other than fat, wisecracking maids and bonehead hucksters.

But apparently, Americans still are comfortable only with blacks who make them laugh. So we continue to embrace only unintelligent, comedic black images; the latest and most popular being Mr. T, the mohawked, monosyllabic savage who embodies all the stereotypes many blacks hate to see portrayed.

This minute, Mr. T is the most visible black man in America. After his role in "Rocky III" and a few months as a star of "The A Team," he has become hot enough to appear on the cover of People magazine.

Bulging muscles, gaudy gold chains, next to no clothes and short bursts of semi-speech. T is half-man, half-animal who looks like a slave and operates on intimidation. The man with the biggest muscles makes the rules. Some bad nigger, this Mr. T. The role doesn't allow him to challenge whitey with intellect, so he'll be just as happy kicking ass.

It would be nice to think that Americans are sophisticated enough to look at Mr. T as an implausible cartoon; to think that he's just a rags-to-riches ex-bouncer who makes a living with this stupid gimmick. The danger is, however, that too many people think Mr. T is somewhat reflective of black America.

There is little if any balance in television characters to show the difference. There's Fred Sanford, the junk dealer, bluffing his way through life. There's Florence, the maid, threatening anyone within reach. There's Benson, no matter how smart, still basically a butler. And now, there's Mr. T. telling People Magazine, "It takes a smart man to play dumb." Americans must not be ready to accept a black economist, wearing bifocals, coat and tie, walking down Wall Street and speaking intelligently. Maybe having a black editor on Lou Grant would have been too threatening.

It was particularly disturbing the other day that a youngster on 14th Street would express his admiration for Mr. T. then denounce Michael Warren, a talented black actor who plays a role too small in "Hill Street Blues."

Talk to a class of 6th graders at Burnside Elementary School in Chicago (where T grew up) and 29 of 31 will say they watch "A Team," because he's tough, he can beat anybody, he doesn't take any stuff, he talks cool, he wears a lot of gold.

It's an act that shouldn't be bought. Mr. T tells kids to stay away from drugs and in school and other things that are healthy and meaningful. Unfortunately, while the voice is saying one thing, the image is saying another. At some point in the near future, I hope, I'll be able to sit down and watch Mr. T, laugh and not be concerned that people will look at this man and think one image somehow reflects so many people. But as long as T's image is basically the only one blacks are allowed to project, I won't watch; just sit back and pity the poor fool.●

FORT TOTTEN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of a bill, H.R. 3305, which, if passed, will finally put an end to 20 years of debate over what should be done with surplus Federal property at Fort Totten in Queens County, N.Y.

My colleagues from New York, Mr. SCHEUER and Mr. OWENS, and I have introduced this bill in recognition of the many hours of long and hard work by a dedicated group of community volunteers in Queens.

The story of Fort Totten involves 20 years of vacillation by the Army as to whether it wants to keep the land or claim it as surplus property. In 1977, the entire parcel, 46.4 acres, was declared surplus to the needs of the U.S. Government. It is evident that the Army and the General Services Administration (GSA) do not want to maintain the land. Under these two agencies, the historic Fort Totten structures have been allowed to deteriorate.

When I was a New York State senator, I helped to form a coalition of community groups, the Fort Totten Preservation Council, Inc., headed by Mr. Nicholas Garaufis, to gain citywide support for the establishment of a park on the property. In reference to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 91-245, we called for the free transfer of this property to the city of New York for constructive, multifaceted public use.

After reviewing the May 7 application submitted by the Fort Totten Preservation Council, Inc., the city, and the Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association (EPVA), the GSA Administrator Gerald P. Carmen, announced that only 11.4 acres of the land, the historic tract, would be donated to the city. Instead of turning the entire parcel over to the city, the agency decided that 32 prime acres would be auctioned, while supposedly giving New York City the "opportunity" to purchase the additional land.

The GSA's decision was a slap in the face to the people of Queens County. After such a long battle, the citizens of New York finally produced a jewel of a plan, only to have it thrown out by the Reagan administration. Under our proposal, the land would serve many factions of the community: the elderly will have senior programs; the young will have ballfields and playgrounds; the disabled will have a unique rehabilitation center; and everyone will be able to enjoy the wonders of a well-preserved natural environment.

Since the GSA has thus far ignored this unusual coalition—this sincere well-planned grassroots effort—my colleagues and I have decided that the time has come to take stronger action.

I am proud to say that the community members have spent many, many hours of their time ironing out the wrinkles and molding a proposal that I doubt any agency or company with paid workers could ever beat. This bill would require that the GSA abide by the law and convey the surplus land at Fort Totten to the city for worthwhile use in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I have included a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, who reviewed the May 7 application submitted to GSA by the Fort Totten Preservation Council, Inc., the city of New York, and the EPVA. He found the project of "considerable merit" and stated that the land is eligible for conveyance to the city without monetary consideration for public park and recreation purposes.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. OWENS, and me in support of the citizens of Queens in their efforts to acquire the property at Fort Totten.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1983.

Hon. GERALD P. CARMEN,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GERRY: This Department has received an amended application from the City of New York to acquire some 37 acres of federal surplus real property known as Fort Totten, New York, New York, for public park and recreation purposes under Public Law 91-485. This new application is the result of negotiations between the City of New York and the Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association. We understand the Association has submitted an amended application through the Department of Health and Human Services.

Our review indicates the project has considerable merit, and we find it eligible for conveyance to the City of New York for public park and recreation purposes at a public benefit allowance of 100 percent in accordance with Section 203(k)(2) of the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended by P.L. 91-845.

I understand from conversations between our staffs that you may have already made a decision to sell a portion of the property. We feel that the recreation value is significant to the people of New York and ask that you reconsider your decision in light of the amended application and assign the property to the Department of the Interior.

The utilization program for the property provides for park and recreation use as set forth in the City's original application dated December 1, 1981. Enclosed are the amended application and attachments that detail the changes in the original application.

Should you desire additional information in support of this request for assignment, we would be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely,

JAMES WATT,
Secretary.●

ON THE STATE OF EAST-WEST RELATIONS

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post entitled "Worlds Apart" by Joseph Kraft. Mr. Kraft pretty well sums up the state of East-West relations, and lays the blame for the strained nature thereof squarely on the shoulders of our comrades to the East.

[From the Washington Post, Tuesday, June 21, 1983]

WORLDS APART

(By Joseph Kraft)

The latest political developments in Russia underline a fundamental truth of international politics. The East-West relation is not a naked struggle, a zero-sum game where what hurts Moscow helps Washington, and vice versa.

At times, on the contrary, bad news for the East equals bad news for the West. Events have now come to just such a pass, and sensible people have to hope that the troubles burdening Yuri Andropov will not block the move toward "constructive dialogue" initiated last week by the Reagan administration.

The administration's gambit came in testimony by Secretary of State George Shultz to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last Wednesday. Shultz brought together all the familiar charges lodged by the Reagan administration against Russia—the massive military buildup; the penetration in Central America, Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia and Southeast Asia; the brutal violation of human rights in Russia and other communist states, notably Poland.

But the Shultz statement marked a watershed because it moved past confrontation. Shultz said the administration had devised a strategy that went beyond "containment" and "detente" to active global deterrence—the building of a capacity to deal devastating blows against Russian expansion all over the world. He said that policy found expression in steps toward more robust defense, which commanded a consensus in the United States and among the allies. Accordingly, he found the time ripe for "constructive dialogue" between the superpowers.

An occasion for dialogue not set in the win-lose calculus was delicately indicated by Shultz. In his statement he referred to the Austrian State Treaty of 1955, a deal concluded by Moscow and Washington after the death of Stalin. The clear message was that the death of Brezhnev and the accession of Andropov provide a similar moment.

But just as the Reagan administration was opening avenues, Andropov was battening down hatches. Though he has now added the job of president to his party post as general secretary, Andropov emerged from a series of high-level meetings in Moscow last week on the defensive.

His health, all recent appearances indicate, is not robust. Perhaps for that reason, he has lost political momentum. Though the ruling Politburo is now at a low of 11 members, no new additions were made at the Central Committee plenum last week. The inference is that Andropov does not command the majority in the Central Committee necessary for full personal primacy.

The attack on poor economic performance, foreshadowed after his accession, has also not materialized. Ideological conformity, not economic dynamism, was the theme of the main speech to the Central Committee plenum—a speech delivered by Andropov's formal rival for the leadership, Konstantin Chernenko. The major personnel move—the designation of Grigory Romanov, the Leningrad party boss, to a post on the party Secretariat in Moscow—also suggested sticky going in improving the economy. For Romanov has been noted for feathering his own nest, and for emphasis on the outmoded iron and steel complex.

Neither have matters gone well in foreign policy. The Soviet effort to split the allies on nuclear defense has been turned back by the rise of new leaders in West Germany (Helmut Kohl) and Japan (Yasuhiro Nakasone), and by Margaret Thatcher's electoral victory in Britain. Soviet moves toward rapprochement with China have been spoiled by a third communist country, Vietnam. The pope's visit to Poland shows that disaffection in Russia's East European back yard is acute.

Andrei Gromyko, in a speech that wound up the week's political doings in Moscow, cast a bleak eye on the international scene. He asserted that Poland "has been and remains an inalienable part of the Socialist community." He charged the United States and Israel were trying to "impose anti-Arab deals" in the Middle East. He reiterated the threadbare propaganda charge that the Reagan administration was subject to "militarist intoxication." He labeled President Reagan's most recent arms control proposals an "unacceptable" invitation to Russia for "unilateral disarmament."

A slight chink was left in the Gromyko speech. The Soviet foreign minister said that "parity" defined the present level of the superpowers in nuclear weapons. He called for negotiations on that basis, and warned against "letting slip by the truly historic opportunity."

Those of us who do not want confrontation for the sake of confrontation have to hope the opportunity will not be missed. But the clouds over Moscow make it hard for Andropov to show the kind of give the United States, not wrongly, seeks. So the odds are that the ships of the superpowers will pass in the night.●

JUNE AND KENNETH BROWN, OF BEVERLY, MASS., CELEBRATE 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of two of my constituents and friends on the occasion of their 25th anniversary.

June and Kenneth Brown of Beverly, Mass., celebrated their milestone earlier this month, on June 7, 1983. This couple, through their enthusiasm, has been a great asset to the whole community. Ken, vice president of Salem Paper Co., in Salem, Mass., has been instrumental in moving that company from a small family business to a prosperous and growing corporation. It now serves the paper needs of thousands on the North Shore, consumers and businesses alike.

Ken can be equally commended for his family life. He values his children more than anything, constantly making grave sacrifices for their benefit.

June, currently a travel agent at Travel World in Salem, is equally active in her community. She has devoted her energy to numerous projects, ranging from helping needy children to fulfilling civic responsibilities. June, a natural with people, has taught both nursery school students, and less privileged ones with learning disabilities.

Through all of this, the two have managed to raise three beautiful children, Douglas, Todd, and Kimberly.

My sincerest congratulations to them, and may their next 25 years be as productive as their last.●

NICARAGUAN BARES PLAN TO DISCREDIT FOES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon be considering legislation to terminate covert aid to anti-Sandinista rebels in Nicaragua as a means of curbing the flow of weapons to El Salvador. A lengthy article in the Washington Post, June 19, describes the experience of a Sandinista state security official who recently defected from Nicaragua. His comments about the extensive program of the Sandinistas to subvert the Government of El Salvador and discredit all those opposing the Sandinista regime are extremely enlightening and should be read carefully by every Member of Congress.

NICARAGUAN BARES PLAN TO DISCREDIT FOES

(By Don Oberdorfer and Joanne Omang)

The recent expulsion of three U.S. diplomats from Nicaragua was the product of a two-year plan, authorized at high levels of the leftist Sandinista government in Managua, to discredit democratic opposition forces there through a web of false accusations, according to a former official of Nicaraguan state security.

The former official, Miguel Bolanos Hunter, said he was in charge of surreptitiously filming American diplomats as part of the plan and participated in meetings on the operation that were presided over by Lenin Cerna, director of the Direccion General de Seguridad del Estado (DGSE), the Nicaraguan Interior Ministry's department of state security.

Bolanos, 24, who led a 60-man guerrilla unit in the final battles that brought the Sandinistas to power in 1979, defected from Nicaragua six weeks ago by hijacking a light plane to Costa Rica. He has provided an unexpected intelligence bonanza for the very U.S. agencies he worked against for the last three years.

Bolanos had served briefly after the Nicaraguan revolution as special assistant to the Sandinista army chief of staff, Joaquin Cuadra.

From January 1980 until his defection May 7 he was an official of state security, nearly all of that time a counterintelligence case officer with special responsibility for surveillance of U.S. Embassy and CIA activities in Nicaragua.

Since leaving Costa Rica about three weeks ago as part of an arrangement with the U.S. Embassy there, Bolanos has been debriefed extensively by State Department and CIA officials.

Access to him was offered to reporters for The Washington Post by State Department officials, who arranged for meetings with Bolanos at the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank. Washington Post reporters interviewed him there for 13 hours late last week, with no questions barred.

Various independent sources here and in Central America confirmed Bolanos' identity, though it was impossible to obtain confirmation of the details he provided of the secretive and influential internal security apparatus in Nicaragua.

Bolanos' account includes detailed information about the presence and role of Soviet, Cuban, Bulgarian and East German advisers and assistance in the Nicaraguan security apparatus.

The defector said their presence is extensive, with two high-ranking Soviet officers and a Cuban officer assigned as advisers to the 35 Nicaraguans in the counterintelligence section where Bolanos worked.

He said many more such advisers worked with other Nicaraguan military and security forces.

Among other things, Bolanos said:

Nicaraguan intelligence has deeply penetrated the anti-Sandinista guerrilla groups that have been fighting a U.S.-supported "secret war" against the Nicaraguan regime. The locations, armaments, personnel and many other details of insurgent activity have been passed along for many months by Nicaraguan agents who, according to Bolanos, include a close adviser to Eden Pastora, leader of one of three major insurgent groups.

The assassination of exiled Nicaraguan leader Gen. Anastasio Somoza in Paraguay in September, 1980, was planned in Managua with Cuban assistance. Bolanos said he knew Hugo Alfredo Yrurzun, the assassin who wielded the bazooka that blasted Somoza's automobile, as an interrogator in Nicaraguan state security in March, 1980. Yrurzun was gunned down by Paraguayan police after the assassination.

Public demonstrations and heckling during the visit of Pope John Paul II to Managua last March were orchestrated by Nicaraguan state security, which placed thousands of pro-Sandinista Catholics in prominent positions for the papal mass and kept thousands of anti-Sandinista Catholics away. Bolanos said he helped control the event from an operation center near the public square in Managua, and that the pro-Sandinista slogans that interrupted the pontiff's homily had been chosen in advance by the security apparatus.

Planning and training for the spectacular and damaging raid by leftist guerrillas in nearby El Salvador on the Salvadoran government military air base at Ilopango in January, 1982, was centered eight miles from Managua in a Nicaraguan facility under the supervision of a Cuban adviser. This account, which Bolanos said he learned from the Cuban adviser, illustrates the extensive support Bolanos said Nicaragua gives to the rebels fighting against the U.S.-backed government in El Salvador.

About 80 Soviet-built MiG warplanes presently in Cuba have been designated for Nicaragua. Bolanos said he was told this by the head of the Nicaraguan Air Force, whom he identified as Raul Venerio. Because of U.S. warnings against bringing MiGs onto the land mass of Central America, the current plan, according to Bolanos, is for the MiGs to be based in Nicaragua only after the expected Sandinista victory in elections there in 1985. Nicaraguan pilots who have been undergoing training in eastern Europe will be ready to fly the jets starting next year, Bolanos said, and the planes would be flown on Nicaragua's behalf by an "international" group of communist pilots if they were needed before 1985.

Orlando Jose Tardencillas, 19-year-old "Nicaraguan guerrilla" who embarrassed the Reagan administration by suddenly recanting his previous story before the Washington press in March, 1982, was put up to this by Sandinista officials. Bolanos quoted Cerna, chief of Nicaraguan state security, as saying that Tardencillas had passed word from a prison cell in El Salvador that U.S. officials wanted to use his participation in the Salvadoran war for propaganda purposes. According to this account, an order was secretly sent back to Tardencillas in prison to cooperate until he was brought before the American press and then to "turn around" to embarrass the U.S. government. Tardencillas, who was permitted to return home after the famous press conference, is now a national hero and a Sandinista youth leader in Nicaragua, according to Bolanos.

The man telling this story is the Managua-born son of an American, Gloria Hunter, and a Nicaraguan, Dr. Rodolfo Bolanos, an eye, ear, nose and throat surgeon. Young Miguel briefly attended several colleges in the United States before joining the Sandinista revolution against Somoza. His parents left Nicaragua for Miami, where they now live, after the revolutionaries took power.

Because of his upper-middle-class background and American connections, Bolanos said, Cuban advisers opposed his application to join the highly sensitive state security apparatus. But they were overruled by high-ranking Sandinistas who known Bolanos as a comrade-in-arms.

Bolanos said he wanted to join the internal security service after being mistakenly detained by the secret police shortly after the revolution and realizing his captors had more power than anyone else in Nicaragua.

But, as Bolanos told it, this experience also played a part in his growing disillusionment with the revolution over the years. In addition, he cited the distinct minority status of his revolutionary faction, the *terceristas*, within the predominantly more radical security apparatus, his growing conviction that Nicaragua is heading down a totalitarian path and, finally and apparently most deeply felt, a sense of outrage at the luxurious living and special privileges of Sandinista leaders compared to the privations suffered by most of their followers.

Bolanos himself benefited from those privileges as a "militant," or full member of the Sandinista Party, a status he said is enjoyed by only 600 to 800 people. Other accounts have put party membership as high as 4,000.

Party members are permitted to shop at special stores which offer items that are unavailable or strictly rationed elsewhere, Bolanos said, and this spring party members were permitted to buy Cuban-made television sets, stoves and refrigerators at one-fourth or less of their open market prices.

Bolanos said the birth of a son last October was the beginning of the end. He determined then, he said, that "I'm not going to allow my son to become a slave or be in a slave system." After that, "my observations became more critical," and eventually he began to plan an escape.

Despite many privileges and impressive powers, internal security officers are not permitted to have passports or to travel abroad. But Bolanos was able to obtain a passport and exit permit for his wife and infant son to "visit relatives" in Costa Rica. They left Managua on a commercial airliner the morning of May 7.

As soon as he confirmed their departure, Bolanos boarded a light plane he had chartered the previous day to take him to a city near the Nicaraguan-Costa Rican border. As the aircraft approached its destination, he said, he drew his gun and ordered the pilot to continue across the border and land at an airport in Liberia, Costa Rica.

Bolanos said, and Costa Rican authorities confirmed, that he was taken into custody and charged with air piracy. Just what happened next is murky and reportedly was the subject of high-level discussions between Costa Rican and U.S. authorities. The result was that Bolanos was released from custody and left Costa Rica under U.S. auspices.

Bolanos said there were "no conditions" on his entry to the United States, pointing out that he has a claim through his mother to American citizenship, for which he has now applied. When he crossed the Costa Rican border, he was carrying an expired U.S. passport, which he had obtained during his student days as the son of an American woman.

He denied that he agreed to make public what he knew as a condition of coming here. He said the idea of telling his story to journalists was his from the beginning.

He is not being paid by the U.S. government, Bolanos said, nor has he been promised any protection. In order to remain unnoticed in the midst of the American people, he declined to have photographs published in which he could be recognized, although his picture is on file in Managua.

A spokesman at the Nicaraguan Embassy here, Angela Saballos, said yesterday that the embassy is aware of Bolanos' defection but added, "He was not in a decisionmaking position, so he did not have any inside information."

Eventually, Bolanos said, he hopes to fight for a new, non-communist, democratic revolution in Nicaragua, "maybe from some place closer to Nicaragua" than the United States. He declined to be more specific.

Bolanos described the atmosphere in Nicaragua's security apparatus as full of intrigue, aided and in some respects complicated by the presence of the experienced outsiders from communist countries. About 2,800 to 3,000 Nicaraguans in the department of state security are aided by about 70 Soviets, 400 Cubans, 40 to 50 East Germans and 20 to 25 Bulgarians, according to Bolanos. He estimated that there are about 2,000 Cuban military personnel in the country, most of them posing as teachers.

He said the Soviets, who used Cuban-adapted manuals of the KGB, the Soviet secret police, have provided Makarov automatic pistols as a comradely gesture to Nicaraguan security officers. He described the Russians as high-ranking—with one of the two Soviet officers assigned to his F2 section a colonel in the KGB—but as relatively restrained in their intervention compared with the Cubans.

Last year, for the first time according to Bolanos, the Soviets supplied sophisticated bugging devices to the Nicaraguans. Next year, he said, high-level Nicaraguan security agents are scheduled to attend a special KGB school in Moscow rather than be trained entirely in Cuba.

The other Europeans have less importance, according to Bolanos, who said that the East Germans are mainly advisers on hidden microphones and technical operations. They also direct advisers and participants in the sub-section of F2 that operates against the West Germans and other European embassies, he said. The Bulgarians have "a small center" to process information and supply occasional advice.

As Bolanos told it, the Cubans are in on just about everything and make their presence felt with a constant stream of advice bordering on directions. Bolanos said that, shortly before his defection, an argument broke out in the F2 section, with the Cuban adviser taking sides in a divisive way. As a result, he said, Cerna and other officials had the adviser sent back to Cuba.

Bolanos said that, like many Nicaraguan security officials, he was schooled in Cuba. He spent four months in mid-1980 at a school in a special security base south of the Havana airport where, he said, many teachers held class for Nicaraguans in the mornings and for Angolans in the afternoons.

The chief Cuban adviser to Cerna, whose working pseudonym is "Mayan," and several other Cubans were among those who worked on the plan to discredit the democratic opposition in Nicaragua by concocting a false conspiracy linking them to U.S. diplomats, according to Bolanos. "This is an element of the big strategic plan," he said, to eliminate all effective opposition to Sandinista rule by 1985, when national elections are to be held to resoundingly endorse the Sandinista regime.

Agents were used to lead American diplomats into suspicious situations, he said. He added that his unit of the F2 section was assigned to provide films of U.S. diplomats meeting Nicaraguans from democratic opposition parties and factions, the Catholic church, labor units, the press and the private sector.

For six months, Bolanos said, he was in charge of shadowing Linda Pfeifel, political affairs officer of the U.S. Embassy. Bolanos said he supervised the bugging of Pfeifel's house and, on one occasion, personally searched her belongings.

"I knew everything about her," he said. "I knew where she went and what she did. I even knew what kind of deodorant she uses."

A great deal of film was shot over many months with Americans and their Nicaraguan contacts unwittingly in the starring roles, according to Bolanos, who said the idea was to produce a motion picture that would dramatically "expose" the supposed conspiracy.

He said the whole plan, which recently was given the name of "Operation Spiderweb," originally had been scheduled to be unveiled at the end of April with the expulsion of some American diplomats. It was postponed, Bolanos said, because of the desire to obtain more "incriminating" documentation.

It was after he left Nicaragua, Bolanos continued, that the security services added a final detail: the charge that Pfeifel supplied a bottle of poisoned liqueur to a double agent intended to be given to Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Miguel D'Escoto.

This was the high point of a June 6 press conference in Managua, in which Cerna participated and where videotapes were shown with James Bond-style sound track, announcing the expulsion of Pfeifel and two other U.S. diplomats on espionage charges.

The Reagan administration, which by then had been forewarned by Bolanos, responded June 7 by closing all six Nicaraguan consulates in the United States and expelling their 21 diplomatic personnel.●

DO WE NEED A TRADE DEPARTMENT?

HON. STEPHEN L. NEAL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration has proposed the creation of a Department of Trade to consolidate the numerous trade-related functions now lodged in various Government departments and agencies.

The question of whether we should have such a department has been debated for years in Congress and within previous administrations. I once introduced a bill to create a Department of Trade, in the hope that I could generate some interest in improving our support for exporters. At the same time, though, I think we should be careful about creating new Government entities.

In a recent column in the Washington Post, Philip H. Trezise, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a former official of the Nixon administration, made a provocative argument in opposition to the establishment of a Department of Trade.

I do not necessarily agree with all of Mr. Trezise's comments, but I do think that my colleagues should take account of the points he has raised before we decide whether to allow creation of a new department. At the least, we should heed his reminder that there is no magic bureaucratic formula for solving our trade problems.

Without objection, I would like to have Mr. Trezise's article, "A New Department We Don't Need," from the June 7, 1983, Washington Post, printed in the RECORD so that our colleagues may consider his arguments.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 1983]

A NEW DEPARTMENT WE DON'T NEED

(By Philip H. Trezise)

(The writer, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, was an assistant secretary of state for economic affairs in the Nixon administration)

It is news that an administration which came to office vowing to kill the departments of Education and Energy should now be proposing to create a new Department of Trade. This is at least as bad an idea as the Department of Education and probably worse than the Department of Energy.

Why a Department of Trade?

One answer is that trade responsibilities are now diffused among a number of agencies. Another, which is not necessarily connected with the first, is that our international trade in goods is chronically in deficit. A third, which seems too frivolous to be accepted, is that Ed Meese wishes to reduce the size of the Executive Office by transferring out the special trade representative and staff.

Trade is the most pervasive aspect of our foreign relations. Can one imagine a secretary of state so self-effacing as to foreswear a role in making trade policy? As the foreign debt crisis has brought sharply into focus, the link between trade and finance means the Treasury has a basic interest in trade policy. The Department of Commerce, representative of the nation's business sector, cannot be excluded.

Other Cabinet departments are involved. Labor, of course, Justice (antitrust), Defense (East-West trade, the mobilization base), Interior (fisheries and minerals) and Energy all have good claims to have their views represented.

Among the non-Cabinet agencies are the Export-Import Bank, facilitator of big-ticket exports, the Federal Trade Commission, sharing an antitrust interest with Justice, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the International Trade Commission. It would be unfortunate if the Council of Economic Advisers, a reliable voice for good sense, were not to be consulted on trade issues. In the past at least, it was not unthinkable to have a member of the Federal Reserve Board at interagency meetings on trade.

Then there is Agriculture. The essential hollowness of the idea of a Trade Department is that no one expects that Agriculture will be asked to give up any part of its trade responsibilities. And agricultural goods normally make up 20 percent of our exports. Some centralizing of responsibilities.

With or without Agriculture, there unquestionably is a coordination problem. Where should the coordinating responsibility be lodged?

For about 20 years it has been in the Executive Office, where in our government differences among the departments usually are referred and resolved. To put it in a renamed Commerce Department is not going to prevent intra-Cabinet differences from being taken to the White House. No form of organization can deny a Cabinet secretary the right to make his case to the president.

So what is to be gained? The president says that a Department of Trade will have us "speak with one voice on trade." Does he really mean that we now speak with more than one voice after his administration has made a decision? And surely he does not mean that he wishes to silence the interagency debate that precedes a decision?

Whether a Department of Trade would tilt policy toward more protectionism is arguable, I suppose. The Commerce Department has never been the steadiest or staunchest defender of free trade, which follows from the fact that the department's business constituency includes important groups with a stake in obtaining or perpetuating import restrictions. At any rate, there is a more than hypothetical risk that to try to centralize the trade responsibility in a slightly altered Commerce Department would tend, case by case, to weaken resistance to pressures for protection.

It takes a large act of faith to believe that a Department of Trade could do much for the nation's deficit in merchandise trade. None of the departments or agencies concerned with foreign trade can have been entirely happy with high interest rates and the consequent strong dollar that has hampered exports and encouraged imports. None had the power to change things. Would a new department be able to bring the deficit under control, or persuade the Federal Reserve to adopt another monetary policy?

Microeconomic influences on the trade account are likely also to be beyond the reach of any department, new or old. Like it or not, policies toward human rights, bribery, trade with the East and the Arab boycott do have a negative impact on exports. Congress and the executive are aware of this and have accepted the consequences. To assume that a Department of Trade could persuade them to the contrary requires a suspension of disbelief.

It would be interesting to question those members of Congress who cheerfully rejected President Ford's 1975 proposal to allow oil prices to rise to the world level. If they had been told by a secretary of trade that this decision infallibly would inflate the import bill, as it did for the next six years, would they have acted differently?

A persistent notion has it that we lag all other nations, especially Japan, in managing trade policy. No so. Everyone has a coordination problem, for the same reasons that we have one. In Japan seven major ministries and a number of non-Cabinet agencies are in the act. The Ministry of International Trade and Industry, or MITI, despite its awesome press notices, is one among many. It does not even have charge of trade negotiations, that being for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The bottom line is that a Department of Trade could perform no feats of magic. It could not eliminate the need for tedious interagency conferences and clearances. It could not free the president from having to decide the difficult ones. It could not do what all present departments of government wish could be done quickly and painlessly: make our giant, sprawling economy more productive, competitive and prosperous. To expect it to remove even minor impediments to exports is the merest hope.●

LOUISVILLE PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLAR

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the rest of the Louisville and Jefferson County community in congratulating one of its native sons, Mr. Brian C. Jones, on being named a 1983 Presidential Scholar.

Our entire community is exceedingly proud of Brian for his accomplishment and for representing us so well. We wish him all the best that life has to offer and hope that he finds success and happiness in all of his future endeavors.●

PROSPECTS FOR SECURITY IN EUROPE—THE FALSE ILLUSIONS THREAT

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 13, at the plenary session of the North Atlantic Assembly in Copenhagen, our colleague ELLIOTT LEVITAS spoke on the subject of "Prospects for Security in Europe—The False Illusions Threat." Congressman LEVITAS presented what I felt was the most thoughtful statement of the day.

His theme was the danger of false illusions, and I am pleased to share his remarks with this body, because his views merit serious consideration. ELLIOTT LEVITAS has once again shown his mettle in an international forum, and his statement reflects a careful and perceptive analysis of what is at stake for us and our European allies in the debate now going on within the alliance.

PROSPECTS FOR SECURITY IN EUROPE—THE FALSE ILLUSIONS THREAT

The prospects for security in Europe are good. The shared values and democratic principles of the Alliance as well as its military capability give us this prospect and are the source of our strength. Furthermore, our strength of will exists. We are resolutely committed to the dual track decision. The Cruise and Pershing II missile will be deployed on time and on schedule unless agreement is reached in Geneva. Of that there should be no doubt nor illusion.

We reaffirm that the principle of credible deterrence has served the cause of peace well and remains valid for our defense Alliance. However, there is still a threat to peace and security. That threat today is the threat of false illusions.

Whether on our part or the part of others, it is the existence of these false illusions about the world, that poses a real threat. We should thank Mr. Palme, the prime Minister of Sweden, for reminding us here today by his own example of the prevalence of some of these false illusions.

There should be no false illusions about our strengths or weaknesses or that of our adversaries. The dangers of miscalculation, or overreaction, must be avoided in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of ourselves and our adversaries.

There should be no false illusions about the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union, our principles and our intentions—differences on the part of NATO and of the U.S.—and those of the Warsaw Pact and of the Soviet Union.

Our commitment to defense of freedom and the value of individual dignity is clear. The actions of the Soviet Union are equally clear—whether in its continuous egregious violations of human rights in contravention of the Helsinki Final Act or the aggression and increasing violence in Afghanistan.

There should be no illusion about our commitment to *both* paths of the dual track. There has been much public discussion of the deployment track but not enough of the negotiation track.

In recent months, we in the United States Congress, from both our major political parties, have been working with the President to establish new arms control policies that can achieve nuclear arms reductions through the Geneva negotiations. These proposals which will be made by the United States, I believe, should provide the basis for progress in these vital talks—if the Soviet Union is really interested in seeking reduction of nuclear forces.

However, as I see recent developments in the nuclear arms buildup by the Soviet Union, I ask for performance, not mere words. Instead of peaceful efforts, we see the large deployment of SS-20 missiles aimed at Europe, the modernization of SS-18 and SS-19 forces and the retrofitting and hardening of their silos, the expansion of a blue water Navy, the launching of Typhoon class submarines, the development of new missiles and bombers, all at a pace that indicates some urgency. These developments intensify my doubts about Soviet intentions. At whom are the SS-20's aimed and why? What is the threat to which the recent rapid Soviet nuclear buildup responds?

And now we hear that if NATO deploys the Cruise and Pershing II missiles in response to the Soviet SS-20 missiles and the other theater advantages of the Soviet Union, they will increase again their own military threat to western Europe by deploying more SS-20's in eastern European countries. This recent Soviet announcement is especially revealing about the way the world is. The proposed deployment in eastern Europe was not even made in terms of the sham of a Warsaw Pact decision, but was simply announced unilaterally by Moscow.

I will watch to see how democratically the Soviet leadership will go about deploying more SS-20 missiles in eastern Europe. What free public discussion will be heard? What anti-nuclear demonstrations will be tolerated? What parliament, in the Soviet Union or in its allied countries, will call for a halt and freeze on their deployment? I ask some of our own citizens, who have false illusions, to think about these questions as they compare systems and negotiation positions.

Some people in western nations, both within and without the Alliance, have the false illusion that the Soviet threat is not real and that it can be avoided by means other than demonstrating resolute strength. My colleagues, the threat is as real as the SS-20's and their pre-determined targets. And the people of Afghanistan can attest to the effectiveness of "no deterrence" as a means of avoiding Soviet aggression. And the repressed human beings in the Soviet Union are witnesses to the type of system they would impose if they prevail one way or the other.

Some western leaders and some citizens have false illusions about the Soviet Union. Submarines with nuclear warheads enter their territorial waters and yet there is no change in Swedish policy towards the Soviet Union. What will it take for people like Mr. Palme to lose their illusions? Will it take a Soviet Submarine crawling into the Grand Platz? Probably not. They would simply view it as a novel Intourist visit. It is a dangerous illusion not to see the differences between the Soviet Union and the United States and to act accordingly.

Likewise, Mr. Palme's concept of a Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone is at least consistent with his other false illusions. In a country which has been the target of aggressive and extensive Soviet espionage activities and whose territorial waters have been violated in peace time, how can we believe the Soviets to respect a nuclear free zone in war?

Mr. Palme and his government are not the only one's who have illusions. Regrettably many people and some parties in NATO countries have these illusions as well.

Now let us look at the illusion of making treaties and observing treaties.

My colleagues, there is a link between Geneva and Vienna arms negotiations on the one hand and the Madrid Helsinki Act negotiations on the other. If the Soviet Union does not perform its obligations under existing agreements to respect human rights why should we expect them to observe arms control agreements?

We seek the establishment of more confidence building measures in Europe. A Conference on Disarmament in Europe, from the Atlantic Shore to the Urals as well as the ongoing MBFR talks in Vienna are paths to that result to reduce the opportunity for surprise attack. We seek reductions in both conventional and nuclear forces to produce stability and to promote peace and security.

But we must achieve this in a context of the Soviet observance of its existing undertakings. Then we will see success in Madrid. We will see a conference on disarmament in Europe and progress in Geneva and Vienna. Without such performance by the Soviet Union, the prospects are dim. It is simply an illusion.

As long as the Soviet Union has the illusion that it can achieve its goals without quid-pro-quo negotiation, there will be no progress in the Geneva talks. And the "quids" and "quo's" must be real—not illusory—on both sides.

The ultimate success of the Alliance is the attainment of lasting peace and security in Europe and the world. When the Soviet Union loses its false illusions about NATO and becomes convinced that they cannot defeat us and that they cannot divide us, then will we achieve meaningful arms control and lasting peace.

In that context of peace, the power of our principles shall demonstrate even greater force than the principle of power. And in that peaceful context the competition between the communistic and democratic systems can be peacefully waged. I believe, under those circumstances the nations which observe respect for human rights and which value individual dignity and which uphold and cherish freedom—those nations shall prevail.●

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION CONVENTION AMENDMENT ACT

HON. HENRY J. HYDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Federal Constitution Convention Amendment Act. This legislation is identical to H.R. 353 which I sponsored in the 97th Congress and is substantially the same as the Ervin bill that passed the Senate unanimously in October 1971 and again by a voice vote in July 1973.

There are two methods of proposing and ratifying amendments to the U.S. Constitution as set forth in article V:

> The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or on the Application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress * * *

In the past, when attempts have been made to amend the Constitution, the proposed amendment has always originated in the House or the Senate. Today, we are faced with a dilemma. Missouri has become the 32d State to call for a Constitutional Convention that deals with a balanced budget. Should two additional States submit applications for a Convention, the Congress would be bound by its constitutional obligation as set forth in article V to convene a Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution.

It should be noted that as of this date, seven States—California, Vermont, Kentucky, Michigan, Montana, Washington, and West Virginia—will shortly begin consideration of legislation that would call for a Constitutional Convention. In addition, the legislatures of California, Illinois, Kentucky, and Montana have adopted resolutions requesting that Congress propose a deficit spending amendment, but not asking for a Constitutional Convention.

The dilemma, Mr. Speaker, is that if Congress is forced to call a Constitutional Convention—then what? Who presides? Who attends? How long does the Convention meet? How is the Convention limited in the scope of amendments it may propose?

The steps required to convene an article V convention and the rules which would govern it are not set out in the Constitution or statutory law. Because this process for amending the Constitution has never been used, many unresolved legal and policy questions arise governing the convening and the authority of such a convention.

My bill accomplishes four things:

First, it establishes guidelines for the Congress and the State legislatures to follow when applying for a Constitutional Convention.

Second, it creates rules by which the Convention would be bound to follow during the course of the Convention.

Third, it sets forth procedures for Congress and the States to follow when ratifying the proposed constitutional amendments.

Fourth, it limits the subject of the Convention to that contained in the call.

Mr. Speaker, the need for legislation to implement article V is ever present. In the period since 1789, State legislatures have submitted more than 400 applications for a Convention to consider amendments relating to a wide variety of subjects. In recent years, legislatures have applied to Congress for a Convention more often than in the past. During the 174-year period from 1789 to 1963, Congress received approximately 250 applications requesting a Convention. In the period since 1963, more than 150 such applications have been received. Because the number of applications calling for a Constitutional Convention has proliferated so rapidly in recent years, we now face a situation where Congress could be asked to call a Convention and we would not be in a position to comply with our obligation as set forth in article V.

Mr. Speaker, we must realize that we are in a unique situation. The Congress has an excellent opportunity to act rather than, as we so often do, react. There are many unanswered questions regarding this issue and we have an obligation as elected representatives of the people to be able to answer these questions. We should take action now, while we have the opportunity to examine the situation in an objective, and unhurried manner rather than having to deal with the stress and confusion should we be suddenly confronted with a Convention call. With the addition of Missouri to the list of States calling for a Constitutional Convention, the need for this legislation has become intensified.

There is a clear need for orderly procedures to avoid the threat of a runaway Convention and thus a constitutional crisis. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this timely legislation in addition to joining me in a call for expeditious hearings.

Following are the main points of my bill:

1. States use the same procedure for adopting convention application as they use for the passage of statutes, but without the approval of the Governor.
2. Receipt of an application by Congress is to be announced on the Floor of both Houses, and copies sent to each Member of Congress and state legislature.
3. Each application is to remain in effect for 7 years, unless rescinded by the State legislature.
4. Applications may be rescinded by state legislatures until two-thirds of the states have submitted application, then all applications remain in effect.
5. After Congress determines the validity of the applications, it shall pass a concurrent resolution calling for a convention.
6. The convention must be convened within 1 year after adoption of the concurrent resolution by Congress.
7. Delegates to the convention shall be popularly elected, one delegate from each congressional district and two additional at large delegates from each state.
8. The convention shall elect its own officers.
9. Each delegate may cast one vote.
10. Each delegate's vote must be recorded and a verbatim record kept.
11. Amendments shall be proposed by majority vote of the delegates.
12. The convention shall be limited to subjects named in the concurrent resolution and that delegates subscribe to an oath to refrain from proposing or voting in favor of any proposed amendment not so named.
13. The convention shall be terminated 1 year after date of its first meeting, unless Congress extends its life.
14. Questions arising as to convention procedures shall be determined solely by Congress.
15. Congress may disapprove a proposed amendment on the ground that substantial procedural irregularities occurred at the convention or that the amendment pertains to a subject different from that described in the resolution calling the convention.
16. Congress may not disapprove a proposed amendment on the ground that it disagrees with the substance of the amendment.
17. Congress must transmit the proposed amendment to the states for ratification.
18. The proposed amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the states.
19. Each state shall adopt its own rules of procedure for ratifying proposed amendments, except that any state ratifying action shall be valid without the assent of the Governor.
20. State ratifications may be rescinded by the same process by which the amendment was ratified, except that a ratification may not be rescinded when there are valid ratifications by three-fourths of the states within the requisite time.●

COMMUNITY SEEKS CREATIVE WAYS TO HELP UNEMPLOYED

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

• Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to draw to the attention of the House the effort now underway in my hometown of Sacramento, Calif., to help the thousands of unemployed in that area.

The California Job Journal and radio station FM-102 have joined hands and, with the involvement of many others, have put together a special event to demonstrate concern and support for jobless citizens. In this event, food and entertainment will be provided for a needed spiritual lift to those now seeking jobs. Also, local merchants are providing gift certificates for food, clothing, and other items for the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, we often speak of the need for selfless involvement and cooperation between private and public sectors in meeting the challenges of our society. We often hear that more people need to do more things. Mr. Speaker, people in Sacramento are trying to find solutions and remedies to those problems. I wish to use this opportunity to congratulate them on their service.•

MX VOTE SIGNAL TO SOVIETS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

• Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Oxnard Press-Courier, in my district, describes the importance of the MX missile program for the arms-control talks with the Soviets. It views the recent House and Senate votes on the MX to be a useful signal to the Soviets to stop dragging their feet on arms negotiations in Geneva. I urge my colleagues to consider the views expressed in the Press-Courier editorial.

[From the Press-Courier, Friday, June 3, 1983]

MX VOTE SIGNAL TO SOVIETS

The House and Senate victories for the MX missile program averted a devastating defeat for President Reagan's defense and arms control strategies. Had these two crucial votes gone the other way, U.S. arms negotiators sitting across from their Soviet counterparts in Geneva would have been undercut. Worse yet, Congress would have been opting for something akin to unilateral disarmament.

Avoiding these blows to the nation's security was the plus side of the MX votes. But there was a minus side, too. Congress was giving a tentative stamp of approval to an MX basing scheme that most experts acknowledge will be vulnerable to Soviet attack.

The whole purpose of the MX program is to restore the survivability of land-based missiles, still the most critical leg of America's nuclear deterrent triad—manned bombers, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles.

At present, only land-based missiles have the size and accuracy to threaten the hundreds of Soviet ICBMs that would be held in reserve in hardened underground launching silos to deter U.S. retaliation following a Russian first strike. The best way to protect the MXs from being destroyed in a first strike would be to make the missiles mobile.

But every effort to design a mobile basing system for the MX has fallen victim to one sort of objection or another.

Consequently, a commission appointed by President Reagan ended up recommending that 100 MXs be built and deployed in existing, fixed missile silos.

That would leave the MX no less vulnerable than the current Minuteman missile force. But without any of the highly accurate, 10-warhead MXs at all, the United States would have far too few land-based missiles capable of assured kills against super-hardened Soviet missile silos.

The administration and Congress could still bail the country out of this strategic bind later and put the MX on wheels, or build an anti-ballistic missile defense at acceptable cost using existing technology. That would preserve a credible land-based deterrent through the 1980s while the Pentagon pursued research on a space-based ABM defense that might effectively end the Soviet nuclear threat by the 1990s.

The one certainty in all this is that the Soviets would never agree to such a treaty if Congress denies Reagan the weapons—MX among them—needed to guarantee U.S. security in the absence of a verifiable arms reduction treaty requiring the Soviets to dismantle their first-strike force.

The House and Senate votes on the MX just might cause the Russians to doubt their current strategy of stonewalling in Geneva while waiting for Congress and the nuclear freeze movement to stop the Reagan defense buildup.•

BILL TO INCORPORATE ISLANDS INTO THE MAKAH RESERVATION

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

• Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which provides that two small, uninhabited, federally owned islands lying just off the coast of the present Makah Indian Reservation in Washington State are to be held in trust by the United States for the Makah Indian Tribe, and thereby incorporated into the Makah Reservation.

This legislation would right a longstanding wrong, to the satisfaction of the 1,200 Makah Indians of the Makah Reservation and to the honor of the United States. It is not intended to, nor would it have the effect, of enlarging or otherwise altering the fishing rights of the members of the Makah Tribe. The islands in question—Tatoosh and Waadah—comprise approximately 80 acres. They are of no significant commercial value to the United States. They are, however, of great cultural, historical, and religious importance to the Makah people.

The only current use made of these islands by the Federal Government is the placement on Tatoosh Island of two unmanned navigational aids. The Coast Guard, in correspondence with the tribe, has indicated that it has no opposition to the change in status of the islands, provided that its ability to maintain and service these facilities is protected. The tribe is agreeable to this provision, and I have incorporated the Coast Guard's proposed language into the bill.

There is ample precedent for this legislation. In 1970, Congress enacted Public Law 91-489, by which the 719-acre Ozette tract was restored to the Makah Indian Reservation. In that case, as in this, the lands were federally owned, unused, and of little monetary value, but were of great symbolic importance to the tribe. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.•

NAVY'S F-404 ENGINE "OUTSTANDING"

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

• Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the House some encouraging news in the world of military procurement. As some know, the Department of Defense administers a program of incentives to defense contractors for outstanding performance well beyond the requirement of their contract.

Department of Defense targets for these incentive awards, specify milestones which, when achieved, result in significant advantages in the performance of the equipment being developed. I am extremely pleased to report that a company in my district in Massachusetts has been awarded three of these incentives. The company is the General Electric Co.'s aircraft engine group in Lynn, Mass. The incentive awards were the result of their exceeding performance goals in the development of the F-404 engine which powers the Navy's multimillion-dollar F-18 aircraft.

As part of the F-404 development program, the U.S. Navy set demanding reliability and maintainability goals as priority requirements. These requirements outranked the usual objectives of getting maximum power out of the machine regardless of the cost or consequences to do so. Consistent with that, the Navy devised a series of tests that this engine would be subjected to, and signed development contracts with General Electric for the accomplishment of these goals. The testing included challenging reliability and maintainability goals; goals which in being met have resulted in significant cost savings, not only in dollars, but in man-hours required to keep the engine in operational readiness. These goals, surpassed any that current generation engines were capable of meeting. General Electric was offered incentives to meet or exceed those goals.

The first test was a simulated mission endurance test of 750-engine hours on one engine. The test was run at General Electric's facility at Lynn, Mass., that simulated both sea level and altitude flight conditions with throttle movements and power requirements made to a schedule which simulated the spectrum of missions flown in U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corp operational units. The simulated mission schedule was generated based upon extensive detailed flight profiles flown in McDonnell Douglas' flight simulators by both U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corp pilots. The goal established for this test was a mean time between failure of any engine part of at least 72 hours. Upon completion of the test and evaluation of the results by the U.S. Navy, it was demonstrated the engine had a mean time between failure of 250 hours—three and one half times better than requirement. For this truly outstanding achievement, General Electric was presented by the Navy with an incentive award for which it can be most proud.

The second test to be completed was one run by U.S. Navy and involved detailed analysis by the Navy of the results of the operational use of the F/A-18 aircraft over a 10,000 flight-hour period using production engines. The goal was to have a mean time between failure of at least 264 hours. At the end of this particular test, U.S. Navy records indicated the engine reliability exceeded the goal of 264 hours with an actual 281-hour mean time between failure record. For this achievement, General Electric was awarded its second incentive fee.

The third and final reliability and maintainability test has just been successfully completed. This demonstration was a 500 aircraft hour accelerated service test evaluation on one F/A-18 and the same two F-404 engines, flown and maintained by U.S. Navy personnel. Again, the unprecedented performance of this new aircraft engine, has earned General Electric the maximum incentive award from the Navy. To quote, in part, from a letter sent to General Electric Co. by Comdr. J. C. Weaver, F/A-18 Program Manager, Naval Air Systems Command,

> The fee earned was determined from the results of the Accelerated Service Test reliability and maintainability data analysis which verified all (6) goals were substantially exceeded.

The established goals for the award were judged tougher than any current fighter engine has to date attained and included a maintainability goal of 2½ maintenance man-hours for each flight hour. Less than one-half a maintenance man-hour was required, which is six times better than the goal. The goal for the maximum time for any engine repair at base level was bettered by 3 to 1. The goal for the value of replacement parts cost was bettered by 2 to 1 and the total test engine support costs was also bettered by over 2 to 1—very significant and cost effective results.

I agree with Commodore Weaver's closing remarks in his letter,

> It is a distinct pleasure that such a determination can be made to close out the F-404 reliability and maintainability evaluation phase. GE's performance in earning these awards for all three performance periods established (in the contract) is testimony to the emphasis and discipline dedicated to F-404 engine reliability and maintainability. Such performance is a credit to the G.E. company and is greatly appreciated by this Command.

I feel performance of this kind is worthy of note. I commend General Electric's workers whose dedication and efforts made this possible.●

FLAG DAY—THE STORY BEHIND THE STAR

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Independence. Freedom. Justice. Three of the many ideals for which our flag stands. Each June 14, we take this time to remember what Old Glory has stood for, and also to call attention to the America of the future.

Our flag consists of red and white stripes, representing the 13 original Colonies, and on a field of blue 50 white stars.

Fifty stars * * *.

Have we ever really thought about the story that is behind each star? Every star represents a State, and the 24th star tells Missouri's story.

The name "Missouri" comes from an Indian word meaning the town of the large canoes. In 1673, two French explorers, Jacques Marquette and Louis Jolliet, became the first white men to see the mouth of the Missouri River. Eleven years later, Robert Cavelier claimed the Mississippi Valley, including Missouri, for France. He named the region Louisiana—after King Louis XIV. In 1803, the United States, under President Jefferson, purchased the Louisiana region from the French, securing Missouri for our young Nation. A year later, in 1804, Lewis and Clark started their famous journey from St. Louis to the Pacific Northwest. The Missouri Compromise of 1820, paved the way for Missouri's entrance into the Union on August 10, 1821.

Throughout the early 19th century, Missouri was referred to as the mother of the West because it lay at the edge of the western frontier. Missourians also supplied many of the pioneers who were settling the West. In 1884, Lamar became the birthplace of our Nation's 33d President, Harry S. Truman.

The origin of Missouri's nickname, the "Show Me State" is also very interesting. The phrase has been traced to a speech by Missouri Congressman Willard Duncan Vandiver in 1899. He said

> * * * frothy eloquence neither convinces nor satisfies me. I am from Missouri. You have got to show me.

As Missourians we have earned the right to be proud of our place on the flag and of our country. We have shown, and continue to show, the energy, devotion, love, and dignity that has made this great Nation.

We salute our flag not only each June 14, but on every day in between.●

OVER THE MOUNTAIN ATHLETIC CLUB

HON. W. J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring to your attention the fact that the Over the Mountain Athletic Club of New Orleans will celebrate its 10th anniversary on July 8, 1983.

The Over the Mountain Athletic Club was formed for the purpose of encouraging physical fitness, promoting comradery among men in sports and the furtherance of athletic perfection. The club is composed of 175 men from all walks of life who live in Orleans and Jefferson Parishes.

Over the past 10 years the club, whose members' average age is 35.4 years, has promoted and organized senior athletic competitions, and has entered recordbreaking teams in numerous athletic events. One of the club's members placed first in the 220 yard dash at the 1981 International Senior Olympics in Mexico.

The club has also contributed substantially to charitable activities. Members have donated both funds and manpower to provide assistance with hurricane relief. The club members help to maintain any park or playground they use for their athletic competitions. They have donated grandstands, resurfaced fields, and mowed grass. The club has also raised thousands of dollars for charitable organizations through such events as the March of Dimes Pledge Walk.

I am pleased and proud to add my hearty congratulations to the Over the Mountain Athletic Club upon its 10th anniversary. I hope this fine organization will flourish for many years in the future.●

PROHIBIT ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES WHO ARE NOT A PARTY TO THE 1963 LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills that would prohibit U.S. foreign assistance and American IMF funding approval to any country that is not a party to the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty. I have included the text of both bills.

A couple of weeks ago, this body voted in favor of a freeze on nuclear weapons. This bilateral freeze with the Soviet Union, on the production and deployment of nuclear weapons, is an attempt to eliminate arms that could prove catastrophic if ever used. However, we are ignoring the catastrophe of nuclear weapons that are being tested right now in our atmosphere, under water, and in space, that are injuring the Earth and its future life, right now.

It only makes sense that we stop foreign aid and IMF loans to nations that feel that they have enough national resources to develop nuclear weapons stockpiles in lieu of economic, social, and antihunger programs for their own people. Could there be anything sillier than for America—with our many internal problems—providing forms of financial help to nations which are using their resources for enormously expensive weapons of doom?

Our own atomic veterans can attest to the constant health problems experienced by those exposed to atomic weapons and nuclear fallout. We are no longer unsure of its affects; we know how harmful exposure can be. Yet, every year we support countries that, if they do have atomic weapons, continue to ignore the Limited Test Ban Treaty, and if they don't have weapons, have no intention of abiding by the treaty once they get them. Why? Radiation and nuclear fallout travel. If present in the atmosphere anywhere, we will all eventually feel at least some of its effects. We share our great oceans, and any third grader can tell you that the water in one area makes its way, with pollutants and all, to other areas of the world. Where radiation is concerned, it is truly a very small world in which we live.

My bills do not ban the testing of nuclear weapons, so we need not argue about upgrading weapons stockpiles, and maintaining safety features. We abide by this treaty now, and only test nuclear weapons underground. Why should we expect less from others? And, more importantly, why should we support others who ignore the health and environment of their neighbors, not to mention the needs of their people, and the general well-being of the world? The answer is, we should not!

The bills follow:

H.R. 3374

A bill to prohibit United States foreign assistance to any country which is not a party to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) United States foreign assistance may not be provided to any country which is not a party to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (done at Moscow, August 5, 1963).

(b) As used in this section, the term "United States foreign assistance" means assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, foreign military sales financing under the Arms Export Control Act, sales and donation programs under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and programs under the Peace Corps Act.

H.R. 3375

A bill to provide that the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund shall vote against providing any financial assistance from the Fund to any country which is not a party to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 40. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the Fund to vote against providing any financial assistance to any country which is not a party to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (done at Moscow, August 5, 1963).".●

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY MONROE

HON. WAYNE DOWDY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the board of supervisors of Franklin County, Miss., have declared June 30, 1983, as Johnny Monroe Day. Mr. Monroe has served as county agent and assistant county agent in Franklin County for the past 30 years. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Mr. Monroe has ably served his community, his State, and his country.

In addition to his invaluable work as county agent, Mr. Monroe has influenced and guided several generations of 4-H Club boys and girls. The benefit received from these young people's association with Mr. Monroe cannot be adequately measured. It can be said, however, that society as a whole is better off as a result of the high standards of honesty and integrity instilled in these young people by Johnny Monroe.

It is a privilege for me to join with the people of Franklin County in saluting Mr. Monroe and the high principles for which he stands.●

THE 1984 QUESTION

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the Lompoc Record, a newspaper in my district, recognizes the political significance of the decisions being taken in the Congress and specifically in the Foreign Affairs Committee regarding U.S. policy in Central America. The principal question is this: "Who will resist subversion from Castro's Cuba if the United States does not aid its friends in Central America?" The question is a legitimate one, and if the decision is made not to help our friends, then the responsibility will have to fall on those who make that decision.

I urge my colleagues to consider the views expressed in the Lompoc Record editorial which follows:

[From Lompoc (Calif.) Record, June 15, 1983]

THE 1984 QUESTION

There was potent political symbolism in the contrasting approaches of the Reagan administration and congressional liberals to the problem of Nicaragua.

While the administration was playing diplomatic hardball with Nicaragua's junior league Castros, liberals on the House Foreign Affairs Committee were voting to cut off covert U.S. aid to anti-communist Nicaraguan guerrillas.

Ideally, foreign policy choices ought to be weighted on their merits with only secondary consideration given to domestic political consequences. Put another way, questions of war and peace are too important to be decided on the basis of momentary political advantage at home.

But in a democracy, domestic politics can never be wholly ignored, if for no other reason than that no foreign policy can be sustained for long unless it enjoys public support.

That being the case, those on the House committee who recently voted to bail out the Sandinsta regime in Nicaragua by denying sustenance to its opposition ought to be thinking about how this action will "play in Peoria."

More to the point, they ought to be thinking about how their votes will look when compared to the Reagan administration's "don't-tread-on-us" response to the expulsion of three U.S. diplomats from Nicaragua.

The administration answered those expulsions and the Nicaraguan government's absurd charge that U.S. diplomats were plotting to poison its foreign minister, by closing six Nicaraguan consulates in the United States and expelling 21 Nicaraguan diplomats. Presumably, the Sandinistas will think twice in the future before engaging in such shabby disinformation.

Contrast that response with the House committee's 20-14 vote in favor of denying aid to Nicaraguan guerrillas willing to die to prevent their country from being turned into a clone of Castro's Cuba.

Among other things, congressional liberals must hope that the American people never ask themselves this question: If the United States dooms its friends in Central America by denying them the aid they need, who will be left to resist the Castroite tide?

The House Foreign Affairs Committee's shameful vote, and the stark contrast with the administration's justifiably tough stand, make it even more likely that the American public will be asking just this sort of question.

The answers should be right in time for the 1984 elections.●

OF SOUP LINES AND NATIONAL DEBT

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this editorial from the June 10, 1983, issue of the Charlotte News into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with special attention given to the last sentence.

[From the Charlotte News, June 10, 1983]

OF SOUP LINES AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

The U.S. Conference of Mayors says the cities are running over with hungry people—and running out of money to feed them. A study to be released next week will only underscore the need in some of the nation's larger cities.

"Extraordinary efforts have been made by government, religious and voluntary agencies to respond to the need for emergency assistance," according to the conference. "But the need is outstripping the public and private resources that are available."

With transients on the increase, and the number of jobless families at a high level, the cities' soup kitchens and emergency food banks are stretched thin. Food donations last year as compared to 1981 have doubled in some cities, and have increased five-fold in others, according to the conference's eight-city survey.

Even with its relatively low unemployment rate, Charlotte's soup kitchens have been busy this past winter. Crisis Assistance Ministry, the focal point for much of the community's voluntary emergency aid, has been under increased financial strain.

The national economic recovery now under way is weak. The headlines this week alone highlighted continuing employee layoffs locally as businesses adjust to new conditions. While the local housing market continues robust, the job market has not rebounded, particularly for the low-skilled jobs that many of the unemployed seek.

A slow economic recovery will prolong the stress on a deficit-plagued federal budget, precisely because of legitimate aid requests like the one being made by the mayors. Yet one of the factors slowing recovery is investors' doubt that Congress and the president can resolve the current budget impasse, including offsetting the gargantuan debt. While the soup kitchens cannot be allowed to close, Congress can best serve those standing in soup lines by facing its budget dilemma.●

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WORKS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years the Reagan administration has been preaching the evils of affirmative action and proposing Federal spending cutbacks for those programs designed to afford minorities equal opportunity. Now, an unpublished Labor Department study confirms what many of us in Congress have been saying since President Kennedy issued affirmative action requirements for Federal contractors some 20 years ago. As indicated in the following New York Times article, the Federal contract compliance program has substantially improved employment opportunities for minorities and women. These advancements in equality were directly attributable to compliance with the contractual obligations of affirmative action. I urge my colleagues and the President to consider the significance of this study, especially in light of the President's recent effort to stack the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

[From the New York Times, June 19, 1983]

STUDY SAYS AFFIRMATIVE RULE EXPANDS HIRING OF MINORITIES

(By Robert Pear)

WASHINGTON, June 18—A new study by the Labor Department has concluded that affirmative action of the type criticized by President Reagan has been highly effective in promoting the employment of blacks, women and Hispanic people.

The study said companies doing business with the Federal Government, which are subject to special affirmative action requirements, "have posted significantly greater gains in the employment and advancement of minorities and women" than other companies. The study said the gains were "attributable to the good-faith efforts of Federal contractors to comply with their contractual obligations of affirmative action."

Federal law forbids employment discrimination on the basis of race, sex or national origin. The law applies to all companies. But only businesses with Government contracts are required to take affirmative steps to hire qualified women and members of minority groups in proportion to their numbers in the work force.

EARLY INVESTIGATION EFFORT

The unpublished Labor Department study, one of the first systematic effects to investigate the efforts of the Federal contract compliance program, analyzed employment practices at 77,000 factories, offices and work sites with a total of more than 20 million employees.

It found that from 1974 to 1980 the rate of minority employment grew 20 percent among these doing business with the Federal Government but only 12 percent among the companies not covered by affirmative action requirements.

"The difference in performance between Federal contractors and noncontractors in employment of women during the period studied is even greater than that for minorities," the study said. "Women's participation in the contractors' work forces grew by 15.2 percent, as opposed to 2.2 percent in noncontractors' work forces."

In 1980 the Government contractors had a total of 14.1 million employees, of whom five million were women and 2.6 million were members of racial or ethnic minority groups, the study said.

The study also said women and members of minority groups experienced significantly greater upward mobility at the companies where the Government enforced affirmative action. At these companies, it said, large numbers of blacks, women and Hispanic people who had been service workers or low-skilled blue-collar workers moved up to skilled production, craft and white-collar jobs.

Labor Department officials said 20,000 to 30,000 companies, including nearly all the biggest corporations in the country, were subject to the affirmative action requirements because they did business with the Government. The department, in keeping with Reagan Administration policy, plans to issue new rules soon that relax those requirements the officials said.

NEW RULES CRITICIZED

Civil rights advocates and officials of another Federal agency, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, have criticized some of the changes, but business organizations have generally welcomed them.

President Reagan and William Bradford Reynolds, the Assistant Attorney General for civil rights, have opposed the use of numerical hiring goals such as those set by Labor Department rules for more than a decade. Both men contend that the Supreme Court was wrong to uphold a voluntary affirmative action program that reserved a certain number of places for blacks.

Mr. Reynolds said "preferential treatment based on race" was intolerable regardless of whether it was meant to help or to harm a particular minority group. He said "race-conscious affirmative action" could itself be a form of discrimination.

Barry L. Goldstein, a lawyer with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Inc., said, "It certainly seems that the Labor Department has wanted to keep this study from being made public because of possible embarrassment to the President and the Justice Department, which have strongly opposed affirmative action."

Labor Department officials said they had not released the study because they wanted to verify its conclusions and check its statistical methods. Robert S. Follett of Welch

Associates in Santa Monica, Calif., an economic consulting concern hired by the Labor Department to review the study, said "the methodology was appropriate" and the conclusions were valid.

The first affirmative action requirements for Federal contractors were established in 1961 under an executive order issued by President Kennedy. But over the next 20 years, according to the Labor Department study, there was little "factual documentation" of whether such rules actually increased job opportunities for women and members of minority groups.

STUDY ORDERED IN 1981

In September 1981, Ellen Shong Bergman, director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, assigned her special assistant, J. Griffin Crump, to study the question. The office is part of the Labor Department.

Mr. Crump's study said the "superior performance" of Federal contractors in hiring and promoting blacks, women and Hispanic workers was remarkable because total employment at those companies grew only 3 percent from 1974 to 1980. In the same period there was an increase of 8.2 percent in total employment at the companies not doing business with the Government.

Another unpublished study, done for the Labor Department by Jonathan S. Leonard of the University of California at Berkeley, reached a similar conclusion. "The Federal contract compliance program has substantially improved employment opportunities for black males," he wrote. He added that affirmative action had increased the demand for black male labor and that this helped explain "a significant part of the increase in the relative earnings of black males."

Mr. Crump reported that Government contractors, under the stimulus of affirmative action, had a smaller proportion of their black and Hispanic employees in low-paying jobs. Twenty-two percent of the contractors' minority employees were service workers or unskilled laborers. For companies without Government contractors, the corresponding figure was 39 percent.●

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for 35 years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has sponsored competition in the Voice of Democracy scholarship program, a contest whereby students from every State in the Union are given the chance to express their thoughts on their country and government.

Students must record their speeches and then are judged for content and delivery. This year almost one quarter of a million young people competed for five national scholarships. The theme of this competition was "Youth—America's Strength."

I am very pleased to be able to present to you and my worthy colleagues the text of the winning speech for the international students category, which was written and delivered by one of my constituents from the 20th Congressional District of Texas, Miss Ruth Carson Hobaugh.

I would also like to share with you a short statement by Miss Hobaugh:

I think we youths recognize our potential. Newly turned eighteen, I'm excited about getting the chance to vote, my input into my country's affairs, and the possibilities and responsibilities that lie before me in college and in life. We do recognize our potential, but we must also be aware that there is another generation which will depend on us. We must insure that the same opportunities that were so important to us are available to our children. This is what contributes to our nation's strength. The youth of America make up the future foundation of our country. People make up our nation, not money, weaponry, or factories; people—like our student in Mission Control, succeeding for himself, and for us.

This young San Antonian is currently living in Germany where her father is stationed as a dentist with the U.S. Army. She recently completed her studies at the Heidelberg American High School, and plans a career in medicine or another science/people-related occupation.

Miss Hobaugh's speech is, as follows:

1982-83 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM OVERSEAS WINNER (HEIDELBERG, GERMANY)—RUTH C. HOBAUGH

The other night as I watched the news, there was a story about an 18-year-old student who had designed an experiment to be performed in the weightless environment of the Columbia Space Shuttle in orbit. As I watched him smiling jubilantly from his place in Mission Control, I felt a special enthusiasm. Whether he realized it or not, he was there not only for himself. In that brief moment, he was representing the young people of the United States, and doing it very well. He was poised, well dressed for the occasion, vibrant and dynamic, and he was showing his creativity, intelligence and motivation through his endeavor.

I could identify with this fellow 18-year-old, and I was proud of him. I think all of America should be proud and very happy with what his accomplishment represents, for it actually says a great deal about America's most valuable resource for the future—her youth. Now, obviously, not all of us have the same talents as this young man, and that is why his efforts led him to a solo appearance at Mission Control. But he is not alone; the same America which produced him gave rise to an entire generation of young people who will contribute significantly to society in the coming decades.

The youth of this generation are a strength, and there are several reasons for this. We have grown up in a society that advances technologically so quickly that we are accustomed to rapid change, and expect to participate, even initiate, more progressive developments. We are not stymied by thoughts of the impossible, for in many cases we have seen the so-called impossible take place. In America, we have been encourage to freely examine moral and philosophical issues such as marriage, the right to life, good and evil, religion, differing political philosophies, man's ability to destroy the earth, and the duty to preserve and protect it. Most importantly, our generation has been presented more choices and opportunities than ever before. We can guide almost every facet of our lives, which leads us to responsibility. Although this independence can be frightening and overwhelming at times, it is also challenging, even exhilarating. There are often criticisms of the many mistakes we young people make, and truly we do make many wrong decisions. But we can learn from our mistakes and how to avoid them. I've learned to follow my parents' usually correct advice, even when it's unsolicited. We learn to take risks and, through this, feel a sense of satisfaction when we witness our successes. This highly technological and free-thinking society is conducive to the shaping of the moral, personal, and intellectual character of America's youth.●

COMMENDABLE DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the highly commendable and successful dropout prevention program of the Cabell County public school system. Under the direction of Mr. Dewey J. Parr, former principal of Harveytown Elementary, the program has succeeded in reducing the dropout rate for Huntington High School alone by 7 percentage points. The program's chief goal is to keep as many students in school as is conceivably possible and to give them more reasons to be happy and successful there.

School officials were extremely alarmed at the high dropout rate in Cabell County, which was 21 percent of the county's nearly 18,000 students in 1981. In view of the current high unemployment rate in this country, opportunities in today's job market are few and far between. There already exists keen competition among college graduates for the few available jobs. It is even more difficult for those who do not complete high school. Employers are hiring skilled and educated people. By not graduating, high school dropouts forfeit the most minimal requirement for most jobs, the high school diploma.

The students who are likely to drop out must be recognized and helped early in their school careers. This is exactly what the Cabell County dropout prevention program hopes to do. The program was developed by school administrators and was fundamentally designed to identify the characteristics of potential dropouts and establish a better relationship with the parents of those students. The program seeks to identify the teachers who can best work with these students, teachers who can best help these students, and establish a stronger bond between the school and their parents.

The funding for the dropout prevention program comes from less than half of the county's $123,000 share of a Federal block grant program. These title 2 funds allow Cabell County to implement this necessary and noteworthy program.

Already I have noted some effective changes in the Cabell County school system for the 1982-83 school year. Beginning with the youngest of the community, the program works to encourage elementary schoolchildren to learn skills so that they may overcome language difficulties early. It is designed to teach these children to communicate effectively from the start. It is hoped that these children will be less likely to drop out of school if their communications skills are honed early.

Among high school students, the dropout prevention program has achieved some dramatic results. In this first year Mr. Parr has concentrated his efforts on Huntington High School where the program is based. According to statistics, this high school had a dropout rate of 100 students from an 800 enrollment, the highest in the county for the 1981-82 school year. In 1983 the dropout rate of Huntington High has dropped from 30 percent in 1982 to approximately 23 percent. Furthermore, the Cabell County school system had 111 less dropouts in 1983 than in 1982.

I must commend the dedication and hard work given to this program by the parents, teachers, and principals of Cabell County. I find that their sincere effort and devotion to this program has sparked students' interest and is keeping them in school. I hope that this program will continue to progress and proves to be even more successful in the future against the threat of illiteracy.●

NATIONAL TENANTS DAY

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, early in his distinguished political career, President John F. Kennedy stated that, "the Government must take a stand in helping alleviate the housing shortage." Unfortunately, under the Reagan administration, public and assisted housing programs have been the targets of significant budget reductions. Today, I am introducing legislation to bring attention to the victimization of public housing tenants. This measure designates May 18, 1984, as "National Tenants Day."

President Reagan's emasculation of public housing programs has been mendaciously implemented. Under the illusion of establishing a social safety net, the Reagan administration requested that $5.2 billion be rescinded from public housing and section 8 authorization funds in 1981. As a result, once Congress acquiesced to this request, the number of additional units authorized to be constructed in 1981 fell from 255,000 to 210,000 units.

In addition, the Reagan administration's fiscal year 1982 budget recommended that only 175,000 additional units of section 8 housing be constructed. Later, this figure was lowered to 152,000 units.

Tragically, this administration has continued its unrelenting assault on public housing programs. In the fiscal year 1984 budget, President Reagan recommended that the public housing modernization program be merged with the public operating subsidies program. According to the budget proposal, modernization funds would decline from $1.4 billion to $350 million by 1987, the last year of the program.

The dehumanization of innocent people is the primary result of President Reagan's sordid attacks on public housing programs. Earlier this year, I held a hearing concerning homelessness in Baltimore City. During this hearing, I learned that there exists between 3,500 to 12,000 homeless individuals in Baltimore City. Undoubtedly, if the Federal Government would increase its allocation of funds for the construction of new public housing units, the number of homeless people in Baltimore would decrease.

Baltimore City, however, is not the only city whose residents lack adequate public housing facilities. The New York Times reported that as many as 17,000 families are illegally doubling up in apartments in New York City's public projects because of the shortage of housing for the poor. In Dallas, Tex., the city's housing authority estimates that thousands of families are on waiting lists for vacant public housing units.

I believe that the establishment of a National Tenants Day will generate nationwide attention to the inadequate supply of public housing units. In addition, it will publicize the human suffering which results from overcrowded housing, and the rapid deterioration of existing public housing units. Finally, this bill will send a message to the Reagan administration that the Congress will oppose future legislative attempts to reduce funding for public housing programs.●

CELEBRATION OF NATIONAL FLAG DAY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1983, our country celebrated National Flag Day, a day set aside to show our pride and respect for the symbol of our Nation.

Yet, our flag is more than a symbol. It is not simply the Stars and Stripes which are displayed across this country—in schools, homes, and workplaces—which give meaning to the 14th of June.

Our flag is an outward tangible sign of the inward commitment of generations of American people to uphold the freedom of the individual. Designating a day to stop and reflect on the importance of that pursuit gives each of us an opportunity to renew our individual commitment to the spirit of democracy.

The flag represents the work of our Founding Fathers and the Union of these 50 sovereign States. But the true meaning of our Naton's flag is the celebration of the hearts, minds, and hands of all American people.●

RAOUL WALLENBERG—A REPORT FROM ISRAEL

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the case of Raoul Wallenberg has continued to disturb relations between the West, especially Sweden, and the Soviet Union. The Soviet seizure of this man in Hungary during the final months of World War II, when he was carrying on a one-man crusade to save as many Jews as possible, has captured the imagination of many people. In the years following World War II, many inmates of the Soviet Gulag have either heard that Raoul Wallenberg was still alive and in one of the camps or claim to have seen him. The Soviets, for their part finally admitted in 1958 that he was captured by the NKVD and assert he died in prison in 1947. Subsequently, further information has contradicted that assertion, and the evidence indicates that he is still alive. One person to make a very thorough investigation of the case is Avraham Shifrin, himself a victim of 10 years in the Gulag. Upon settling in Israel, Mr. Shifrin established a Research Center for Prisons, Psychprisons, and Forced-Labor Concentration Camps of the U.S.S.R. In compiling data on Soviet forced-labor camps, Mr. Shifrin came across information on Raoul Wallenberg, which he compiled into a report at the request of the Swedish Embassy in Israel. The report is dated January 1980 and is reproduced below for the edification of my colleagues:

FACTS CONCERNING THE FATE OF THE SWEDISH DIPLOMAT RAUL WALLENBERG KIDNAPPED BY THE SOVIETS FROM BUDAPEST IN 1945 (COMPILED AT THE REQUEST OF THE SWEDISH EMBASSY IN ISRAEL)

1. In April, 1963, when I was a political prisoner in camp no. 07 (Dubrovlag, Mordo-

via, USSR), I personally had a chance to talk with some five or six criminals who had arrived in our camp shortly before that.

These criminals told me that during the previous three or four years they had been kept in a camp on Wrangel' island above the Arctic Circle, where they were used in the service unit (for bringing food products into the camp and the work outside the camp).

I was greatly surprised and did not believe that there really existed a camp on Wrangel' island none of us prisoners had ever heard of before. Still, I thoroughly questioned those criminals who insisted that on Wrangel' island there was a complex of three camps located one next to the other, and that the only prisoners kept in those camps were foreigners, "exclusively generals" as the criminals remembered it. According to their evidence, there were several thousand prisoners in those three camps: in the dwelling zone, in the working zone and in the big hospital zone. These three zones were strictly separated from each other and there were no contacts (except for separate cases) among the prisoners of different zones. The prisoners of the service unit were not allowed to communicate with the prisoners of the three camps, yet, when bringing food into the camps they had occasional contacts with the prisoners there and were sure therefore that there were only foreigners there.

During my ten years in the camps and the consequent four years in the exile, I never heard of the camps on Wrangel' island again. The only conclusion which can be made from this fact is that the very existence of those camps was kept top secret. The appearance of the above mentioned criminals from Wrangel' island camps in the regular camps can be explained by the resentment of the authorities at the inevitable contacts among the Soviet citizens from the service unit and the foreigners in the camps.

2. In 1972, already in Israel, I met a Mr. Efim Moshinsky who told me that until 1962 he had been kept in the camps on Wrangel' island. His evidence, both in general and in some details, matched the one given to me in 1963 by the criminals. (See appendix 1—the testimony of Efim Moshinsky certified by the notary of the American embassy in Israel). As follows from Mr. Moshinsky's testimony, he knows for sure that until 1962 the Swedish diplomat Raul Wallenberg was kept in the dwelling zone of the camps on Wrangel' island because he (Moshinsky) even corresponded with Mr. Wallenberg sending messages to him to the closed barracks where he was kept and receiving answers.

Besides, Efim Moshinsky said that in the same camp he personally saw and talked with Mr. R. Trushnovich, a leader of the Russian anti-communist organization NTS who was kidnapped from Berlin by the Soviet KGB in 1953. In order to verify the evidence of Mr. Moshinsky, I asked the son of R. Trushnovich, Mr. Yaroslav Trushnovich presently residing in Frankfurt-on-Main, to send me a picture of his father. Upon receiving the picture I offered it to Mr. Moshinsky along with about 15 other male pictures, without telling him there was a picture of R. Trushnovich among them. (See appendix 2 for a detailed description of the identification procedure).

Besides, Mr. Moshinsky handed over to me a list of names and ranks of a number of foreign prisoners (all of them army officers of their countries) who were kept in the camps on Wrangel' island in 1962. Most of the people on the list were either German or Italian.

3. Being in Rome in 1972, I happened to mention in one of the interviews to the newsmen that there were camps for foreigners on Wrangel' island. (In those days I had to present all this information from my own name because Mr. Moshinsky's family was remaining in the USSR for which reason he did not want to publicize his name.) The news hit the head of one of the news agencies of Italy, Mr. Gluisseappe Delangoro who got very interested in this matter and asked me for the list of foreign prisoners from the Wrangel' island camps made by E. Moshinsky. I transfered the list to Mr. Delangoro.

4. A few months later in the same year, Mr. Delangoro called me from Rome and asked for an appointment. Upon his arrival in Israel I put him in touch with Efin Moshinsky. During our conversation with Mr. Delangoro and Efim Moshinsky, Mr. Delangoro informed us that (a) he had transmitted the list of prisoners from Wrangel' island to the Committee on Relatives of Officers Missing after World War II; the list was checked in the Committee and Mr. Delangoro was informed that all the people from the list were listed among the missing Italian officers; (b) in the same Committee Mr. Delangoro was told that about a year before (i.e. in 1971) a hunter in the South of Italy winged a goose on whose pad was attached a rubber tube with a piece of paper in it. The paper was badly damaged by water (who knows for how long it had been travelling with the goose back and forth . . .), therefore it was hardly possible to read the message. What was clearly seen on the paper was the word "SOS" in the very beginning and then separate words like "Italian officers" and "island behind the Polar Circle". According to Mr. Delangoro, the message is being carefully kept in the Committee on Relatives of Missing Officers.

5. In 1973, a TV-team from Sweden arrived in Israel to take an interview with me concerning the fact connected, in one way or another, with the search of Raul Wallenberg. The program they made was shown on Swedish TV. Following this show a letter came to the Swedish TV-centre from a former political prisoner of Soviet camps, a Hungarian by birth, who wrote that in 1967 he was for a while kept together with Raul Wallenberg in a camp East of Irkutsk, in Zabaykal, and that that was a large secret camp for foreigners; the Hungarian wrote also that according to his knowledge, R. Wallenberg had been brought to that camp from Wrangel' island.

6. In 1976, I received information from Rumania concerning three former Rumanian army officers who arrived in Rumania from the USSR via China. According to my correspondent, the three officers had served 25-year terms in the camps of the USSR and were released in 1970 from a special camp for foreigners in Zabarkal, further than Irkutsk. Upon their release from the camp, they were told by the Soviet authorities that Rumania no longer existed as an independent state but was rather a part of the USSR and that they would not be permitted to go there. Then they escaped to China where they learned that Rumania did exist as a sovereign country; from China they were permitted to leave for Rumania. Till now I have been trying to establish contacts with these Rumanians in order to find out from them whether Raoul Wallenberg was still in that camp near Irkutsk in 1970; because the information contained in the above mentioned letter of the Hungarian describing that camp matches exactly what the three Rumanian officers told about it.

7. In 1977, I was visited in Israel by Mr. Mark Seidenberg of the USA, who told me the following: he learned about the Wrangel island and the concentration camps for foreigners located there from my Hearing on Soviet Forced-Labour Camps before the Committee on Internal Security of the US Senate in 1973; he got interested in the subject and started looking for and finally found a man who possessed all official legal documents proving that he owned some lands on Wrangel' island. As it turned out, Wrangel' island was discovered in the 18th century by the Americans and legally belongs to the American State of Alaska. Mr. Seidenberg found out that the Soviets occupied the island after the October revolution of 1917; they arrived there in 1926, arrested the entire American colony there and raised the Soviet flag. Having gotten all this information, Mr. Siedenberg bought the lands on Wrangel' island from their previous owners.

From the American CIA Mr. Seidenberg got a map of Wrangel' island made from a satellite. The map had been sanitized: the marks indicating Soviet camps on the island had been removed. I showed this map to Efim Moshinsky who immediately and without any hesitation pointed to Budhta Rodzjersa as to the place of location of the camps on Wrangel' island.

It is interesting to remind the reader that in 1945 the Soviets simply denied the very fact of Raoul Wallenberg's kidnapping by the KGB. Later, in 1958, former Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev admitted the fact and informed the Swedish authorities of Raoul Wallenberg's death in a Moscow prison in 1947. Some time later Swedish media published information released by a Soviet psychiatrist to a Swedish psychiatrist at a scientific congress. The Soviet psychiatrist said that Wallenberg had been in his psychiatric hospital as a prisoner, and the date mentioned by the Soviet doctor was much later than the date offered by Khrushchev as the date of Wallenberg's alleged death . . . while later the press informed the Swedish audience that the Soviet psychiatrist had died "of heart attack" in the USSR right after his information had been published in Sweden.

10. At the disposal of the Swedish government, as far as we know, there is a number of testimonies by former German POW's who returned from the USSR in 1956 and who had met R. Wallenberg after 1947 in various Soviet camps and prisons. One of these witnesses named the Vladimir prison as the place of his meeting with R. Wallenberg in 1959.

In 1979, continuing the search for additional information about the fate of R. Wallenberg, we came across former prisoner of Soviet camps and prisons A. Kalinskii who gave detailed testimony concerning his meeting with R. Wallenberg during their transportation from Verkhneuralsk prison to the prison of Vladimir in 1958 and concerning their consequent meetings in the Vladimir prison where they were simultaneously kept in 1959. A. Kalinskii's evidence coincides with that of the above mentioned German POW down to the smallest details, such as the number of Wallenberg's cell. Furthermore, in support of his evidence A. Kalinskii has presented absolutely authentic postcards of the International Red Cross mailed by him to his sister in Israel from the Vladimir prison; in one of these postcards it is written quite clearly that alongside him is kept "Swede who saved Jews".

11. In 1978, in Israel arrived a new witness whose name cannot be revealed at the moment because his family is still remaining in the USSR. The evidence given by this witness is kept in the Swedish embassy in Israel. It says that in 1977 the witness was present at a dinner-party at the place of a high-positioned KGB officer in Moscow, with whose son the witness was friendly. When everybody was drunk, the witness and his friend the son of the KGB officer started to discuss outloud the possibilities of an illegal escape from the USSR to which the KGB officer answered that if they only try to escape they will find themselves in the same place where a Swedish diplomat has been kept for over 30 years "by him". When the witness arrived in Israel and saw newspaper articles about R. Wallenberg's fate, he recalled the expression of the KGB officer and notified the Swedish embassy in Israel.

12. In early 1979, Dr. Anna Bilder residing in Israel was telephoned from Moscow by her father, Mr. Yan Kaplan. Shortly before that Mr. Kaplan had finished his three-year imprisonment and answering his daughter's question concerning his state of health he said that three years is a relatively small term and that he had seen, in the hospital of the Butyrskaya prison in Moscow, "a Swede who had already served over 30 years" and who felt quite well in spite of the long term. Following this conversation Mr. Kaplan tried to transfer to Israel a detailed letter describing his meeting with Raoul Wallenberg in 1975, but the letter was intercepted by the KGB and Yan Kaplan was immediately arrested again. A few months later his wife found a way to send a letter to her daughter wherein she is asking to save Yan Kaplan and says that his arrest is directly linked with his attempt to send a letter to the West describing his meeting with R. Wallenberg in 1975 in the hospital of the Butyrskaya prison.

Thus, the fact that the Soviet authorities have been lying about the death of Raoul Wallenberg has been proved. Now, the only way of pressure upon the USSR in order to obtain the release of Wallenberg can be an energetic campaign demanding that representatives of the Swedish government, the UN and international "Wallenberg rescue" committees be given an opportunity to talk with Yan Kaplan without Soviet representatives and get direct evidence from him. If such a demand (not a request) is initiated simultaneously by various sources and is supported by the international press, it may eventually result in the release of both Yan Kaplan and Raoul Wallenberg.

Requests have no influence upon the Soviet killers . . . January, 1980.●

PARTICIPANTS IN NATIONAL HISTORY DAY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, this week I was pleased to learn that a group of sixth grade students from Belle, Mo., won prizes and nationwide recognition as participants in National History Day. I take this opportunity to congratulate them for this distinct honor and well-deserved award.

Five girls attending Maries County R-2 Primary School won third place in the junior divison of group performance. Their accomplishment was particularly impressive, since they were the youngest students from the smallest school district to win. They competed against sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students. Awards were given to the top three finalists, with $1,000 for first place, $500 for second place, and $200 for third place.

Thirty-nine States and the District of Columbia entered participants. To qualify at the national level, the Maries County team accomplished the best of several hundred performances from students across Missouri. Nationally, each State had two teams advance in each category for both junior and senior divisions, 1,425 students in all. Of the 61 entries in group performance judged on Thursday, June 16, 1983, only 8 survived for the runoffs on Friday evening, June 17, 1983.

The theme for National History Day was Turning Points in History. The contestants acted out scenes which they felt best exemplified the topic. The girls from Maries County chose to play the roles of the suffragettes who convened at Akron, Ohio, during their fight to secure the right to vote for women. These events directly led to the passage of the 19th amendment to the Constitution.

The participants were Tara Cope, who played Jane Gray Swisshelm; Lyzbeth Taylor, who was Sojurner Truth; Julie Sassman, whose role was Emma Coe; Jeannie Spurling, who served as the narrator; and Jeannie Roher, who played the roles of Frances Gage and Susan B. Anthony. Maries County sixth grade teacher, Ann Edwards, coached the girls during the competition. For their efforts, the girls received a bronze medal and $40 each. One contestant concluded that the money "would just about bring her savings account back up to where it was before the trip to Washington, D.C."●

A TRIBUTE TO DR. KARL PLATH

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1983, Dr. Karl Plath will resign after 17 years as superintendent of Deerfield and Highland Park High Schools.

Throughout his distinguished career, Dr. Plath has devoted considerable time and energy to bettering the high schools of School District 113 by developing programs which have given students, staff, and other community members a greater opportunity to participate in the different phases of the educational process.

These accomplishments include initiating summer workshops for teachers and administrators to improve existing courses and develop new ones, formulating a staff development program, and adding student and teacher representatives to the board of education. Dr. Plath has also overseen additions to and remodeling of both high schools, encouraged community involvement in the schools through volunteers, advisory councils, and adult attendence of high school classes, as well as establishing the Lake County Area Vocational Center and developing the Northern Suburban Special Education District.

More than these accomplishments, the tenor of excellence and the obvious personal commitment to it that has characterized all that Dr. Plath has done in education in an area of our country known for quality public education is the real legacy he leaves to his profession. I first knew Dr. Plath at the beginning of his career when he was coaching football and teaching Evanston Township High School.

Throughout his exemplary career, I know of no person more highly respected for his dedication to making things better. No better inheritance to those who follow him could possibly be left. I commend to my colleagues in the Congress the record of outstanding accomplishment in public education of Dr. Karl Plath and honor and pay tribute to him on a job well done.●

SACRAMENTO JOB CORPS A SUCCESS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the House's attention the fact that few Federal job programs have had the record of success that the Job Corps has had since its inception in 1964.

This fact was reaffirmed for me recently as the Sacramento Job Corps Center is now celebrating its fifth year of service to the people of the Sacramento area. Since 1979, more than 4,000 students have enrolled at this facility.

This program has been cost effective and has provided involvement in a range of community projects for the center's students. The Sacramento Job Corps Center set a national record in 1982 by graduating 300 individuals with high school equivalency degrees.

Mr. Speaker, this program operates at a minimum expense to the taxpayers. It provides realistic and useful training and opportunities for thousands across the Nation every year and, ultimately, benefits our society far more than the dollar line in the Federal budget might suggest.

I wish to conclude my statement by congratulating the Sacramento Job Corps Center on their past service and extending to them best wishes for the future.●

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS BACKS VITAL ARTS LEGISLATION

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week the U.S. Conference of Mayors unanimously adopted a resolution which supports my legislation, the National Heritage Resource Act (H.R. 1285). The resolution was passed at the mayors' annual meeting in Denver, Colo., on June 15, 1983.

I am pleased that the U.S. Conference of Mayors has joined me in supporting this vital legislation which assists museums, libraries, and research institutions in acquiring manuscripts, personal papers, photographs, and works of art.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Whereas, prior to 1969, federal tax law made it possible for writers, artists, and scientists to make donations of their works to charitable organizations and to take deductions for those contributions that were equal to their fair market value; and

Whereas, in 1969, tax legislation was passed which limited those tax deductions for writers, artists, and scientists who were making donations of their works to charitable organizations to the cost of the materials used to produce the artistic property contributed to charity; and

Whereas, these reductions have sharply curtailed the amount of research materials available for scholarly activity; and

Whereas, our libraries and museums nationwide are experiencing a dramatic decline in acquisitions from the creators of art, literature, musical compositions, photography, and other works; and

Whereas, in these times of scarce economic resources, institutions of all types are unable to compete with other private purchasers, and institutional acquisitions budgets have been slashed; and

Whereas, the National Heritage Resource Act of 1983, introduced by Representative Thomas Downey, provides full fair market charitable contributions deductions for the creators of original works of arts, literary materials, musical manuscripts, photographs, and other materials; and

Whereas, this legislation has been recommended by the Presidential Task Force on the Arts and Humanities, appointed by President Ronald Reagan and passed the Senate Finance Committee in the 97th Congress, and is supported by a distinguished number of groups and individuals, including the Council of Creative Artists, Libraries and Museums; Dr. Daniel Boorstin, the Librarian of Congress; the American Library Association; the American Council on Education; the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities; the American Arts Alliance; the American Association of Museums; the Research Library Association; and the Committee on Art Law of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the U.S. Conference of Mayors fully supports the passage of the National Heritage Resource Act; and

Be it further resolved that the U.S. Conference of Mayors stands ready to assist national associations, universities, museums, scholars, and artists in their efforts to secure implementation of this legislation.●

WHO WILL STOP THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENT? THE IRANIAN GOVERNMENT IGNORES WORLD PLEAS TO DESIST FROM RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION OF THE BAHA'IS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, once again, this past weekend, the horror and inhumanity of religious persecution was perpetrated by the Government of Iran in the execution of 16 members of the Baha'i faith; 6 men and 10 women, some of them teenage girls, were hanged for the crime of refusing to recant their faith and convert to Islam. The executions occurred despite an appeal from President Reagan 1 month ago for clemancy for these falsely charged prisoners.

Most of the women who were hanged on Saturday were wives, mothers, or daughters of men executed Thursday. Included were both the wife and daughter of a businessman, the 54-year-old mother of a young male student who was hanged on June 16, the 18-year-old daughter of a man executed on March 12, and six young women in their teens or early twenties. All were hanged for no crime except that of adhering to a religion which practices peace and nonviolence, which accepts all religions as shared truth, and which does not permit political activity except for loyalty to one's government. The Baha'is look to world opinion for protection. Guided by the precepts of their religion, they cannot take up arms and resist these acts of persecution.

The Islamic regime has conducted an official campaign of religious persecution against the Baha'i community since coming to power 4 years ago. Baha'is have been singled out with a special vengeance. More than 150 Baha'is have been executed in Iran in this brief period, hundreds more injured. Thousands have been made homeless and unemployed because of their faith. Baha'i holy places and cemeteries have been desecrated and destroyed. Baha'i women have been subjected to unbelievable humiliation and degradation because their religion awards them equality. Equality for women is, of course, antithetical to Islamic belief.

Many voices have been raised in protest against this ongoing wave of religious persecution. The U.S. Congress, the European Parliament, the Parliaments of Canada, Great Britain, and Australia, as well as the U.N. Human Rights Commission and Amnesty International all have protested the atrocities against the Iranian Baha'i community. Iran's response to world opinion is to persecute and execute.

All nations must join in protest and joint efforts to prevent further slaughter of blameless Baha'i who are even now being held in Iranian prisons. All nations must hold Iran accountable to honor the commitment it made in the U.N. General Assembly in 1981 condemning religious intolerance.

We, too, are accountable. We have known in advance of the danger to these martyred lives. We must act now to save others, and not wait to react with words of outrage when it is too late.●

CONSUMER ATTITUDES TOWARD BUYING AN AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is correctly concerned about the state of our domestic automobile industry, which employs one out of every five American workers. When analyzing policy options and the reasons for a decline in domestic sales, we must necessarily include the attitudes, perceptions, and the experiences of auto consumers.

Unfortunately, the consumer end of the transaction is not always taken into consideration. This has been brought to light during the ongoing debate over the pending domestic content legislation for automobiles, H.R. 1234. You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make it drink. Similarly, we can provide incentives for consumers to purchase cars by lowering interest rates and restraining inflation, but ultimately it takes a willing buyer to complete a sale.

The Outlook section of the Washington Post for Sunday, June 19, 1983, contained a revealing personal account of a prospective auto purchaser by Joel Garreau, the editor of the Outlook section. Garreau traces his own attempt to purchase an American vehicle and the troubles he encountered.

The article points out that it is not possible to "buy American" simply by following the nameplate of the vehicle. This is the case because many vehicles are being designed overseas and only assembled, in whole or in part, in the United States. In addition, many American-designed and assembled vehicles contain substantial quantities of foreign-sourced components.

During the markup of H.R. 1234 in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute that would have mandated a program of domestic content disclosure to assist those who wish to intelligently "buy American." Specifically, the substitute would have required a label on each vehicle to disclose actual content percentages as well as an annual report on each manufacturer's fleet content ratio. This alternative to the domestic content performance requirements of H.R. 1234 would help consumers such as Mr. Garreau. Unfortunately, it was not adopted by the committee.

The article also highlighted the perceptions of consumers on the relative merits of foreign and domestic automobiles. At least by the writer's experience, he found the imported automobile and the import dealer to be more responsive to his preferences for service and vehicle performance, even though he started out in search of a domestic model. Whether Mr. Garreau's account is representative or not is immaterial. What is important is that his is not an isolated instance of a consumer's reaction to the choices, or lack thereof, facing potential car buyers today.

Next to real estate, a car is the most expensive purchase an individual makes in the marketplace. Therefore, the interests of consumers should be paramount in the formulation of an auto recovery policy. We could try to legislate the competition away, as H.R. 1234 attempts to do, or we can help make our own industry more competitive. The latter course is best for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the Garreau article entitled "Would You Buy an American Car From These Salesmen?" at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1983]

WOULD YOU BUY AN AMERICAN CAR FROM THESE SALESMEN?

(By Joel Garreau)

I tried, America. I worked at it for more than a year. I'd bought American cars for the last decade and a half, and I had no intention of stopping now, when the economy really needed my money. I figured it was going to be taken out of my pocket one way or another. If I didn't spend it on an American car, I'd just pay for it in food stamps to former UAW members. But nobody could quite bring themselves to sell me an American car.

A recent windfall allowed me the luxury of looking for something a trifle sexy.

The first thing I tried to buy was the Chrysler convertible, shortly after they came out. The first thing the salesman would not let me do is drive it. Not around the block, not around the parking lot, not at all. I guess they didn't want me to experience wind in my hair and admiring glances from passersby. I might have whipped out my checkbook right then and done something crazy. No, instead they stuffed me into a family sedan that they claimed was comparable.

In the confines of this mom-and-pop-mobile, without the distractions of being able to see the sky, a few flaws in the K car started looming large. Such as the thing cornering like a four-poster bed. I wanted a little excitement in my life, but not the kind caused by feeling I was taking my life in my hands around a 30-mile-an-hour corner.

Then I noticed that the undercoating that I didn't want anyway had been so liberally applied to the cars in the showroom that there was black tar splashed all around the rocker panels. The screws holding down the top were rusted. The convertible functionally had no back seat. The engine was a Mitsubishi. An additional $4,000 worth of profit had cheerfully been added to the car, bringing it over $15,000, take it or leave it, no deals.

I didn't need this. Several months later Chrysler was up to its keister in unsold convertibles. The price came down to $11,000. I was not surprised. I was also not tempted. This is not the only car in America. I decided to take Lee Iaccoca's advice—find a better car and buy it: a Chevy.

I went and looked at Camaros. I started asking technical questions, but I did not get technical answers. In fact, I had tremendous trouble getting a salesman to talk to me. The distinct impression I got was that people asking questions were automatically labeled tirekickers—people who have nothing better to do than waste the time of salesmen who did not have a single other customer.

Such grunts as I was able to elicit indicated that the salesman had not had enough initiative to learn as much about the car as he could have with a casual glance at Car and Driver or Road & Track. He seemed bored.

And again, they wouldn't let me drive the car. I liked the car. I pressed. Okay, they said, make an appointment for next Tuesday night. We'll probably be able to find a car to let you drive.

I came back. They handed me the keys. I asked where the nearest winding road was. They said, "Oh! We're not going to let you take it out of the parking lot. What do you think this is?" I'm leaving, I said. Good-bye, they calmly said, walking back into the showroom devoid of customers.

At this point, I was getting a little steamed. I wasn't crazy about the lack of amenities in the 114,000-mile 1978 Mustang that I was driving, but it had been a decent car. There had been public announcements that the Mustang convertible was about to be introduced. I'll stick with Ford, damn it, I said.

Went to the Ford dealerships. Yup, coming out within weeks they said. this was last June. It was also last September, last November, last December and last February. But I'm no fair-weather patriot. I was willing to wait to get the opportunity to buy American. In March I got the call from one of the many Ford salesmen with whom I had left my card. Convertibles are in. Be right over, I said.

Looked good. After debate with two salesmen and the senior manager, it was agreed that I could drive the car—a little. All right, I said. Let's get the top down. You see what's coming: the tonneau cover that would not stay on, the clamps that wouldn't lock, the glass rear window that weighs so much and requires such a contorted position to install that it is almost physically impossible to deal with.

This thing did have a back seat that would hold one person, not comfortably. It didn't have much trunk. Yet the wind felt good. Pretty girls smiled at me. I reached for my checkbook. Okay, how much? Over $16,000, I was told, and you certainly can't have this one. Somebody ordered this one months ago. We can put you on the waiting list.

I was not deterred. As long as I'm on a waiting list, I said, special order it so I can pay for only the options I want. We sat down. It took a crowd to figure out what options were available on the convertible. But we worked something out. Okay, I said, I'm finally going to get a car, and in only two to three months!

I went home and told my wife the good news. She said, let me see if I've got this straight. You're going to pay $14,400 for an $8,000 car that doesn't include an air-conditioner or a radio?

What do women know about cars? I went into work Monday and told my fellow car-enthusiast on the financial staff the good news. He said, you're going to pay $14,400 for an $8,000 car that doesn't include an air-conditioner or a radio?

Guys who write financial news are really smart, I thought to myself. I called Ford back. Sorry, I said, but that's just too much money. I'm going to buy a Pontiac.

I liked the Firebird a lot. It was 1,000 pounds overweight compared to other cars in its class, which meant a four-cyclinder engine was out of the question. But I could live with a six. It probably couldn't get any worse than 22 miles a gallon, and what the heck, gas is only a buck and a quarter. It didn't have any head room, but the special suspension will keep my head from hitting too hard on the roof. To get the sunroof open, you can't just hit a button. You stop the car, get out, lift two heavy panels off the roof and store them in the not-too-spacious trunk. But with the T-bar open, at least you have room for your head.

And I really, really liked the optional Lear seats. Lots of lateral support. Six different adjustments from lumbar to thigh areas. Very functional and comfortable, given that I spend a lot of time in the car.

They wouldn't let me drive the Firebird out of the parking lot, either, but I now understood that that was an unreasonable request on my part. I at least got to like first gear driving from the showroom to the fence. Besides, I was getting desperate. I was running out of Detroit brands.

Went home. Studied the information packet. Waited for a Saturday that wasn't pouring rain to go back and buy the Firebird. That took until weekend before last. This time I was so determined to buy I brought my wife. We walked in the door of the dealership and took out our checkbook. The salesman was not supercilious. He just said they didn't have anything with the good seats in stock. We were again willing to wait for a special order. The salesman wrote it up, took it to the manager for a price, and I got out my pen.

By this time I should have known things were going too smoothly. The manager and the salesman come back with long faces. We can't sell you the car, they told me. Special orders were shut off May 23. We won't know what the prices will be on an 1984 until late in the summer. Even if we did, you wouldn't get it until late September. There's noth.ng like what you want anywhere for 300 miles. There is simply no car to sell you.

Stunned and dejected, I trailed my wife back to the old car, kicking the pavement. My eyes were so studiously downcast I didn't realize I had followed her all the way across the parking lot. That's where the Honda place was that is part of the very same car dealership. She was staring at a new Prelude.

It wasn't American. I wasn't interested. I turned to go and bumped into a salesman, whose very first words, before introducing himself, were, "Want to drive it?"

Did I hear right? Was this car salesman asking me if I wanted to drive a car?

I didn't have time to collect my thoughts. A ring of shiny black objects were acing toward my chest. I caught them reflexively. They were car keys.

In a daze, I turned around and looked at the Prelude for the first time. Nah, I said, I don't want it. Automatic transmission.

The salesman handed me a different set of keys. "The five-speed's over there."

My wife was trying to wipe the pleading look off her face. "It's going to be your car," she said, resolutely.

I looked at the Prelude. I tried to clear my mind of everything terrific I'd read about it. Well, I rationalized, after a year of shopping, I could at least treat myself to one ride in somebody's new car. "For the best winding roads, take a right and head straight," said the salesman, unprompted.

The Prelude smoked out of the dealership. "Oooh," I tried to prevent myself from saying out loud. Through some S-curves, the car squatted, pointing itself exactly where it should go, clutching me in its standard-equipment high-support seats, so much like the ones I longed for in my Pontiac.

I won't dwell on the power sunroof and the four-speaker digital-readout stereo and the owner's manual that recommends against taking the Prelude over 80 miles per hour in third with two more gears to go. Nor will I dwell on the fact that with all these goodies and a hefty, unconcealed dealer profit, it's the same roughly $11,000 as the less-fancy Firebird nobody would sell me.

I will draw three meager pieces of solace: I'm buying from a kind-of American company. Honda has started building Accords in Ohio. I know. This is a Prelude. I'm reaching for comfort where I can.

I discovered to my relief that there are cars that America is building with which I could have fallen in love, had someone given me half a chance.

There is still at least one American in the Washington area who knew how to actively sell me a car. He may have learned his attitude from Japanese management. But he learned it.

There may be hope for us yet.●

MARY AND JOSEPH EVANS WINNERS OF THE STANLEY PIEKARZ MINUTEMAN OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 24, Mary and Joseph Evans will be awarded the Stanley Piekarz Minuteman of the Year Award. The Piekarz Minuteman Award goes to the person or persons whose performance and dedication to a cause demonstrate the honored traits and qualities that best serve the needs of the country, State, and community.

The hard work and leadership that brings this award to Mary and Joseph has been crucial in their efforts to make the West Elsdon community on Chicago's Southwest side a clean and safe place to live. The Evans were instrumental in mounting a fight against the Meyer Steel Drum Co. Meyer manufactures steel drums, and since December 1980, the noise and pollution of steel drum manufacture have angered the Evans and other residents in the neighborhood.

Along with 23d Ward Alderman William F. Krystyniak, the Evans led a neighborhood group in a fight against Meyer. The group's actions led to the issuance of 13 pollution citations by Chicago's environmental protection agency. The Evans will be going to court throughout July and August for each of the citations, working to see that Meyer is eventually moved and peace is restored to their community.

The tireless efforts and willingness of the Evans to be active participants in the community is an inspiration to all who know them. I will be proud to award the Stanley Piekarz Minuteman of the Year Award this Friday to Mary and Joseph Evans.●

A SHOT HEARD 'ROUND THE WORLD

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I brought to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work of Robert and John Gianetti. These two men are architectural sculptors and have been responsible for the restoration of some of the most historic mansions in the Washington metropolitan area. Most recently they have also found themselves responsible for providing the fodder for one of the most humorous gags of this administration; perpetrated on our Secretary of the Interior James Watt.

I refer, of course, to the now famous (infamous?) plaster foot, fully complete with bullet hole, that President Reagan presented to Secretary Watt after his gaff about the Beach Boys.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article that appeared recently in the Washington Post about these two fine arts craftsmen.

SCULPTOR GETS PLASTER FOOT IN THE DOOR

(By Michael Kernan)

It was James Watt's foot that made the Giannettis famous.

Here they'd been architectural sculptors in Washington for decades, and their father before them, doing fancy plaster work on the Capitol, the White House and all over. For more than a year they've been renovating the Renwick Gallery, a five-year project that they say will cost $15 million to $20 million.

And then the White House staff orders a plaster foot with a hole in it for a gag on President Reagan. But Reagan turns it over to Watt, and the whole country laughs, and Giannetti's Studios is suddenly on the map.

"It's funny how things work out," says John Giannetti, 42. Last year, when he ran for the Maryland legislature, he thought about getting some incidental publicity on the Renwick job but decided not to. Now, as he finishes the very last plaster mold on the facade, the press shows up. The Renwick's sandstone exterior features are melting away, and Giannetti is making molds of every lintel, corbel, molding, medallion, pilaster, keystone and cornerstone on the entire building: everything but the bricks.

The stonework will all be restored to mint condition and reproduced exactly in precast architectural concrete by a Pennsylvania firm. It may be another three years before all the pieces are replaced.

"Those corbels [the little stone ends that stick out under the eaves] go all the way through to the inside wall," Giannetti said. "It's an enormous job. But the pollution was really destroying this sandstone. You can crumble it with your finger." He gazed up at the venerable landmark. "You know, sometimes, working up there, we'd feel a presence. Someone watching us. Those early stonecutters."

The studio in Brentwood, Md., just over the District line, is cluttered with plaster models of all these pieces, including two 18-foot free-standing fluted columns in sections. The last bit, the large medallion keystone over the Pennsylvania Avenue entrance, was cast in rubber and plaster by Michael Pathlak, a Russian-Jewish emigre who learned his trade in Kiev.

"We've seen a lot of action on this corner," Giannetti says. "ERA demonstrations, ambassadors at Blair House next door, the president going by. Sometimes we'd have to get down from the scaffolding. The Secret Service would come by and call us: They already knew all our names."

The sculptor and his brother Robert grew up in the plaster business here with their father, the late George Giannetti, who came over from Italy in 1910 at the age of 14. They worked on the Capitol's east facade and interiors, Mount Vernon, Ford's Theatre, the Kenmore House ceiling ("one of the most beautiful in America") and the press office moldings in the Nixon White House, not to mention fancy ceilings in Potomac, McLean and so on. Their father sculpted many of the executive seals around town, including a 16-footer on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. building.

As for the foot: No, it wasn't anybody's foot in particular. "They ordered it six weeks ago—with the hole. We did it in Fiberglas. My brother sculpted it in clay in a couple hours. We couldn't talk about it because it was a big secret at the time."

He smiles with the amused tolerance one would expect of a man who has spent 18 months working across from the White House.●

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED MEDICARE CUTS

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue which this Congress must face before the end of the decade: Medicare funding and reforms. Policy analysts inside and out of Government predict that by the end of this decade the medicare fund will be broke. I hope that we do not wait until the last minute to address the serious problems which we know exist today. The political process is not well served by last-minute legislating; it is my hope that we begin discussing the issue in order to prepare for legislative action that will insure adequate medical protection for our elderly citizens.

As we begin to consider reforms in medicare to insure its solvency, let us not forget the origin of the program. Medicare was enacted in 1965 to provide health services to elderly and disabled Americans. Today, the medicare program serves nearly 30 million people. Despite the millions of dollars spent on health costs by medicare, the program only covers about 40 percent of the elderly's health costs. In addition, medicare does not cover outpatient prescription drugs, eyeglasses, hearing aids, dentures, and preventive care.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the elderly of our country need this program as much today as they needed it when the program was first instituted 18 years ago. Today, over 15 percent of the elderly of our country have incomes below the poverty level, and over 25 percent are living on just 125 percent of the poverty income level. Nevertheless, the President has cut billions of dollars from medicare in his 2 years in office. And the administration has proposed an additional $1.9 billion cut in fiscal year 1984.

In addition, the administration plans dramatic changes in the medicare regulations which will push medicare coverage out of reach of the average elderly person. These changes corrupt the original purpose of the medicare program, to provide medical coverage to elderly Americans. Clearly, medicare needs some reform. We should not, however, abandon the very Americans the program was intended to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I think we should not lose sight of an important feature of medicare: Medicare benefits are as much social security as the monthly pension benefit. If medicare deductibles and copayments as well as premiums charges are increased by 153 percent by 1988, as the administration plans, this will have the same effect as cutting benefit checks by the same amount. This Congress would not stand for cutting benefit checks. But if we sit back and allow the administration to have its way by rewriting the copayment and medicare deductible regulations, we will be taking the money right out of the monthly benefit checks just as a thief would steal it out of a mailbox.

In conclusion, I want to remind my colleagues that medicare is title XVIII of the Social Security Act. This Congress took courageous and bipartisan steps to insure the solvency of the old age survivors trust fund without breaking our promise to the retired citizens of our country. I urge my colleagues to examine closely the medicare system and to take the same courageous action in solving the oncoming medicare problem—without breaking our promise to the elderly of our country needing health care.●

BANKRUPTCY OF AN EMPIRE

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, the American people witnessed the failure of Congress to exhibit the will to make the hard decisions necessary to halt the hemorrhaging of the Federal budget. My colleagues will send to the President a series of spending bills which will "buy" particular constituencies across the country at the expense of the common good.

Frustrated, some of us, plod along hopeful that the executive check on the Congress actions will lessen the blow of these spending decisions. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I join the editorial staff of the Wall Street Journal in expressing hope that the President will make the hard decisions that this Congress could not. I submit the following editorial to my colleagues because I believe, unless changed, the current dismal practice of irresponsible spending with total disregard for the source of financing will be devastating:

BANKRUPTCY OF AN EMPIRE

There is a good chance that over the next four weeks Congress and Ronald Reagan are going to provide a most fascinating political spectacle. Congress has begun to pitch the president a series of budget-busting appropriations bills, and Mr. Reagan is said to be limbering up his veto bat to swat them.

On one level, we'll be watching a struggle between a Congress no longer capable of controlling federal spending and a president who refuses to give Congress the additional taxes it wants. One of the recurring motifs will be that the president, crazed and blinded with ideology, is refusing to behave in a pragmatic and bipartisan spirit.

But if you'll step back a bit from this entertaining showdown, we think what you'll see is the intellectual bankruptcy of the political empire Congress has built for itself, year by year, since the early 1970s. Congress didn't win all of the spending battles during the Nixon, Ford and Carter years, but in disbursing a total of $3.6 trillion, it still managed to create a giant system of financial and political dependency that lumbers toward ever-greater excesses.

Consider a few highlights of the constituency building record. In 1971, Congress passed a 10% across-the-board hike in Social Security benefits, and expanded federal assistance for training doctors and health professionals. In 1972, Congress increased pensions for 900,000 members of a nearly bankrupt railroad pension system, authorized a federal takeover of the federal-state welfare system for the aged, blind and disabled, liberalized eligibility requirements for black-lung benefits and increased Social Security benefits 20% and double indexed them to inflation.

In 1973, Social Security benefits were increased an additional 11%; Congress also increased contributions to health-insurance programs for federal employees, indexed payments for the school-lunch program to food prices and mandated twice yearly inflation adjustments for food stamps.

In the following year it created an office of juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, the National Institute for Aging, the Legal Services Corp., programs for solar and geothermal energy, a six-year and $12 billion aid-to-mass-transit bill and a $25 billion appropriation over four years for education. In 1975, unemployment compensation was extended to 65 weeks, and $1.4 billion was appropriated for family planning and community mental-health centers.

We'll skip 1976 so we can get to the year Tip O'Neill became House speaker. His 1977 Congress put out $12.5 billion for "neighborhood revitalization." Food stamps became free, with an estimated four-year cost budgeted at $24.4 billion. In 1978, Congress rested, but did expand financial assistance for students from middle-income families. In 1979, teachers got the Department of Education, and Congress expanded support for a network of regional and state health-planning agencies and raised the federal contribution to state welfare costs by $900 million a year. The 1980 session gave fitful birth to the $1.6 billion toxic-waste "superfund." In November, voters elected Ronald Reagan.

From the perspective of men and women who had to give people reason to support them every two years, it was quite a performance. Broad classes of citizens came to depend on the budgetary distributions of Washington's philanthropes. Other groups, by now fully politicized, turned to Washington for a similar share in the benevolence. Local and state governments benefited either directly or insofar as Washington diverted citizens' claims on their own budgets.

So now we're in for the great budget battle of '83, or at least we can hope so. No matter who says what about whom in the coming weeks, we suggest you keep an eye fixed on one figure—the House Democrats' $863 billion budget. With Mr. Reagan's budget at $842 billion, the Democrats are further away from anything a president has proposed in recent memory. And with no reasonable expectation of using the budget to colonize more segments of American society, the Democrats have simply got to have that money to keep their existing constituencies responsive.

And up to now, they've succeeded mightily. Amid all the wailing over Mr. Reagan's gutting of the safety net, outlays for income-transfer programs from 1980 to 1983 went from $283 billion to a whopping $408 billion.

It has become too embarrassing to try to defend this grand bean feast before the American people so no one tries. Congress has become spending dependent, in need of larger and larger fixes to ensure continued incumbency. Shock treament is in order and we hope the president has the gumption to administer it.●

FIRST NATIONAL THEATER WEEK

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, last year during this month the first National Theater Week was proclaimed by the Senate and House of Representatives. National Theater Week recognized the strength and vitality of the theaters in America, and urged our citizens to assist the efforts of the theaters throughout our country.

It is now, on this first anniversary of that historic bill, that I ask my fellow colleagues to support our theatrical institutions. They are a crucial part of our American heritage, and it is in our Nation's interest to support their efforts.

As the late Congressman Phillip Burton said:

> This is our National Theater Week . . . let us feel privileged to celebrate it.●

THE PASSENGER CAP AT NATIONAL AIRPORT IS NOT EQUITABLE

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 3329 transportation appropriations for fiscal year 1984. At that time, I understand, an amendment will be offered to delete the language which would prohibit the use of funds for either lowering the existing passenger cap or reducing the number of air carrier flights. In other words, the bill as reported to the floor would stop the FAA from implementing its proposal; the amendment to be offered would allow the FAA to go forward with its plan. I intend to oppose such an amendment, although I would prefer that the prohibition of any change in the existing policy be in some other form than that of a spending prohibition in an appropriations bill.

Let me say at the outset that I fully support the development of a rational and balanced airports policy for our region. To that end, I applaud the efforts of all parties to enlarge the scope of Dulles Airport; it would please me immensely if a large portion of passenger traffic at National were redirected to Dulles or BWI. Unfortunately, I see little hope of achieving an equitable redistribution in the FAA's proposal to reduce the passenger cap from 16 million to 14.8 million persons. I say equitable, because I cannot support administrative or legislative efforts to redefine air service in the Washington metropolitan area which would have the effect of eliminating short-haul jet service between the Hampton Roads, Va., area and Washington, D.C. I would point out that a substantial number of my constituents utilize National Airport for 1-day business trips to Washington, but I am certain that they would opt for ground transportation, albeit less convenient, were they unable to utilize National. It is inconceivable to me that frequent users of the Washington/Norfolk corridor would elect a 2-hour, round-trip ride from downtown Washington to Dulles when the driving time to Norfolk is approximately 3½ hours.

Permit me to quote from a recent letter from Kenneth R. Scott, executive director of the Norfolk Port and Industrial Authority, Norfolk International Airport:

> Our primary concern regarding operational restrictions at Washington National Airport relate to the adverse impact such controls would have on air service in short-haul markets such as Norfolk-Washington. We remain extremely puzzled as to how proponents of the "passenger cap" at Washington National Airport will, in fact, achieve what we understand is the ultimate goal of transferring passenger activity to Dulles International Airport. It remains our assessment that the passenger cap and other unrealistic operating controls at Washington National Airport that do not take into account distance will not achieve the goal of transferring passenger activity to Dulles. A restriction on the number of flights and/or passengers that can be handled at Washington National Airport will, in our opinion, only force the carriers to drop the short-haul markets and emphasize the more lucrative long-haul markets into Washington National Airport. The original intent of Dulles and the current objective for that airport is to attract long-haul markets. But with the FAA's continued encouragement of long-haul flights to Washington National, we remain confused as to the ultimate objective in regard to Washington National Airport.
>
> It remains our thinking that the Federal Aviation Administration, as Operator of Washington National Airport and Dulles, needs to develop and implement an innovative plan that would control the activity at Washington National and "force" the long-haul service and increased activity to Dulles. We feel that this can best be done by somehow "forcing" Washington National Airport into a restricted short-haul market. While we certainly do not consider ourselves experts in all the details and ramifications of how such a plan can be developed and implemented, we do feel that efforts to restrict Washington National Airport to the short-haul markets is the most feasible approach. For example, we feel further consideration should be given to restricting nonstop air service to/from Washington National to approximately 500 miles. Another thought, the implementation of which is difficult to perceive, relates to somehow prohibiting or discouraging "connecting flights" via Washington National Airport. In other words, if there was some way of restricting the use of Washington National to origination and destination passengers only it would help maintain the "passenger cap" which the FAA is suggesting as a solution to Washington National's problem. Norfolk's passengers, for example, frequently use Washington National as a connecting hub and thus add to the passenger cap for Washington National Airport when, in fact, that passenger is not going to Washington but rather is using Washington to get to their final destination.

I believe that Mr. Scott's concerns and suggestions are cogent, reasonable, and of considerable merit, and accordingly I have brought them to the attention of Secretary Dole in the hope they will be considered during ongoing FAA deliberations.

In the meantime, however, I feel constrained to oppose any attempt to lower the existing gap. I believe that the reservations expressed by Mr. Scott are shared not only by me but by a number of my colleagues, particularly those in the East whose districts are served by short-haul flights to Washington National, and I feel certain that they will join those of us who oppose the anticipated amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me the opportunity to share my views, and those of Mr. Scott, with my colleagues in this way.●

A DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1983, the 25th annual Puerto Rican Day Parade took place on New York City. One of the parade committee officials was the Honorable Felipe N. Torres, a retired New York City judge. Judge Torres was born and educated in Puerto Rico, and attended City College and Fordham University Law School. He was a member of the New York State Assembly from 1953 to 1962, and a family court judge from 1963 to 1968. As the patriarch of the "Exemplary Family of the Year," Judge Torres deserves special recognition as a distinguished citizen of his community, as indicated in the following article from the New York Daily News.

TODAY, IT'S NUEVA YORK

The Puerto Rican Day Parade, a New York City tradition that celebrates its 25th anniversary this year, steps up Fifth Ave. to a salsa beat at noon today under the promise of a blue San Juan sky and a golden Caribbean sun.

Many thousands of marchers are scheduled to parade past many hundreds of thousands of spectators lining the avenue from 44th St. to 86th St., where the line of march turns east toward its terminus at Third Ave.

Along the way, if past years are any guide, there will be acres of Puerto Rican flags, galaxies of "Kiss Me I'm Puerto Rican" buttons and an assortment of homemade island-style snacks for sale by street vendors.

And, of course, there will be the other ingredient without which no New York City parade would be complete—gaggles of city, state and federal elected officials making themselves visible to the potential voters along the way, and politely elbowing each other out of the way when the news cameras come around.

There will be plenty of parade committee officials, but the No. 1 dignitary of the day should be the Honorable Felipe N. Torres, 86, a retired judge and patriarch of the "Exemplary Family of the Year."

Torres, who was born in Puerto Rico and attended schools in Ponce, P.R., earned a B.S. degree from City College and a law degree from Fordham University Law School. He want on to become a member of the State Assembly (1953-62) and a Family Court judge (1963-68).

THE DEUBLIN CO. OF NORTHBROOK, ILL., COMPETING SUCCESSFULLY IN JAPANESE MARKET

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, many have reacted in panic lately, to the claim that "Made in Japan" has supplanted "Made in America" as the symbol of quality and durability. Many look to the Federal Government for relief, calling for legislation to protect failing domestic industries from foreign competitors. Others, however, know that America has not lost its capability to recapture international markets. They remember that the Japanese have learned their most valuable lessons from America, and concentrate on rediscovering our own means of success.

A firm in my district, the Deublin Co. of Northbrook, Ill., can show many ailing firms in our country that they still possess the means to succeed on their own without looking in vain to the same Federal Government which has stifled so much of our productive power in recent years.

An article describing their success which appeared in the New York Times follows:

[From the New York Times, May 30, 1983]

SELLING TO JAPANESE INDUSTRY; A STEEL GIANT PREFERS PARTS MADE IN UNITED STATES

(By Steve Lohr)

FUKUYAMA, JAPAN.— Certain types of foreign products fare much better in Japan than others. Those most likely to win out are well-known brands that give a consumer the cachet of membership in the international community.

Manufactured items sold to large industrial corporations, on the other hand, have a more difficult time in Japan. To succeed, such products must pass through a labyrinth of distributors who have decades-old personal ties with domestic suppliers. A further obstacle is that the competing Japanese supplier is frequently a member of the purchaser's Keiretsu, or business group, with one company having a direct stake in the health of the other.

It often seems, therefore, that Japan's message to foreign businesses is: Give us your McDonald's, your Mercedes-Benz, your Johnnie Walker, but we'll make our own widgets, thank you.

A MAMMOTH STEEL FACILITY

Nonetheless, some overseas companies do manage to sell to Japanese industrial customers, and some even occasionally displace a domestic rival to do so.

One such success story is found here, 370 miles southwest of Tokyo, at the Fukuyama works of Nippon Kokan K.K., Japan's second-largest steelmaker. The mammoth Fukuyama plant, with a production capacity of 16 million tons a year, is said to be the biggest integrated steel mill in the world.

In the last few years the Deublin Company, a small concern with headquarters in Northbrook, Ill., has unseated domestic suppliers to sell its specialized parts to Nippon Kokan.

Deublin, a privately owned company with yearly revenues of about $15 million, makes rotating unions. These are essentially stubby, hollow axles. Air, water or hydraulic fluids pass through them, aiding heating and cooling in a variety of industrial processes.

The key part of a rotating union is a seal of two disk-like surfaces, machined so flat that there is no air between them and held together by atmospheric pressure. This lets one side of the union rotate, while the other remains stationary, with little friction at very high temperatures and under extreme pressure.

Deublin, founded in 1945, makes rotating unions and nothing else. It says it is the world's largest producer as well as the leader in quality.

"We're the Rolls-Royce of the industry," said Del Reisner, Deublin's chief engineer, who was in Fukuyama to call on Nippon Kokan.

The product, Mr. Reisner explained, is actually relatively simple to make. But the edge Deublin has over competitors, in his view, is superior design and quality that is the result of "a lot of little things that you learn only with years and years of experience."

At Deublin, that experience has stayed in Northbrook, Ill. "We've got a lot of lifers," Mr. Reisner said, "so we haven't lost our know-how to other companies." Mr. Reisner himself is 42 years old and has been at Deublin for 24 years.

Deublin gets about one-third of its sales in overseas markets. Since the mid-1960's, it has had a representative in Japan. But by the late 1970's, the company decided that, as Mr. Reisner put it, "We didn't have anywhere near as much of the Japanese market as we should have."

SUBSIDIARY FORMED IN JAPAN

So in 1978 Deublin hired Katashi Uemura, a former trading company official familiar with Deublin's product, and established a Japanese subsidiary, the Nippon-Deublin Company, in Osaka. Having a full-time Japanese staff, born and bred in the nation's business culture, is "absolutely indispensable" if a foreign company is to do well here, Mr. Reisner said.

Since 1978, Deublin's sales in Japan have multiplied 25 times, to an expected $1.3 million in 1983 at present exchange rates. Though it sells to other Japanese companies, too, Deublin's success at Nippon Kokan accounts for a big share of the increase.

The advantages of Deublin's product over those made by Japanese suppliers seem clear-cut. The American company's rotating unions cost about twice as much (up to $362 apiece), but they last three or for our times as long.

COSTLY ROLLERS LAST LONGER

That extra endurance is particularly valuable to steelmakers since the rollers to which the unions are attached cost from $4,260 to $6,380 each.

But winning acceptance for Deublin's products took time. "All Japanese steel companies have special relations with their suppliers," said Mr. Uemura, managing director of Nippon Deublin. "It's very difficult to overcome that."

Mr. Uemura made his approach directly to the engineers in Nippon Kokan's maintenance department rather than trying to go through the steel company's distributors. He figured correctly that the engineers would become advocates for Deublin's rotating unions if they could see how they worked.

In 1979 Nippon Kokan agreed to test four of the Deublin devices for a month, and they outperformed Japanese-made parts. Today Nippon Kokan has more than 1,000 Deublin rotating unions in use.●

STOP THE SPACE ARMS RACE

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a June 20, 1983, article in the New York Times by Flora Lewis on the increasingly dangerous space arms race.

It is absolutely essential that the United States and the Soviet Union resume negotiations to stop the arms race in space before it escalates out of control.

COMING: SPACE WAR?

(By Flora Lewis)

PARIS, June 19.—A little noticed passage in the generally tough speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko last week contains what may be a crucial new arms control offer.

He said the Soviet Union was willing not only to ban weapons in space but to agree on banning the use of force in or from space. The initial White House response—affirming of U.S. interest in discussing the implications of space-based defense against nuclear ballistic missiles—seems to have missed this vital distinction. A ban on the use of force in or from space would head off the imminent leap in the arms race to deployment of antisatellite weapons.

It is a minute to midnight in this contest, not, as with laser weapons, a generation away. The Soviets have already tested a satellite killer. The U.S. plans a test this fall.

A panel of U.S. scientists with extensive experience in defense judged the Soviet weapon "a cumbersome and inflexible system in comparison to the mobile, F-15-based U.S. system."

Sponsored by the Union of Concerned Scientists, the panel proposed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 18 a draft treaty to block both sides from this dangerous plunge into the first phase of star wars.

It deserves urgent attention. Moscow has already tabled a treaty at the U.N. but it is quite inadequate from the American view, prohibiting only "weapons in orbit." A series of U.S.-Soviet talks was launched during the Carter Administration. But they broke down after the invasion of Afghanistan, just as the negotiations were getting to the core issues.

Since then, both sides have pushed ahead with development. As Thomas Karas points out in a lucid, extremely informative book called "The New High Ground," space has been militarized for 25 years. So far, however, it contains only electronic eyes and ears to serve ground-based weapons. Antisatellite systems (ASAT's) are certain to be the first arms in space if they are not forestalled by mutual agreement.

An argument has been raging in the Pentagon, the Congress, and among scientists for years on whether these would be good or bad for the U.S. Those who think they would be good talk of the need to "share the military competition" with the Soviets. They argue that nuclear weapons inhibit the use of American force on earth causing a "creeping paralysis of will . . . to defend ourselves or our interests." They consider space safer for war.

The quote is from a 1981 study by Lieut. Col. Barry Watts and Maj. Lance Lord, now officers of the Air Force Space Command. It is reported in the Karas book. The book also cities Brig. Gen. Ralph Jacobson telling a House subcommittee in 1981 that "the U.S. has a legitimate need for an ASAT capacity to remove the current sanctuary status the Soviets enjoy in space."

Those who think this is a mindless risk, which could be as irreversible as nucleasr weapons themselves, point out that the U.S. also enjoys such "sanctuary status." It is a great deal more dependent on its satellites for defense than the Russians with their vast continental communications.

In military pariance, satellites are very "soft," vulnerable to attack in all kinds of ways that would be relatively cheap to mount. U.S. atomic tests in the 1950's showed, unexpectedly, that they could practically all be disabled by a big nuclear burst in space. But that would ruin both "friendly" and "hostile" sky monitors. So the focus is on selective weapons.

Successful ASAT's could paralyze the strategic defense of either country without ever touching a missile. Therefore, once they are available, there would be a terrible temptation to suspect deliberate attack and retaliate on earth if important satellites went dead without explanation. That increases the danger of nuclear war by accident.

The U.S. is confident that it is now ahead in the relevant technology. But the scientists opposed to ASAT's are convinced the Russians could catch up.

There are measures which could be taken to strengthen the defense of key satellites. But they would be costly, uncertain, and risk being leap-frogged by fairly simple new offensive measures. The only way to stop a new spiral would be to agree on banning ASAT's now.

If the U.S. tests successfully now, the Russians undoubtedly would not rest until they improved their weapon, and then it would be too late for a really verifiable treaty.

The central provision in the American scientists' draft is: "No weapon that can destroy, damage, render inoperable, or change the flight trajectory of space objects can be tested in space, or against space objects." Mr. Gromyko's speech appeared to signal readiness to accept this prohibition.

If President Reagan is serious about arms control, which the Scowcroft commission said the U.S. must be, he should offer a test moratorium and offer immediate talks, not just on antimissile defense technologies, but on ASAT's as well. The draft treaty is an excellent start. As Mr. Karas says, "We can't hope to make the earth safe from warfare by moving combat into space. Military systems in space are designed to produce military advantages on the ground."●

TRIBUTE TO WALTER M. SNYDER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor an outstanding citizen from my district, Dr. Walter M. Snyder. Dr. Synder will be retiring as director of personnel for the Baltimore County Schools on June 30, 1983, after 25 years of service. His commitment to education dates back to 1950 when he began teaching at Dundalk Senior High School. He is a highly respected member of the Maryland educational community, and affectionately referred to as the dean of personnel directors.

His commitment to serving the community extends far beyond education. Dr. Synder served with the U.S. Field Artillery during World War II and was held as a prisoner of war. Also he recently received a citation from Mayor William Schaefer of Baltimore for his activity and contributions as a patron of the arts.

I am sure my colleagues join me in warmly thanking Dr. Walter Snyder for his service to the students and staff of the Baltimore County Public Schools.●

GARRISON PROJECT CHANGE NEEDED

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the Garrison Diversion Unit, a controversial water project in North Dakota, is increasing.

On the national level, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly supported an amendment to delete funding for Garrison on December 14, 1982, by a vote of 252 to 152.

Funding for Garrison is opposed by major environmental groups and the National Taxpayers Union.

In North Dakota, the Bismarck Tribune, a major North Dakota newspaper, recently reversed its editorial position from support of Garrison to opposition. The reversal in editorial position along with other recent occurrences raises some serious doubts about the extent of support for Garrison in North Dakota. I am inserting a copy of that editorial for the record.

Others in North Dakota continue to either oppose the Garrison project or to call for alternative projects more suitable to North Dakota's needs. And these voices are growing in influence. In the November elections, for the first time in history, three individuals—all highly critical of the project—were elected to the Garrison Conservancy District Board. Several citizens were elected to the North Dakota Legislature running on anti-Garrison planks.

Canadians—the national and provincial governments, individual citizens, farm groups, small businesses—continue to oppose the project. And no wonder, since the potential harm to Canadian waters and fisheries is so great.

South Dakota landowners continue their legal battle to force the Interior Department to analyze the project's impacts on South Dakota and the James River before further construction takes place.

I could go on, but these few examples adequately illustrate the breadth of concern about the Garrison project. Garrison has become a national symbol of waste in Government. It is time to look at less costly alternatives to Garrison. I urge my colleagues in the Congress to oppose additional funding and construction of this project until we have been presented with some responsible alternative projects:

GARRISON PROJECT CHANGE NEEDED

It's time to take a good, hard look at Garrison Diversion.

It almost doesn't matter that Garrison survived a recent House-Senate conference committee test.

Clearly, Garrison has lost political support in the House, which, only five days before the conference committee met, voted to cut funds 252-152.

The project is not likely to recoup much House support in the foreseeable future.

At the very best, Garrison's promoters will be able to work lose crumbs for funds. At the worst, Garrison won't be so lucky next time.

But Congress isn't Garrison's only problem.

Aside from Congress, Garrison still finds: Stronger Canadian opposition than ever, based on fears of harm to Manitoba's fishing industry.

Opposition from environmental groups, who aren't likely to ease their stands on water development in North Dakota unless they perceive a better shake for wildlife and wetlands.

Renewed opposition by North Dakota farmers to a wildlife mitigation plan. Many landowners see Garrison as a project that takes from one set of farmers and gives to another, and many believe there is too much land in public ownership now.

The point is, as constituted, the Garrison plan continues to meet objections at every turn.

It has been nearly 30 years since Garrison Dam was completed, and this state still has no water project. At that rate, no living North Dakotan will see a completed project.

Garrison's supporters have stuck to their guns long past the time they should have tried to compromise and get a project moving forward, and it is time we faced political realities.

We should also realize that, more important than a specific water project outlining a certain number and location of acres, Garrison Diversion is an idea.

The idea is this: North Dakota has all this water in one place, doing itself little good. The best thing to do is to move that water and put it to better use.

The idea always has been and still is sound, and the idea should be implemented.

Furthermore, North Dakota has a right to a water project for agreeing to flood out more than half a million acres to create Lake Sakakawea and prevent flooding of downstream states.

But, that doesn't mean the state has a right to this particular project. It means the state has a right to compensation by whatever project or projects are acceptable to a wide array of interests.

For years, this newspaper has supported the authorized project in its editorials, believing that the 250,000-acre project was good and merely the first phase of a much bigger water plan.

Thus, it is no small step for us to urge that the current project be de-authorized and a project more palatable to the political powers that be, as well as to our own farmers, be authorized instead.

The reason we've come to this conclusion is that it's time to make measurable progress on a water project for North Dakota, rather than continue to get very little.

What is an acceptable alternative?

We can't say for sure. That's something to be planned out by our State Water Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation.

But here are some ideas:

If we agree to deauthorize Garrison, perhaps the feds would finance a municipal and industrial water pipeline project not only for the southwest area of the state, but for the eastern part as well.

Even that project would not fully compensate for flooding the Missouri River bottomlands.

The state should push, then, for federal financing of some of the items in the huge 1983 State Water Plan the Water Commission is presenting to the Legislature.

Let's come up with something everyone can agree on and do it. Having some water project is a whole lot better than sticking to a principle and having none.

Our politicians should show the leadership required and admit that big changes are needed for this state to get the uses it deserves out of its water.●

SISTER MUNA HONORED FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues the outstanding career of public service of Sister Evelyn Muna of Guam.

Sister Muna is currently superintendent of 16 Catholic schools on Guam. For nearly 32 years, she has devoted her life to the education of the island's young people and she is known far and wide as a teacher and administrator of outstanding talents.

In these days of concern over the quality of the public schools in America it would be wise to take a close look at the career of Sister Muna. Through her unswerving drive for better education, she leads the way for all school systems who want to give their students the best of educational opportunities.

We on Guam are indeed fortunate to have a woman of such talents and dedication in our midst. Sister Muna has shown that she possesses the qualities needed to spark a never-ending interest in education in her students and her staff.

On July 29, Sister Muna will take a much deserved sabbatical to study off-island for a year. I am certain that she can teach those who teach as much as they can bring to her new classroom. I wish Sister Muna well in her classroom work and thank her for reminding all of us that quality education is a challenge not only for the students but for those who teach.

I ask now that a story which appeared in the June 13 Pacific Daily News now be inserted in the RECORD. Thank you.

NUN DEVOTES LIFE TO EDUCATION

(By Azelle San Nicolas)

The main focus of her life has been education.

For the past 31 years, Sister Evelyn Muna has devoted her life to teaching and administration in the public and Catholic school systems.

In 1980, she was appointed by Bishop Felixberto Flores to serve as the superintendent of the 16 Catholic schools on Guam and on Saipan.

And, since then, she has been overseeing the education of the island's 5,000 Catholic school students.

Sister Evelyn, who will be leaving next month for a year of study, will be relieved of her duties as superintendent by Sister Cecile Marie Crisostomo, a School Sister of Notre Dame.

"My work has been very challenging. I enjoyed every bit of it," said Sister Evelyn, a Religious Sister of Mercy.

"I can't put a claim on any accomplishment or take credit for anything. I am involved in the service ministry and my greatest accomplishment was the fact that I served with love," she said.

The bulk of her work now is in the revision of the mathematics curriculum.

"The Diocesan Mathematics Council is working to assess the needs of the mathematics program in the schools," said Sister Evelyn.

By the 1983-84 school year, the council hopes to come out with a standardized mastery skill check list for each mathematics teacher.

"My major concern is remediation. I want to try to raise student achievement in mathematics and language arts," said Sister Evelyn.

Another area of concern for Sister Evelyn is the increase in service to the schools from the gifted and talented program.

"I never want to see the discipline watered down. I'm not talking about extraneous discipline, but internal and mental discipline," said Sister Evelyn.

She plans to leave the island on July 29.

CHILD SUICIDE VICTIMS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, I am today submitting for the RECORD two articles from U.S. News & World Report related to the committee's work.

According to one of these reports, the suicide rate for people 15 to 24 years old has risen 300 percent in the past 20 years. Psychologists are linking the tragic incidents of youth suicides to feelings of "low self-esteem," a "sense of loss or failure," and "the pressures of growing up too soon."

This deadly trend concerns me greatly and I commend the reading of these shocking reports to my colleagues.

BEHIND A SURGE IN SUICIDES OF YOUNG PEOPLE

WHY CHOOSE DEATH AT SUCH A TENDER AGE? THAT'S THE QUESTION ASKED BY PARENTS AND MEDICAL EXPERTS

On June 5, a 17-year-old high-school student in North Salem, N.Y., hanged himself with his own belt in the bathroom of his home.

It was just three weeks after his girlfriend, last year's school homecoming queen, took her life in a similar manner following a quarrel between the two.

Their deaths so shocked the community of 4,500 that police put up barricades to keep outsiders away from the school grounds and counselors kept close watch to spot other troubled youngsters.

Disturbing as the New York tragedy may be, it is by no means an isolated incident. The suicide rate for people 15 to 24 years old has risen 300 percent in the past two decades.

One expert, Los Angeles psychologist Michael Peck, estimates that a million children a year think at one time or another about suicide.

"What we are seeing now is an epidemic of suicidal communication among young people," says Peck. "It is a way of saying: 'Someone help me.' Youth are desperate, unhappy, confused and compulsive. They can't think of any other way out."

CROSS SECTION

Youngsters who attempt suicide come from all classes of society and even include preschoolers. Among the shocking examples are a 6-year-old who tried to hang himself because he thought he was a burden to his financially strapped family and a 14-year-old girl who knelt in front of a train after learning she was pregnant.

Although official figures are difficult to obtain, estimates are that at least 7,000 teenagers kill themselves annually. As many as 400,000 attempt suicide.

Some analysts believe that the suicide rate may be even higher. For instance, many suicides are listed as accidents to protect insurance benefits or to shield the family from the stigma of such deaths. Some homicides, too, are thought to be invited by the victim—a suicidal person who puts himself or herself in a position to be killed. Says psychiatrist Mary Giffin of Northfield, Ill.: "It could be a fall down the stairs, a child who rode a bicycle into oncoming traffic. We've gotten to the point where we question every accident."

As a result, the medical profession is taking a much closer look at childhood depression and stress. Pamela Cantor, a Massachusetts psychologist, says suicide in the young can almost always be tied to a sense of loss or failure.

The loss can be that of a friend, a member of a family through divorce or death, a pet, job, or even a sense of control over their own lives. Failure can be imagined in one's physical appearance, in being too slow or too smart in school or in domestic problems children believe they caused. Abused children often attempt suicide.

Other contributing factors, according to experts, run the gamut from violence on TV and in the movies to low self-esteem, racial bigotry and the pressures of growing up too fast.

Parents who provide little personal attention also are blamed. Says Washington, D.C., psychiatrist Willie Hamlin: "Parents sometimes are so busy working hard to provide the material things that they've neglected what the child really needs and wants—time, attention, love and affection. The child acts out with suicide attempts to get attention."

Still another researcher, sociologist Steven Stack of Pennsylvania State University, sees a relationship between the rising suicide rate among youths and their lagging church attendance. In his view, religious beliefs tend to support people through life's trials and lend meaning to suffering.

Whatever the reasons for the wave of suicides, many government and private groups are taking new steps to tackle the problem. In operation around the country are more than 550 suicide-prevention centers and special hot lines. One Chicago suicide hot line rings every 20 seconds.

ALERTING PHYSICIANS

Dr. Susan Blumenthal, director of a new federal suicide-prevention units, says more pediatricians and medical students are being trained to diagnose and treat depression and suicidal behavior in children.

States and localities also are getting involved. A bill has been introduced in California to provide suicide-prevention programs in schools. Near Dayton, Ohio, a suicide-prevention center has developed a puppet show to reach out to very young children. A Northfield, Ill., medical group shows teachers and school administrator how to spot the telltale signs of suicidal youngsters.

Authorities insist the increased public information is the most important weapon in combating young suicides. This includes being able to recognize when a child is disturbed and knowing that when the child says, "I wish I was dead," he or she may mean it. Some of the trouble sings: Lethargy, loss of appetite, sleeplessness and reluctance to go to school or play with friends.

Julie Perlman, executive director of the American Association of Suicidology in Denver, notes that progress is being made because more people are becoming aware of the problem. "It has been a hard subject to deal with because people would rather ignore it," she says.

With so many families suffering the heartache of such deaths, the issue is getting harder to ignore.

HOW DEATH HAUNTS THE LIVING

Contact with a suicide, even for those with no family connections, can be so traumatic that the memory never fades away.

Such is the case with Alice Dransfield, 57, of Tiburon, Calif., who not long ago saw a young woman leap to her death from San Francisco's Golden Gate Bridge. Having worked as a volunteer at a suicide-prevention center, she explores her feelings of helplessness at witnessing that tragedy.

I remember that a bright sky framed the giant orange towers of the Golden Gate Bridge that autumn morning. My 21-year-old son and I were making small talk as we headed across the bridge to San Francisco.

At midspan, traffic began to slow, and then suddenly stopped altogether in the west lane nearest the ocean. As we braked, a trim, neatly dressed young woman stepped from her car into our lane. In her leather coat and checked pants, she looked like Ann, I thought, although I knew my daughter was away at school in the East.

Then, in one continuous movement, the woman ran around the front of her car toward the 4-foot bridge railing. "Oh, no." I gasped. I rolled down my window and screamed, "No! No! No!" Car horns and traffic noise muffled my voice. As I watched in disbelief, the woman lifted her long legs onto the railing, one hand clinging briefly to the edge. Before we could stop our car and get out, I saw her soar into the air, the ocean breeze blowing her shoulder-length hair.

For a moment she looked like a bird—high above the vast ocean 250 feet below. Then she was gone, one of more than 750 people known to have taken their lives from the bridge.

All I can remember is that I felt devastated, an empty sinking feeling like I had once when coming out of anesthesia after surgery. My body shook and I felt anguish. In seconds I had witnessed life, death, and the finality of suicide. My son and I wept as we continued across the bridge.

But along with the sadness, there was anger. I was certain a barrier above the bridge rail would have stopped her. It was too easy.

All day long I kept thinking about what I would have told the young woman if I only had the chance. I wished I could have told her that I cared. I wanted an opportunity to ask what was hurting and to assure her I would listen. We could have talked about the special people in her life and how they loved her. We could have looked at all the beauty around us.

I thought about the time many years before when there was a rash of suicides within a 10-mile radius of my home. Neighborhood children were asking whose daddy would be next. Since the word suicide was as remote to me as Shakespeare's "Othello," I hardly knew what to tell them. That's what led me to take a college course in suicide prevention and to volunteer as a telephone counselor at a crisis center.

THE HOT LINE

I remember how my pulse raced the first time I picked up the hot line. There were so many things to listen for—clues to the depth of a caller's distress. Are you thinking about suicide? Do you have a plan? What is happening in your life now making you feel suicidal? I listened intently and began to recognize a life-threatening situation caused by a drug overdose. A neighoor and rescue team were sent in as I kept the person talking on the phone.

Like the woman who jumped from the bridge, many of the people calling crisis centers are young people. Among those 15 to 24 years of age, only accidents claim more victims each year than suicide.

The tragedy goes far beyond the suicide victim himself. I have seen parents unable to overcome grief and heard the agony in the voice of a mother whose 19-year-old daughter jumped to her death from a ledge on college campus. She asks why? What happened? She searches for answers, struggling to hold her now empty life together.

Now I find myself asking those same questions. Since that day on the bridge, thoughts of that girl and her death keep popping to the surface. I think about how much life she still had to live and about the many joys that she will never know. I grieve to think that the burdens of life can so darken the human spirit.

I've also been talking about what I saw but am finding that no one really wants to listen. It's too morbid a subject. Suicide is the other person's problem until it strikes someone we know or until we see it happen. Maybe in our survival quest, we have stopped listening and stopped caring. Or could we pay more attention when a friend, family member or coworker seems despondent and somehow not themselves?

I know from my training that it is all right to ask: "Are you feeling suicidal?" Talking doesn't make it happen, but it can help dispel a temporary crisis. It can provide the necessary time to seek help and bring hope back into the lives of those who walk among us in despair.

I saw how the blackness of despair overpowered a fellow human that sunny morning. It happened in one of the most beautiful places in the country, maybe the whole world. Our home overlooks San Francisco Bay, with its ever changing scene of cargo ships, sailboats and the backdrop of an elegant city skyline.

But I'm glad that a huge stand of trees blocks our view of the bridge. In time, I will again wish the trees weren't there, but for now the sight of the bridge would only bring back the memories of a tragic day and a lost life.●

A SALUTE TO TOM

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow and regret that I share with my colleagues today the news of the recent death of Mr. Tom McCutchen, who most recently served for 20 years as the superintendent of the University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station at Milan, Tenn. Tom McCutchen's untimely death leaves a big void in the lives of all who knew him and a large vacancy in the agricultural community of this Nation.

Tom was a leader in his community, devoting many hours to civic organizations and causes and being a very active member of his church. In all of his endeavors, Tom McCutchen sought to help others.

He brought that same attitude to his work helping develop agricultural research at the Milan Experiment Station for the advancement of all farmers. He was also a noted conservationist and it was that keen interest that helped develop the "No-Till Day," an annual field day to which farmers throughout the mid-South came to learn the latest in no-till farming techniques.

Maybe most importantly, Tom McCutchen undertook all of his endeavors because of the deep commitment he felt to helping others. He always sought to return a little something to the society that had given him so much, and so he took leadership roles in his community, in his church, and in his profession. His work in all of those areas will be remembered and his untiring energy will be sorely missed by all of us who knew him well.

Mr. Speaker, I want to include in the RECORD a recent poem published in the Milan Mirror-Exchange newspaper. It was submitted by the employees at the Milan Experiment Station and truly reflects the life of Tom McCutchen.

A SALUTE TO TOM

The only time I ever saw him still
Was in his casket that sad day
For Tom was a man of action
And he proved it in every way
He got up every morning and found work to do
He didn't care to lay in bed
He set good examples for other men
And they followed where he led
Tom was a man with a vision
He had interests in so many things
And tho his final bell has sounded
For years the echoes will ring
I felt I ought to write these words
In honor of our Boss
Along with Family and other Friends
We suffer in their loss
Tom has left for a mansion bright
And even tho he's gone
His memory lingers here with us
His work lives on and on
He would ride the fields each day
To see how things were going
He watched them thru floods and droughts
And with the cold winds blowing
He gave so much of all he knew
To the farmers of the land
To help them turn a profit
And make farming pay again
Sometimes things went wrong as things will do
But he never would give up
He'd just say we'll try it another way
Maybe we didn't work it enough
Yes, Tom, we're going to miss you here
but for now we'll say good-bye
We hope some day to meet again
At the big farm in the sky.

From the employees of Milan Experiment Station.●

ROSWELL PARK HEAD EXCITED BY CANCER FINDINGS

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, in the field of medicine one of the most challenging and puzzling areas of research is the study of cancer. The American Cancer Society estimates that in 1983, 885,000 people will be diagnosed with cancer, of whom 440,000 will die. Cancer strikes randomly, adults and children alike, and causes pain and stress not only for the patient but for family and friends as well.

Because of continuous medical research and developments, there is now more hope for cancer patients. About 46 percent of patients diagnosed with cancer will be alive in 5 years. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that Roswell Park Memorial Institute, one of our Nation's major cancer research centers, is located in my congressional district in Buffalo, N.Y. I would like to share with my colleagues an article which appeared May 29 in the Buffalo News which discusses the optimism which the director of Roswell Park, Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, has because of the progress to date and the future potential found in the cancer research effort.

The article follows:

[From the Buffalo News, May 29, 1983]

ROSWELL PARK HEAD EXCITED BY CANCER FINDINGS

If you'd like to begin to appreciate the magnitude of the challenge that cancer presents to medical researchers, picture in your mind a jigsaw puzzle of a seemingly infinite number of pieces.

To solve the problem of cancer, researchers have to complete the puzzle.

To state it that way, however, is to oversimplify, to suggest it is a straightforward task, something that can be accomplished with an adequate investment of time and patience.

Anyone who's been on Earth during recent years knows that's not been the case, even when the time and patience have been bolstered by the investment of millions of dollars in research funds.

The reason is that cancer is no ordinary jigsaw puzzle. Those working to solve it do not even know the total number of pieces in the puzzle and the pieces that fit together often do not appear to do so until after extensive research. And when one part of the puzzle is solved, there always appear to be hundreds, if not thousands, of pieces to go.

Recent media reports, however, would indicate that significant progress is being made toward the final solution.

Admitting that "there can always be too much hype" when it comes to the media's coverage of cancer, Dr. Gerald P. Murphy says it is his impression that the optimism is warranted because "a lot of pieces are coming together."

"I'm very excited," he adds. Progress that is being reported on several fronts, he notes, "gives hope to the cancer researcher as well as giving cancer patients and their families hope."

Dr. Murphy, a urologist, has a unique perspective. Not only is he the director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute, but immediate past president and chairman of the executive council of the Society of Surgical Oncology and president-elect of the American Cancer Society.

"If these were findings of just one laboratory, you might call it hype," he adds. "But that's not the case. Progress is being seen in program after program, with sometimes each week bringing a new development."

He cautions, however, that "no one is saying the end is near" in terms of final solution of the puzzle.

Just as solution of one section of a jigsaw puzzle invariably leads to completion of another, today's optimism in the field of cancer is based on work that's been conducted in the past.

Dr. Murphy says an example of that is the research focusing on oncogenes, or genes that some believe to be responsible for the development of cancer.

"All of this work has gone on for years, and some of the work in viral oncology and molecular biology has been disappointing," explains Dr. Murphy. "But that same work and the development of new techniques have made it possible in a number of laboratories to get to the same cellular level and pose the same questions.

"With these techniques," he adds, "we are able to do things that we were unable to do just five years ago."

Dr. Murphy stresses that "while the theory is there, a lot of work remains to be done" when it comes to the topic of oncogenes. Only when that is accomplished, he notes, can the next step toward solution be taken in that area of the cancer puzzle.

Dr. Murphy says a good deal of work also remains to be done before there can be further scientific evaluation of monoclonal antibodies, disease-fighting agents produced with new bio-engineering techniques. Scientists are postulating that such antibodies not only may find a valuable role in transporting drugs to cancer cells, but in early diagnosis of cancer.

There special antibodies, produced by fusing cells, have caused quite a stir in the lay and medical communities. Dr. Murphy notes, however, that wider experience with them that could give a better picture of their role in solving the cancer puzzle has to wait until they can be produced more abundantly.

"The method is time consuming," he adds. "It takes nine to 10 months to get one or two monoclonal antibodies with the type of specificity that you want."

That limitation, he predicts, eventually will be overcome.

Scientific evaluation, while it can produce exciting results, has to follow an orderly process which is not likely to produce headline-grabbing stories, Dr. Murphy notes.

He cites the example of studies involving interferon, a protein produced by the body to fight viruses that only a few years ago was being hailed in the media as a breakthrough in the fight against cancer.

Rosewell Park has provided the American Cancer Society with more than $1 million in human fibroblast interferon to be used in studies that is produced by a process that has tripled and quadrupled recovery rate of the protein.

Dr. Murphy notes that evaluation of interferon is being done in studies designed more to meet specifications of the U.S. Food & Drug Administration than to be the most dramatic measure of its cancer-fighting potential.

Studies are producing promising results in a number of cancers, including those involving the breast, kidneys, prostate, larynx and brain and in lymphomas, he adds.

"But we have yet to get an evaluation of what the full potential is," Dr. Murphy adds. "If this works out, it definitely is going to be something, but it's going to take us another year or two."●

JUST THE FACTS, SIR, JUST THE FACTS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in a hearing before the Joint Economic Committee today, Under Secretary of Commerce Dedrick said, and I quote, that we are experiencing "an average recovery from an average recession." Unfortunately for Mr. Dedrick and the Nation, he is wrong on both counts.

By almost any measure one wishes to use, the recent recession was extraordinary in its severity. Unemployment hit record highs as did the average duration of unemployment. Capacity utilization hit record lows. Farm income was only half that of just a few years ago. Corporate profits dropped sharply. New investment in plant and equipment fell for 2 consecutive years. Real average hourly earnings fell steadily as did average real weekly earnings. Home and house mortgage foreclosures climbed to record numbers and auto and home construction fell sharply. The trade deficit and budget deficit both climbed to unheard of levels. Mr. Speaker, no one who studies the facts can deny that the Reagan recession was and is the most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression. To state otherwise is clearly fallacious.

Similarly, to claim that we are now enjoying an average recovery is a similar misstatement of fact. The average increase in real Gross National Product for the two quarters following the end of all postwar recoveries has been 8.1 percent. With the end of the recession now being pegged as December 1982, we have seen sluggish growth at best. The first quarter of 1983 saw GNP rising at a 2.6-percent rate and the second quarter improved at a 6.6-percent rate. These figures are clearly far below the average recovery. The administration has heralded the 0.7-percent drop in the unemployment rate as being extraordinarily strong. However, even with this much needed improvement, the unemployment rate is still higher than under any postwar President. The number of people out of work today is higher right now than it has been under any other President. The number of business bankruptcies and home mortgage foreclosures is higher under this President than it has been under any other. No, Mr. Dedrick, this is not an average recovery. The weak economic growth of today is significant only in comparison to the severity of the downturn. With no hope of reaching prerecession levels of unemployment until many years down the road under this administration's policies, it is a cruel hoax on the millions of innocent victims of the Reagan recession to proclaim this a strong recovery.

INDUSTRIAL POLICY: ANOTHER VIEW

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I submitted for the RECORD an excerpt from a working paper by the United Auto Workers on an industrial policy for America. Today, I wish to add to this debate a viewpoint that approaches many of these questions from a slightly different perspective, but with many of the same concerns.

Dr. Robert Reich, a professor at Harvard, has added richly to this important debate. His works are numerous and respected. What follows this introduction is an excerpt from his widely acclaimed book, the Next American Frontier, which appeared in AmeriTrust's monthly review, Mid-American Outlook. While I do not agree with Dr. Reich on every point, I find his opinions intriguing and most worthwhile.

Particularly, Dr. Reich and I agree on two key questions that motivate this discussion. First, this Nation needs an indutrial policy—indeed, this Nation has one by choice or by default—and the question is one of how well coordinated and how efficiently managed that policy will be. Second, we agree on the fact that what works in Japan or Germany will not work in the United States. Above all else, an American industrial policy must be just that—American. It must be open, democratic, and responsive.

I commend Dr. Reich's comments to my colleagues for their education and reference.

DEAL WITH PROBLEMS OPENLY

(By Robert Reich)

As the United States economy has slowed down, all participants in American enterprise—corporate executives, lawyers and financial brokers, lower-level employees, government bureaucrats—have taken advantage of opportunities to increase their own economic security at the expense of others.

Every group is reluctant to risk change in its economic status for fear that the burden of change in the economy as a whole will fall disproportionately upon it. But the collective unwillingness of all participants to risk economic change is dooming everyone. America's impasse is rooted in the incapacity of its political institutions to ensure that the burdens and benefits of adjustment will be allocated fairly.

Fundamentally, the United States needs a political forum capable of generating large-scale compromise and adaption—a national bargaining arena for allocating the burdens and benefits of major adjustment strategies. Such an arena would enable the nation to achieve a broad-based consensus about adjustment. It would enable government, business and labor to fashion explicit agreements to restructure American industry. Protectionist measures and bailouts to preserve the status quo for particular industries would be difficult to elicit from government if they were demanded and debated in full view of industrial purchasers, emerging segments, consumers and other groups on whom their costs would fall.

Companies seeking financial support or import protection would have to ensure that the measures would be temporary and would serve to benefit the overall economy.

Perhaps most important, the single arena could provide a focus for an ongoing national debate about human-capital investment.

To a limited extent, this idea lay behind the establishment of a U.S. trade representative's office in the White House. But its jurisdiction is far too constrained, its powers too circumscribed and advisory, and the bargaining over which it presides too covert for this office to become a forum for building a consensus about structural change in America.

We have only to compare it with the comprehensive bargaining arena in which West German structural policy is formulated—where industry, labor, finance and government leaders thrash out workable agreements on wage rates, selective credit policies and adjustment—or with the structure and influence of Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry, to comprehend the scale and effort that is needed.

This is not to suggest that either West Germany or Japan provides the United States with an appropriate model. The relative ease with which a consensus about structural policy has been achieved in both countries may have more to do with their recently feudal (and more recently totalitarian) histories than with institutional design.

America is blessed with a highly contentious political system in which disorder, opportunism and ad hoc arrangements abound and in which hierarchical mass organizations have never found much support. But this by no means rules out the possibility of a more open, more public debate about economic change, in which bargains can be struck "wholesale" in place of the covert "retailing" that now dominates the cloakrooms of Congress, the boardrooms of America's giant corporations and the courtrooms of every judicial district.

The answer is not "national planning," if we take that term to mean the centralized drafting of detailed blueprints for future economic management. We already have that sort of planning.

We have had managerial planning for decades—within our giant corporations and government agencies. Managerial planning depends on stability, predictability and control. It seeks to be apolitical—a legacy of the management era in America. It is becoming dangerously obsolete as America is caught up in the unpredictable dynamic of international competition.

Instead, we need a political forum as versatile as flexible-system enterprises—less concerned with making "correct" decisions than with making correctable ones; less obsessed with avoiding error than with detecting and correcting for error; more devoted to responding to changing conditions and encouraging new enterprises than to stabilizing the environment for old enterprises.

This is not to suggest that America should seek to politicize every major economic issue. The point is that any important economic choice is by nature political, but the political dimension is often systematically obscured. This submergence of politics results in economic policies whose burdens and benefits are allocated in ways that many people ultimately consider unfair.

Americans, like most people, reject or resist painful decisions that they have had no part in making. Efforts to submerge politics serve only to prevent it.

America's accelerating slide into industrial preservation is the most obvious but by no means the only illustration of this fact. Only when political considerations are dealt with openly can we avoid the dilemma of inefficient special-interest policies or institutional paralysis. Adjustment cannot proceed without mechanisms for explicit bargaining among economic groups and without institutions with the authority to monitor and guarantee the consensus.

The biggest barrier to active adjustment is not technical but ideological. For 50 years Americans have been embroiled in an endless debate over the relative merits of two highly artificial concepts: the "free market" and "national planning".

The real choice facing America is rather between evading the new global context and engaging it—between protecting the American economy from the international market while generating paper profits, and adapting it to meet international competition. Either way, government will be actively involved. And though the form of government involvement may be different, the fact of it will be nothing new.

Many Americans feel that government should—and, but for regrettable lapses, does—refrain from interfering with the market. We may even acknowledge that the market itself is a product of public institutions that establish property rights and liability rules and determine how contracts are to be enforced. But we see these as neutral "rules of the game" that do not selectively affect specific industries or groups.

The enduring myth of the unmanaged market illustrates the power of ideology over political reality. The broad array of tariffs, quotas, voluntary export agreements and bailouts for declining businesses that now pervades our economic system is somehow considered an isolated exception to the government's normal role of benign neglect, while our defense-related contracts, targeted tax breaks and assorted subsidies for particular industries are seen as separate issues, unrelated to industrial development or to the dynamics of the market.

Many Americans object to the subsidies foreign governments offer their emerging industries but then fail to acknowledge the seminal role defense and aerospace projects play in the development of our own emerging industries.

We demand that foreign governments reduce the procurement preferences they give certain of their domestic industries but then demand that our own large, regulated manufacturers buy only from American producers. In short, our mythic assumptions lag behind our economic reality: every industry in America is deeply involved with and dependent of government.

The competitive position of every American firm is affected by government policy. No sharp distinction can validly be drawn between private and public sectors within this or any other advanced industrialized country; the economic effects of public policies and corporate decisions are completely intertwined. But so long as this pattern of government involvement is hidden from public view, the result will continue to be historic perservation of an outmoded industrial base.

These disjunctures between ideology and reality make it doubly difficult for policymakers to choose adjustment over protection. So long as all government assistance to businesses and to individual citizens is seen as somehow illegitimate, the government is forced to respond to each industry's plea for assistance with special emergency interventions, as if it were an exceptional case.

Industry participates in this charade, disguising its long-term strategies to obtain government supports through targeted benefits embedded within particular tax laws, appropriations, agency regulations, court rulings and executive orders. Because neither government nor business can admit to the intimacy of the relationship, both sides treat it as an illicit affair, hiding it from public view and thereby undermining the chances for those aspects of the relationship that promote positive adjustment to earn cultural legitimacy.

Above all, this false choice—the free market versus central planning, business culture versus civic culture—has prevented us from understanding the importance of human capital to America's future.

In high-volume production, most of a firm's value is represented by physical assets, while the principal stores of value in flexible-system enterprises are human assets. Specialized machines and unskilled workers cannot adapt easily to new situations. Flexible machines and teams of skilled workers can. Only people can recognize and solve novel problems; machines can merely repeat solutions already programmed within them.

The future prosperity of America and all the other industrialized countries will depend on their citizens' ability to recognize and solve new problems, for the simple reason that processes that make routine the solution to older problems are coming to be the special province of developing nations. Industries of the future will depend not on physical "hardware," which can be duplicated anywhere, but on human "software", which can retain a technological edge.

Financial-capital formation is becoming a less important determinant of a nation's well-being than human-capital formation. Financial capital is highly mobile. It crosses international borders with the speed of an electronic impulse. International savings are flowing around the globe to wherever they can be put to use. But a nation's store of human capital is relatively immobile internationally. The skills, knowledge and capacity to work together within America's labor force will determine our collective standard of living.

(Professor Reich, author of The Next American Frontier, teaches business and public policy at Harvard.)

This article was excerpted from an article in the April, 1983, issue of Atlantic Monthly and was reprinted with permission of the author and publisher.●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF CEDAR GROVE, N.J.

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, an important occasion will be marked in my district this weekend—the township of Cedar Grove, N.J. will celebrate their 75th anniversary.

A very industrious anniversary committee has devoted much time and energy on this project for the past year. The fruits of their labors will now be enjoyed by many. Beginning this weekend there will be special events running for a period of 10 days until July 4. The spectacular events are befitting this important anniversary.

I will be pleased to attend a parade this Saturday, June 25. This parade promises to be a great one—with a large number of marching bands, fire and rescue squads, and decorative floats.

Other plans to commemorate this historic event will include an interesting community interfaith service, a concert given by the New Jersey Pops Symphony Orchestra, an anniversary dinner-dance, a pool party, an arts and crafts show, a fireworks display, 10-kilometer run, theater programs, and a performance by the U.S. Air Force Eastern Express Band.

The township of Cedar Grove is a lovely suburban community in north Jersey which covers 4 square miles and has grown to a population of approximately 12,600 residents.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the people of Cedar Grove here in Washington—something I have had the honor to do since 1972. I would like to commend everyone involved with this worthwhile project for planning so many interesting events and I send the entire township my best wishes for another 75 years of growth and success.●

FLEXIBILITY SHOWN IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTION

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, currently, in this Nation there is great controversy over the question of bilingual education instruction in our public schools. Much of this controversy stems from a basic misunderstanding of the purpose of bilingual education, which is to provide instruction in English and in the native language of the limited English proficiency student. Native language instruction takes place when in the opinion of local school educators, this is deemed to be a necessary part of the limited English proficiency child's individualized academic plan.

A school district by school district examination, to determine how much flexibility there is in their bilingual education methodologies, techniques, and practices will demonstrate that their methodologies are many and varied. A recent article in the May 3, 1983, of the Education Daily discusses the kind of flexibility creative school districts are using in helping limited English proficiency students achieve academic success.

The article follows:

TWO DISTRICTS CHOOSE MIDDLE GROUND IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

As the controversy swirls over whether to provide bilingual or English-only instruction to children of limited English-speaking ability, at least two school districts have chosen a middle path that seems to satisfy those on both sides of the debate.

In the rush to comply with federal and state regulations and spend the extra money that often accompanies the rules, school districts have often overlooked more efficient programs to teach children who do not understand much English, said Jack Fields, coordinator of bilingual education in the Danville, Ill.' school district.

Students in the Danville district who need special instruction in English are taught alongside children who speak only English, Fields last week told the National School Boards Association meeting in San Francisco.

GRADUATED APPROACH

Kindergarten students begin reading in their native language in a segregated room, and then first-graders move on so a regular classroom with English-speaking peers and a teacher who is bilingual, said Fields. "All children work in reading in their first language, with other subjects taught in English and/or the appropriate language," he said.

After children learn to read in their native language, usually during first grade, students then begin to learn to read English. From grade three on, children are generally taught only in English, but teachers are available who can provide help in the native language when needed, he said.

"Our students and parents like this type of program because children receive services when they need them, and there is no stigma of being in a 'special class.' You should like it because it is cost-effective," he told the school board members. "The emphasis should be placed on elementary teachers who are bilingual rather than on bilingual teachers."

The program saves money, Fields said, because fewer teachers are needed than in a traditional bilingual education progam.

TRAINING CENTERS

In Minneapolis, which has 1,750 students with native language other than English, students are taught English and given bilingual instruction in math, science, health and social studies, according to Marily Borea, a Minneapolis school board member.

Minneapolis has established 17 of its 50 schools as Limited English Proficient (LEP) Centers, which are staffed with one bilingual teacher and one English as a second-language teacher for every 60 students.

According to Borea, students may be able to speak English well after two years, but they often do not become proficient in reading comprehension until much later. Math, she said, is usually the first subject in which students with a limited English proficiency succeed.

Each school is required to have a Limited English Proficiency team that meets on a regular basis and consists of the principal, social worker or counselor, English and bilingual staff, as well as the regular classroom teacher, Borea said.

Students with limited English proficiency participate from their first day at school in art, music, physical education, home economics, industrial education and typing, Borea said. "As their English language skills increase and they have demonstrated mastery of basic concepts in their native language, the LEP team is responsible for determining the extent to which each student may benefit from increased mainstream instruction."●

NEWARK UNIT OF AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY RECEIVES OFFICIAL CHARTER

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 the Newark unit of the American Cancer Society will officially receive its charter. This is a very special occasion for the dedicated volunteers involved in the Newark unit, and I take a great deal of pride in recognizing them today.

It is sad to say, but the State of New Jersey, and my home city of Newark in particular, have an alarmingly high rate of cancer. The need for public education about the warning signals and importance of early detection of the disease led to the creation of the Newark unit, the first chapter of the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society to be organized on a citywide basis. It was established in 1981, and already has become tremendously effective in providing public and professional education, as well as patient services, to the residents of Newark.

In addition to formally receiving its charter on Sunday, the unit will hold its first annual awards dinner. Among those being honored will be Mrs. Muriel Gibson, first lady of the city of Newark; the Reverend Oliver Brown, pastor of the Roseville United Presbyterian Church in Newark; Mrs. Shirley Owens, wife of the Reverend Owens who is the pastor of Wells Cathedral in Newark; Dennis Cherot, director of health and welfare in Newark; Miles Berger, owner of the Lincoln Hotel who was a leading fundraiser in the unit's Easter flower drive; Dr. Frank Lapeyrolerie, dean of the New Jersey Dental School who served as chair of the steering committee that set up the units; and the late Sam Terry, who was a security guard, and is being honored posthumously.

I am extremely proud of the volunteers in this unit who give so much of themselves, and who reach far into the community to increase awareness of the occurrence, treatment, and possible conquest of the disease. There are a great number of people who must be recognized for their involvement with the unit, beginning with Gary Nevis who first worked with the American Cancer Society to set up the unit. I also wish to honor the executives of the Newark unit: Louise Epperson, president; Lawrence Schneider, executive committee chairman; Lucye Lee, vice president; Theodore Bolen, vice president, delegate to division; James D. Foster, vice president, delegate to division; Lottie Bow, secretary; Veronica Tasker, treasurer; Rose-mary Horner, chairperson, public education committee; Bernadette Jamieson, chairperson, service and rehabilitation committee; James Brown, chairman, professional education committee; Terry Blue, chairman, crusade committee; Barbara Ann Delaney, chairperson, public information; and board members Bobbie Cottle, Arthur B. Cohen, Rev. Ralph Grant, Dr. Frank Lapeyrolerie, Talib Najjar, Janice Newman, Donald Paulussen, Kenneth Peterson, Ramon Rivera, Roberto Ruiz, R. David Seldin, Louise Bates Tyrus, Edward W. Verner, Thomas R. Walters, Bernice Williams, and Pat Williams, as well as coordinator David Rensky.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these people as they dedicate themselves to the fight against cancer.●

A DOLLAR LOANED IS A DOLLAR LOST—IS THIS THE REAL STORY OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK?

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank was commissioned to provide low-interest loans to foreigners so they are able to purchase U.S.-made products. The justification for this program of making goods available to foreigners cheaper than they are available to U.S. small- and medium-sized businesses is that it increases U.S. jobs through more exports.

U.S. taxpayers are expected to support this program, which provides foreigners with loans at substantially lower interest rates than are available to Americans seeking home mortgages, on the grounds that the profits from the exports will result in a return to the Treasury in higher corporate and employee taxes.

This is all good and well in a perfect world where equity and fairness are the cornerstones of business. But these justifications for the Export-Import Bank are thrown in a cocked hat when the Bank makes its loans through a tax-haven country and through dummy corporations set up to insure not equity and fairness, but that no tax is paid to the United States on the profits from the sale of subsidized exports. A most glaring example can be drawn from the Export-Import Bank's fiscal year 1981 report. That report lists a loan of $3,590,589 to Intairdril, Ltd. of the Cayman Islands, which has long been a mecca for those who wish to escape legitimate taxes and one of the most financially uncooperative countries.

On the surface this loan appears to conform with Exim Bank goals. However, a closer look reveals that Intairdril, Ltd. used the money to buy a drilling rig constructed by the Pool Co. of San Angelo, Tex., which just happens to be the parent company of Intairdril, and both are owned by the huge U.S. company, Enserch Corp. of Dallas, Tex. The rub here is that the profits—generated by low-interest, taxpayer-subsidized loans—would not be subject to taxation when earned by Pool's Cayman Island subsidiary, Intairdril. Moreover, Moody's Public Utility Manual, vol. 1, 1982, in reporting on the multimillion-dollar Enserch Corp. wrote:

> Undistributed earnings on foreign subsidiaries are intended to be reinvested in operations of the foreign subsidiaries; therefore, the corporation has not provided deferred income taxes on such earnings. It is expected that income taxes payable upon any future distribution will be less than the Federal statutory rate because of the availability of foreign tax credits.

What is more, undistributed earnings of the Enserch foreign subsidiaries for which the corporation has not provided deferred Federal income taxes amounted to, according to Moody's, approximately $34,268,000, $18,010,000, and $7,977,000 at December 31, 1981, 1980, and 1979 respectively.

I would be shocked if a penny of the profits on the Intairdril deal will ever be subject to U.S. taxation, and I find it very disturbing that the Export-Import Bank would be using taxpayer-supported funds to underwrite these sort of transactions.

I wish I could report this was one very isolated case, but it is not. In 1982, the Export-Import Bank came back and loaned Intairdril $8.8 million for yet another oil rig to be supplied by Enserch.

There are other less suspicious examples of the Export-Import Bank making loans in tax-haven, tax-avoidance countries. Take for instance, Batsco Ltd., in the country of Liechtenstein. Batsco was loaned $8,414,605 in fiscal year 1981 to purchase a drilling rig from Ingersoll, Inc., of the United States. I am not sure what they are drilling for beneath the Liechtenstein surface, but I am convinced it is not legitimate taxes owed the American Treasury.

What these abuses amount to is the misuse of taxpayers' dollars—a misuse that cheats the public treasury of legitimate tax revenues. If this Congress is prepared to extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank it should be prepared to tighten the financial reins of the bank to assure that every dollar the public spends is being used to help this country, not hurt it.●

THE ALCOHOL ENFORCEMENT AND EDUCATION PROJECT OF THE TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION OF OAKLAND COUNTY, MICH.

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years through the efforts of such organizations as MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, both public attitudes and State laws relating to drunk driving have shifted considerably.

However, even before the problem of drunk driving came into the national spotlight, many organizations were working very hard on ways to reduce the human and economic losses caused by drunk driving.

The Oakland County alcohol project, which is administered by the Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County (TIA), is considered by many as one of the most innovative and successful of this type of program aimed at getting the drunk driver off the road.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the TIA for its fine record, and to apprise my colleagues and others of this excellent project, I wish to include the remarks of Mr. Bruce B. Madsen before the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving. Mr. Madsen is the managing director of the Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County, in Oakland County, Mich.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF BRUCE B. MADSEN BEFORE THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON DRUNK DRIVING, DETROIT, MICH., NOVEMBER 5, 1982

I'd like to begin my presentation of the Oakland County Alcohol Project by quoting a few brief paragraphs from an Oakland Press editorial:

"Our world is filled to overflowing with 'programs' that do not work. Some are public, some private, some a little of both, but they share one distinguishing characteristic. Their grand aims are seldom achieved."

"So brace yourself. We have a progam here in Oakland County that seems to be working."

The editorial then goes on to describe Oakland County's current drunk driving project; the fact that it's a four-year, 1.2 million dollar project administered jointly by the Traffic Improvement Association of Oakland County and the Oakland County Sheriff's Department. The editorial explains how the project works and what it has accomplished. Then it ends this way:

"If further research bears out the early data, this program will have been the most important public undertaking in Oakland County this year."

"No doubt about it."

Neil Munro wrote that editorial in November, 1980, about six months after our program had become operational.

The "further research" he referred to is now available for two years of project operations. I'm pleased to report that the project is an outstanding success—exceeding our most optimistic expectations.

I'm going to depart from the usual format presentation and give you the "bottom line" results before briefly describing the project.

The following is a summary of the basic findings of two years of operation.

DUIL arrests on a countywide basis were increased by 30 percent.

DUIL arrests within the Oakland County Sheriff's Department increased by 130 percent.

The special alcohol enforcement teams—which includes six to seven officers who work four nights a week—issued over 1,700 DUIL citations.

There were over 11,000 DUIL arrests made throughout the county during this two-year period.

Alcohol-related traffic accidents were reduced by 21 percent. This meant that there were 2,500 fewer accidents as compared to the preceding base years—about half of which would have been in the fatal or serious injury categories.

During the two years immediately preceding the launching of our program, alcohol was a factor in 55 percent of fatal accidents. That has been reduced to approximately 48 percent.

Approximately $550,000 was spent on this project during the two-year period, during which time there was an estimated $14 million reduction in the costs of alcohol-related accidents.

The program is working very well.

The reasons why the Oakland County project is working so well can, I believe, be understood through even a brief summary of the major elements of the project. But, before summarizing the activities, I would like to pass along some basic demographics so that you might better understand the environment within which this project operates.

Oakland County borders the city of Detroit to the north.

It is nearly as large as Rhode Island—approximately 900 square miles.

Our population is approximately one million, making it larger in this respect than 13 of our States.

We have 63 local units of government.

We have 15 courts with traffic authority.

We have 42 police departments.

The annual average number of traffic fatalities for the past three years stands at 155.

Personal injuries average about 18,000 per year.

It's a big county with big problems. Certainly one of the largest is in the human and economic losses caused by the drunk driver. In the five years preceding our project, alcohol-related accidents took 450 lives, injured over 20,000 people and cost about $168 million.

To combat this problem, we launched our project with great media fanfare in April of 1980. The project incorporates two major thrusts; emphasis is placed on selective enforcement and on public information and education.

Here's how the enforcement operations work:

Through TIA's unique, sophisticated traffic data system, we identified the days of the week and times of the day when the greatest number of alcohol-related accidents occur. We also pinpointed the locations where these accidents were occurring with the greatest frequency.

We established 10 specific locations, each about 15 miles in length, which became the target areas for special AE teams. They work Wednesday nights through Saturday nights from 11 p.m. to 4 a.m. Although these hours represent only 12 percent of the total time in a week, 65 to 70 percent of all alcohol-related accidents occurred during these hours.

The AE teams are comprised of six sheriff's deputies, two Michigan State Police officers and two to three officers from the local communities within which they operate. The cars are equipped with reflectorized signs bearing our special black and red AE logo.

I'm sure you've all seen van type vehicles which are equipped with breath testing devices. Gambling a bit on whether or not it would work, we equipped three of our patrol cars with breathalyzers, thinking that every team officer would have full enforcement capability and that we could save a lot of money on equipment. It is working exceptionally well. We've been able to reduce the officers' total time in DUIL processing from about three hours to about 45 minutes.

Each of the officers who work on the AE teams attended a one-week course in drunk driving detection, apprehension, arrest and adjudication conducted at Michigan State University. Many of those who attended reported that this was the best course in which they have ever participated. And, at this moment, we are providing this training to an additional 100 officers in three locations within the county.

As we all recognize, one cannot expect improvement in enforcement if only one link in the total enforcement chain is strengthened. Considering this, our total project has included a series of seminars, breathalyzer demonstrations and conferences specifically directed to the needs of prosecutors and judges. A preliminary project evaluation suggests a marked improvement throughout the area of DUIL adjudication. Reports indicate that our judges are taking a tougher and tougher stand on this offense.

Now to the second major part of our total project: We have included an intensive public information and education program which has addressed two major objectives; (1) to create a greater public awareness of the magnitude and cost of the drinking driver problem, and (2) to develop a perception of a high probability of arrest for this offense in Oakland County. As most of you know, Larry Ross of New York University has reported, through his survey of international drunk driving programs, that this perception of high risk is the single greatest deterrent to the drinking driver offense—more so than even severe penalties.

Our total PI&E activities includes a special saturation mass media campaign conducted during the months of November, December, and January. This campaign has received an exceptional level of support by local media and has included news releases, feature stories, drinking driver profiles, editorials, full page display ads, billboards, and television and radio spots—all provided as a public service. The campaign theme and all media materials were developed by D'arcy-Mac Manus & Masius, one of the Nation's largest advertisers. The theme is; "drunk drivers, the party's over."

During the remaining nine months of the year, special attention is directed to speakers bureau activities, special training for high school driver educators in alcohol and the drinking driver problem, involvement of professional and service organizations and feature articles for magazines, newsletters and trade journals.

As the statistics which I reported earlier indicate, the Oakland County project is working very well and, quite surprisingly, we are seeing continuing improvement in all areas of the total project—from enforcement to the reduction in traffic losses.

There are now many, many believers who agree—to paraphrase editor Neil Munro—that this program is the most important public undertaking in Oakland County.

That concludes my description of the Oakland County drunk driving project.

There are just a few observations which I would like to pass along for your consideration.

In the several drunk driving conferences in which I've participated or attended, a significant portion of the deliberation has focused on problems, needs and countermeasures at the State level or on a statewide basis. In shaping policy recommendations, I would strongly urge that major focus and emphasis be placed upon ways and means of meeting this problem at the local level.

For as long as I can remember, experts in highway traffic safety administration have been saying that traffic accidents are a local problem—and that the solution to this problem must come from the local level.

I believe this to be particularly so with respect to drunk driving countermeasures for certainly enforcement, prosecution and adjudication is notably autonomous and local in nature. In this sense dealing with the drunk driving problem is conspicuously different than many other functional areas of traffic safety—such as establishing traffic engineering design standards which must be initiated at the Federal and State levels.

Certainly local authorities need good State legislation as a basis for operations. In that respect, we know that our Oakland County project will benefit substantially from the recently enacted Michigan law providing for the use of preliminary breath testers and also the illegal, per se features.

But, these valuable additions to our legal framework will have precious little impact on the drunk driving problem in areas where no management systems exist for upgrading the level of official performance or creating the necessary climate of public awareness, concern and support.

And, in particular, I would urge that emphasis also be placed on means for providing for financial support to local programs—such as that now in effect in the State of New York. While local revenues raised through drunk driving fines may be used for enforcement, certainly consideration should be given to providing funding for soundly based programs of public information and education such as we have had the pleasure of introducing in Oakland County.●

THOMAS BALIGA RECEIVES PATRIOT OF THE YEAR AWARD IN SOUTHWEST CHICAGO

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, June 24, Thomas Baliga will be awarded the Patriot of the Year Award in the Fifth District of Illinois. The Patriot of the Year Award goes to the individual or individuals whose sense of Americanism and patriotism have been shown in years of dedication and service to the community.

Mr. Baliga has been a dominant figure in the growth and development of the Archer Heights community in southwest Chicago since 1971.

Tom has fought hard to improve the quality of life in the Archer Heights area. He has brought business into the area, eliminated a community nuisance in the form of the Midway Metals Junkyard, and fought for a rapid transit system for the southwest side.

Mr. Baliga has won many awards before the Patriot of the Year Award, including the Ray McDonald Community Achievement Award and the Archer Heights Community Achievement Award.

I proudly offer Tom my congratulations and insert into today's RECORD excerpts of an article describing more of Tom's achievements, printed in the Midway Sentinel.

THOMAS BALIGA HONORED FOR COMMUNITY LABORS

In 1968, Tom along with his parents Stanley and Florence, moved into the Archer Heights Community. He worked part-time at Marshall Field & Company while attending Northeastern Illinois State University. He graduated on the deans list in 1971 with a bachelor of arts degree in Political Science. His major emphasis in college was on urban government. Tom is proud of the fact that he was able to pay for a majority of his college expenses.

His full time employment started with International Harvester Credit Corporation as a cash operations clerk. He is currently a supervisor for the Internal Financial Reporting Company.

Baliga's community involvement began in 1971 when he served as president of his block club, a position which he held until 1976. In 1976, he joined the Archer Heights Civic Association. In 1977, he was elected Vice President and the following year obtained the presidency. Tom served in this capacity for five years and is presently the executive director of the association.

As president of the civic association, Tom waged a community crusade to improve the quality of life in the Archer Heights area. Some of his major battle victories include preventing the establishment of a postal facility at 47th and Kilbourn. One of his major objections to a post office at this location was that a 24 hour, 7 day a week operation of this magnitude was not conducive to a residential area, however, instead of leaving the building a vacant eyesore, he was successful in relocating the Selfix Company at this location. He also played an integral role in the closing of the Midway Metals Junkyard which was located at Archer and Knox. This particular business was an eyesore to the community due to the number of junk cars which caused mud, grease and oil to be spread over the sidewalks in the community. Tom attended numerous court hearings in which he testified in regard to this matter. He was again successful in eliminating a community nuisance.

He has also played an active role in fighting for a rapid transit system for the Southwest side. For the last 5 years, Baliga has attended various public hearings and contacted our federal, state and local officials in an attempt to acquire the best possible transit system for our area.

Tom has received numerous awards for his dedication and leadership which have included the Archer Heights Community Service Award and Presidents Service Award.

Besides his involvement in the Archer Heights Association, Baliga is also an active member in the 8th District Police Beat Representative Program and the Metropolitan Area Transportation Council.

In evaluating his years of community involvement, Baliga said: "We are one of the very few privileged people of the ward who have the freedom to determine our own destiny since we live in a democracy. This democracy is not something which materialized overnight, but came about as a result of the dedication and great personal sacrifice of our forefathers over 200 years ago. So great was our forefathers dedication to the principles of freedom and democracy that the sacrifice they had to make was their lives in a great many cases. In more recent times, 1918 and again in 1941, many of our own family or relatives were called on to make this same sacrifice. For these reasons, I believe freedom exacts the price of involvement from all of us in our community."

The Midway Sentinel takes great pleasure in honoring Tom Baliga for his many years of dedicated service to our community.●

THE TWO HISTORIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND IRELAND

HON. JAMES F. McNULTY, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

● Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, it is especially important for Irish Catholic America to recognize its substantial role in bringing peace and justice to Ireland. Too often romantic visions have gotten in the way of hard considerations for commonsense and justice. The initiative in Ireland must still be reclaimed from the hands of the unjust.

For many Americans, it is unbelievable that peace flourished in Northern Ireland; it is unbelievable that religious groups lived in peace and justice with one another. That view has got to be contrasted with some facts. The following is taken from the "Holy War in Belfast" by Andrew Boyd.

In 1784 when Hugh O'Donnell, an Irish Catholic priest educated in exile in Salamanca, built Belfast's first Catholic church, St. Mary's in Chapel Lane, the Catholics numbered a mere 1,300 in a total population of about 15,000 citizens. But the Protestants overwhelmed O'Donnell with generous subscriptions to his building fund. William Bristow, Episcopalian Vicar of Belfast, paid for the pulpit of St. Mary's out of his own pocket.

The day when St. Mary's was opened, Sunday 30 May 1784, was long remembered in Belfast. Captain Waddell Cunningham, an officer of the Irish Volunteers, arranged a parade of his men in full uniform and, when Fr. O'Donnell arrived to say Mass, formed them into a guard of honour for his reception. At least half the congregation in the church that morning, it was said, were Protestants.

A few days later Fr. O'Donnell thanked his many Protestant and Presbyterian friends in a letter to Tisdall's Mercury, one of the local newspapers:

The Roman Catholic congregation of Belfast return their grateful acknowledgments to the Belfast First Volunteers, to the Belfast Volunteer Company, and to the inhabitants at large for their so generously enabling them to erect a handsome edifice for their celebration of divine worship. They know not in what adequate terms to express their feelings excited by the attendance of so respectable a Protestant audience on Sunday last at the opening of the house, the impression of which mark of regard is never to be effaced . . ."

I join my friends and colleagues in hailing a new initiative for a new forum in Ireland and I assert that peace and care and sharing can become hallmarks of the society of that land as clearly once they were.●

RECIPIENTS OF LOS ANGELES HARBOR COLLEGE'S 1983 POLITICAL SCIENCE AWARDS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, two students from Los Angeles Harbor College, Celia Anne Reynolds and John Thomas Gilmore, are this year's recipients of the college's political science awards. These awards have been presented to the winners of an essay contest in which participants were asked to respond to the statement "What citizenship means to me." I insert these essays into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and hope that our colleagues will find them as insightful as I have.

MY IDEA FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

(By John Thomas Gilmore)

In 1981, the Education Testing Service (ETS) conducted a national survey among 3,000 United States college students and concluded that most U.S. college students have "a limited parochial view of the world". The ETS, also, noted that "the lack of knowledge of international affairs—appears related to a general lack of interest in other nations and world issues among these students". Unfortunately, since my arrival in the U.S. two years ago—I am an Irish citizen—I haven't found any reason to disagree with the ETS findings. At Harbor College, for instance, there seems to be little interest among students in the study of world affairs, a fact which is exemplified by the handful of students attending classes related to the subject. As a result, I have decided to launch a political club aimed at promoting an interest in both domestic and international political affairs. Here I will discuss some reasons for wanting to start the club; how I hope the club can operate and what I anticipate the club to achieve.

Three basic reasons inspired me towards forming the club. One, the need to promote a greater understanding among students of different political, social and economic systems around the world such as the nature of a rightwing government in Chile; the existence of apartheid in South Africa and the distinctiveness of the economic system in communist Yugoslavia.

Two, because there is a growing tension between the forces of communism and democracy all over the globe, which conceivably could lead to a nuclear war if the nuclear arms buildup is continued in the U.S., western Europe and the Soviet Union. Therefore, faced with such a catastrophic possibility, we should try to understand what motivates exponents of these different ideologies, such as the communist Soviet Union and the democratic U.S. This can, also, explain reasons for the respective involvement of the Soviet Union and the U.S. in Afghanistan and El Salvador.

Three, there are two major events scheduled to take place in the U.S. in 1984. One, the Olympics here in Los Angeles, and two, the presidential election. As Olympic hosts, it is our responsibility to learn about different nations, so that we can communicate intelligently with the various nationalities attending the games. Also, at a time when the U.S. is still recovering from the effects of economic recession, such as over 10% national unemployment, U.S. students should be given every opportunity to educate themselves about their political system so that we can have a more informed electorate in 1984.

While I appreciate the difficulties associated with starting a club, I hope it can operate in the following ways. One, it can act as a platform for discussion where ideas are exchanged such as arguments for Left, Right and Centre in different political systems. As such, the club will not promote any one political ideology or party.

Two, it can attract students on campus who hail from areas all over the world, such as Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Samoans, Asians and Europeans. In turn, these students may be urged to share information about their respective countries, such as culture, geography, history, religion, foreign investments and energy issues.

Three, the club can serve as a source of political information for all students on campus. For instance, it can produce a newsletter listing political material available at the library ranging from the U.S. News to the Progressive. The newsletter could, also, stress the availability of political literature by authors ranging from Herbert Marcuse on the left to William F. Buckley, Jr. on the right. Information regarding political programs on television such as "This Week" or "Face the Nation" could also be listed.

Four, the club could help organize political events both on and off campus. For instance, guest speakers with views varying from the right-wing John Birch Society, to the left-wing Revolutionary Marxist party, could be invited to address the students. Off campus events, such as attending political movies, like "Reds" or "Gandhi," could also be arranged.

If this club is started, it can have three major beneficial results. One, it can lead to a greater understanding among students of international affairs including U.S. politics, which can minimize over-simplicity and prejudice, such as one adopting the idea that capitalism is good and communism is bad, without attempting to understand arguments for and against each system.

Two, it can result in increased political participation on campus. For instance, students may become motivated to get involved with student government, an institution that is virtually nonexistent at Harbor College—approximately, only fifty students voted recently to elect a new executive for Harbor's student government.

Three, students may engage in political discussion and keep informed about politics once they leave college. Also, the more knowledgeable they become about politics, the greater the likelihood that they will become active in politics, such as voting; writing letters to legislators; attending political meetings; joining a political party and maybe even running for political office.

Finally, it is regrettable that in an age when the U.S. is becoming increasingly involved in areas around the world, from Central America to the Middle East, so many U.S. college students are indifferent to international affairs and issues. Nevertheless, that is the reality and as a student faced with the choice of becoming a passive watchdog or an activist, my choice is for action. By starting a political club I want to create a high psychological involvement in politics among students, in the hope that this may lead them to a greater interest in and understanding of political affairs both at home and abroad. The raw material available is ample; an internationally-flavored student body and an abundance of political literature. Results, such as the rebirth of student government, can be achieved. It is time to get involved—it is time to begin.

WHAT CITIZENSHIP MEANS TO ME

(By Celia Anne Reynolds)

Time provides opportunity for wisdom. Wisdom enables us to set value. In America, value is determined by demand. As individuals, we are free to choose what is valuable to us. We have this freedom to pursue happiness, pleasure, and comfort as long as we have the right of citizenship. The privileges of citizenship are rewarding, but may be revoked. This valuable status must be maintained with consistent personal effort. Citizen involvement means claiming ownership of one's citizenship.

Citizenship must not be taken for granted, but preserved as a valuable possession. The right to vote is often disregarded because the reason supporting this right is forgotten. Increased sales tax makes us snarl and we gripe at the extension of rent control, but we tend to ignore how these decisions were reached. They were the result of the voting poles. The younger generation needs to see the attention given the voter pamphlet when it comes in the mail and the effort their parents make to get out and vote. Children need to learn their rights can be revoked by not participating as a citizen. The secured right to join with people in the decision-making process is a fundamental basic of our democracy. We, as citizens, must teach our children its value through our actions.

Another example of values is pride of ownership. Our status as United States citizens is worthy of respect, the same respect we would give a valuable possession. We should want to learn more about what we value; this gives our treasure meaning. Active interest in daily news, both local and nation-wide, provides an awareness of the economic tempo. Teenagers wince when their favorite rock station is switched for a continuous news radio station. Nevertheless, I believe their awareness has increased when my teenage daughter said, "Why did the President do that?" She was listening! They have become exposed to names, places, and events. It is the slow penetrating beginning of them claiming their citizenship. Conversations between adults regarding the nation's dilemma over high unemployment and the state's fight to balance the budget should be a part of the "dinner table" discussion. I was highly impressed when my daughter wanted to know the difference between stocks and bonds. Satisfied with my reply, she offered to finance twelve percent of a much-wanted Himalayan kitten at the corner pet shop.

Children respond to economic scarcity and survival of the fittest. When the peanut butter jar is getting low, they try to convince their younger brother to eat plain jelly sandwiches. Economic and political activity is in their daily lives and they are learning to expand on the knowledge of their parents and teachers.

The evolution of our awareness as citizens brings a responsibility of accurately conveying information. The source for news information must be credible. Our youth depends on their parents and teachers for guidance toward becoming well-informed citizens. Tainted information is nothing more than biased or prejudiced opinions. The daily exposure of news broadcasts increases their chances for accurate data. It's a pleasure when my son draws my attention to the news headline on the daily paper he delivers as different from the one that comes in the morning. His mind is working, his eyes are reading, the community in which he lives is not a far distant place.

Children begin to believe they are citizens without realizing it. They sense the same values as their parents. There is no room for fads or fashion among treasures. We, as citizens of the United States, must treasure and claim ownership of our citizenship.●

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S LIVER DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the commencement of the "National Children's Liver Disease Awareness Week." Also during this week, a consensus development conference on liver transplantation will convene at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda.

The major topic of discussion at the conference will be the question of liver transplantation as a therapeutic medical service versus an experimental procedure. An exceptional panel of acclaimed medical experts in the field of organ transplants will present their findings and recommendations.

In recent years, the Presbyterian University Hospital in Pittsburgh has developed a liver transplant operation that is hailed by many medical authorities as a stunning breakthrough in the fight against diseases of the liver. The discovery of the immunosuppressant Cyclosporin A has been responsible for more than doubling the success rate of liver transplants to 75 percent. Thus, the thrust of the conference will be to attempt to assess the state of the liver transplant science and to determine whether it merits a new definition.

Reimbursement through medicaid for low-income individuals needing transplants is based upon the State's definition of the operation. Unfortunately, the operation costs a minimum of $50,000 and in most States is not covered by medicaid. In my own State of New York, after reexamining the progress made in the liver transplant science, the New York State Health Department certified liver transplant procedures as therapeutic, and thereby rendered it qualified for medicaid reimbursement. Yet, at present, most States still define the operation as experimental, and thus preclude many low-income children from Federal assistance.

On top of the obstacle posed by the extravagant expense, securing donors can also present an extremely difficult task. Time is an enemy of those afflicted with this fatal disease. Educating the American public to the urgent need for donors is crucial to saving lives.

It is my hope that this week, the "National Children's Liver Disease Awareness Week," will foster greater understanding throughout the country. My colleagues can contribute a great deal to this cause by using this week to promote educational activities in their respective districts. It is our responsibility on the national level to lead communities across America into a cooperative effort in seeking donors and raising funds for liver disease victims. Too many lives depend on it.●

SALUTE TO TONY INOCENTES, OUTGOING PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, LAKEWOOD, CALIF.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1983, the Greater Lakewood Chamber of Commerce will hold its annual installation and awards luncheon at the Lakewood Country Club. Among those to be honored is Mr. Tony Inocentes, who is outgoing president of the chamber.

A 1972 graduate of Wilmington's Banning High School, Tony joined the American Retrieval Corp. the following year. He soon was appointed to the position of manager and, since 1976, he has been its president and major stockholder.

As a director of Greater Lakewood Chamber of Commerce since 1980, Tony has served as chairman of the education committee and chairman of the legislative and bylaws committee. He has also made the time to become active in the California Association of Directors as a member of their legislative executive council and first vice president of the Los Angeles unit.

Under Tony's direction, the chamber has continued its tradition of being responsive to needs of the citizens of Lakewood and has sought to expand the local economic base for the benefit of the entire community. Tony was especially effective in coordinating the actions of the chamber with Lakewood City officials. He can certainly reflect with pride and satisfaction upon his many accomplishments and helping to make the city of Lakewood a better place to live and work.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Tony for his successful term as president of the Greater Lakewood Chamber of Commerce. His accomplishments will be long remembered and appreciated by those who follow as future presidents of this fine organization. And, we are confident that he will continue as an inspiring figure in business and civic affairs. We would like to wish Tony and his wife, Loretta, and their son, Tony, Jr., continued success and happiness in the years to come.●

TIT-FOR-TAT TREATMENT GIVEN TO FOREIGN DIPLOMATS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked by a recent article in the Toledo Blade revealing the rationale for the creation of the Office of Foreign Mission, under the U.S. State Department. The new office has been created solely to retaliate against foreign diplomats from countries which discriminate against American foreign service personnel.

The United States has continuously made efforts to improve our diplomatic relationships with our overseas neighbors. This new State Department policy is unwise and counterproductive.

Mr. Speaker, surely other, more effective and direct means exist to improve the relationship between these countries and the U.S. envoys they host. This type of retaliation undermines our foreign policy efforts and in turn seriously impedes our goal of promoting freedom and democracy abroad. Our stature as a nation suffers when we take the low road in responding to undiplomatic actions taken against us.

The article from the Toledo Blade follows:

TIT-FOR-TAT TREATMENT GIVEN TO FOREIGN DIPLOMATS

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. State Department is starting something that one official calls "Operation Tit for Tat."

All Soviet embassy personnel will have to make their travel arrangements for hotels, trains, and airplanes through a newly established bureau on the department's second floor, the Office of Foreign Missions.

The speed with which airline tickets are provided probably will depend less on the flying weather than on the climate of Soviet-American relations, officials indicate.

As a result of the Foreign Missions Act of 1982, the State Department is supposed to take steps to make life just as hard for foreign diplomats in Washington as it is for American diplomats in their countries.

The State Department had expected to assign one of its own to direct the operation. But the White House decided that the new office required someone meaner than the usual diplomat, someone who was not afraid of being unpleasant if need be.

It assigned James Nolan, a former senior intelligence official of the FBI, as director of the office. He says firmly that if American diplomats are discriminated against overseas, his office will try to make sure that diplomats from offending countries are reminded that the United States can reciprocate.

All resident diplomats in the Soviet Union have to deal with an ubiquitous agency known as Upravleniye po Obsluzhivaniyu Diplomaticheskogo Korpusa (the Administration for Servicing the Diplomatic Corps).

Known in Moscow by the initials "UPDK" (pronounced "On-Pay-Day-Ka" in Russian), it makes travel arrangements, leases apartments to foreigners, provides plumbers, telephone repairmen, maids, translators, piano teachers, and even gives driving lessons.

It is also assumed by westerners that, while UPDK is officially a part of the Soviet foreign ministry, it is in reality an adjunct of the Soviet secret police, the KGB, and keeps track of what foreigners are doing.

Facetiously the Office of Foreign Missions is being called "UPDK-West."

Besides telling the Soviet Embassy of the new travel requirement (the same rules hold for the Soviet consulate in San Francisco, but Soviets at the United Nations are exempt for the time being), the new bureau has sent a circular note to all foreign missions informing them that the new law requires them to tell the State Department whenever they want to buy, sell, or rent property in the United States. The department then has 60 days to approve or disapprove.

This note was sent around because in a number of countries the United States has found it difficult to buy property for embassies or residences and was forced to lease at considerable expense.

The embassies of those countries, on the other hand, have been able to buy properties freely on the open market here. Now, it is hoped, Mr. Nolan says, that the affected countries will be more sensitive to American needs.

The decision to require USSR personnel to use the State Department to make travel arrangements was taken, he says, for both national-security reasons and to put pressure on the Soviets to be more forthcoming in Moscow.

At present, diplomats in Moscow and Washington have to get permission to travel outside the respective capitals. But in

Moscow, U.S. diplomats have found that even after approval is granted by the foreign ministry, UPDK reports that it is unable to get plane tickets or that hotels are booked in the city to which a diplomat wanted to travel.

Mr. Nolan says the State Department has subcontracted the travel agency aspects of the job to a company in McLean, Va., that will make reservations when told to do so by his office.

If UPDK tells Americans that there are no tickets available for travel somewhere, he says, his office might have to report the same news to the Soviet Embassy here.

By issuing the tickets, the State Department and the FBI, which is charged with surveillance of Soviet-bloc diplomats, have a much more detailed idea of a Soviet diplomat's itinerary than in the past, when, after permission to travel was granted, the embassy could book a flight on any plane it wanted on the given day.

U.S. diplomats have assumed that when the Soviet agency books them into a USSR hotel they are placed in a room with built-in eavesdropping devices.

The new system would allow the State Department the possibility of control over which hotels the Soviets can stay in, but no one is saying whether the rooms will be bugged.

Experienced Moscow hands have mixed feelings about UPDK. On the one hand, it often has served as a harassment or charged sky-high fees for painting apartments. "Why are you complaining?" a U.S. diplomat once was asked by UPDK after he protested the fee charged for repair work. "Do you know what our people have to pay in Washington?"

However, the UPDK was able to provide services that ordinary Russians could not secure, or secure with difficulty, such as bartending, printing of calling cards, and appliance repair.

There are no plans for the State Department to provide the Soviet Embassy with English teachers, plumbers, or telephone repairmen, Mr. Nolan says.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE REVEREND MARK JOSEPH GIORDANI UPON THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS PASTORATE AT ST. GERARD R.C. CHURCH, PATERSON, NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 25 the residents of the city of Paterson, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together at St. Joseph's Community Center with Rev. Robert Carroll, copastor and other members of the clergy and congregation of St. Gerard's Roman Catholic Church of Paterson, N.J., in honor of Rev. Mark Joseph Giordani, copastor of St. Gerard's, to celebrate the 10th anniversary of Father Mark's appointment to St. Gerard's parish in total dedication and devotion to the service of God and the cause of brotherhood, goodwill, and understanding among all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to Father Mark on this most joyous occasion and join with his parishioners in great pride of his outstanding achievements in promulgating, enhancing and preserving the richness of his religious and cultural heritage.

Father Mark, the son of Felicita and Louis Giordani, was born on June 9, 1942 in Pessola, Parma, Italy. He attained his elementary and secondary education in Italy and on January 13, 1958, emigrated with his family to the United States. He studied at St. Mary's College in Kentucky and at St. Bonaventure University in Olean, N.Y., majoring in philosophy and minoring in history.

In 1965 after receiving his B.A. degree in philosophy, Mark Giordani entered Christ the King Seminary, N.Y. During his seminary years he was assigned to work in a ghetto in Paterson, establishing a Catholic Community Center to help the underprivileged. There his love for the poor sparked his tremendous dedication to God's people in the innercity.

On May 31, 1969, Father Mark Joseph Giordani was ordained to the Holy Order of the Priesthood by His Excellency, the late Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Bishop Lawrence B. Casey in St. John's Cathedral in Paterson and received his masters degree of divinity in theology.

In response to his request for an inner-city parish, Father Mark's first assignment as a curate was with Our Lady of Lourdes Church in Paterson. He will long be remembered for his devout and faithful service to the parishioners of Our Lady of Lourdes Church. Among his many accomplishments there, he organized the Senior Citizens Club, CYO, Choir, Altar Boys, the Christian Riders Motorcycle Club and the school physical education program.

Father Mark's assignment to St. Gerard's Parish commenced in 1973 and in the following year he was appointed to his present ministry as copastor with Father Bob Carroll of St. Gerard's 1,150 families and 310 school children.

Over the past decade there has been much growth and development at St. Gerard's under the leadership endeavors of the joint pastorate of Father Mark and Father Bob. We join with the members of St. Gerard's Parish in applauding their richness of wisdom and high standards of excellence which have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

As an expression of gratitude for his years of unselfish dedication, on Saturday, June 25 his parishioners will honor Father Mark. In addition to his devout and dedicated responsibility for the spiritual well being of his church members, they particularly wish to commend his reactivating St. Gerard's Senior Citizens Club, creating a folk group, expanding the choir and altar boys, and organizing the Christian Riders. With Father Bob he revamped the parish council, setting up four committees: family life, spiritual life, education, and fundraising committees.

Under Father Mark's dynamic drive and unwillingness to give up the St. Joseph Community Center has been built and its $600,000 cost will be paid, with the burning of the mortgage hopefully to take place in November 1983. It is also important to point out that Father Mark has initiated the following organizations at St. Gerard's: The Divorced-Separated, the St. Vincent De Paul Society, St. Gerard's Day Care Center for working mothers. He is adviser and spiritual director of the Holy Name Society and with Father Bob of the Knights of Columbus. He has served three terms as a representative to the Priests Senate, as a U.S. Army Reserve chaplain in Lodi, N.J. (1977-80), as chaplain to the Paterson Police Department since 1977, as chaplain to the fire and police departments in Haledon, N.J., as chaplain to the Constables Association in West Paterson, N.J., as chaplain to the Italian Circle in Paterson, and as a member of the CETA program advisory board in Paterson in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation was founded on the cornerstone of our people's faith in God which is truly the spirit, conscience and very being of our society. I appreciate the opportunity to call your attention to the good works of Father Mark and seek this national recognition of his dedication, devotion, and untiring efforts toward the spiritual and cultural enrichment of others. For his service to our people with the greatest of devotion epitomizing all the treasured qualities of a man of God, we do indeed salute Rev. Mark Joseph Giordani of St. Gerard's R. C. Church, Paterson, N.J.●

HONORING THE NATIONAL HISPANIC UNIVERSITY

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I bring to your attention an important milestone in the evolution of public education in America: The National Hispanic University known as NHU.

The Hispanic University grew out of the highly successful Bay Area Bilingual Education League (BABEL) which was converted into the National

Hispanic Center for Advanced Studies and Policy Analysis. As such, it is an authorized degree-granting university. The policy center gives the Hispanic community a viable and quality vehicle by which to impact on national policies that affect their education, employment, economic development, and social well-being.

Later this year, NHU will initiate its engineering careers program for Hispanics in Los Angeles. This is a joint venture between the National Hispanic University and Northrop University.

In July, NHU and La Universidad Autonoma de Guadalajara will train 65 special education personnel to work with Chicano and non-English-speaking children. Moreover, NHU currently has 51 students in premedical and educational coursework.

Mr. Speaker, the ethnic diversity of NHU is laudible. While its initial thrust has been to enhance and implement crucial programs for Hispanics, its principles call for equal education for all Americans. Indeed its cosmopolitan student body numbering more than 200 and projected to grow at a rate of 100 percent each year nationwide for the next decade is drawn from many diverse geographical and ethnic backgrounds (Anglo, Asian, Black, and Hispanics). The NHU does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national or ethnic origin, age or physical handicap. Reflective of its diversity is its board of trustees and its advisory board. It is, Mr. Speaker, a commentary on representative America providing leadership in their quest for goals, objectives, and values for meeting the special needs of minority students while at the same time taking the lead in meeting the general and overwhelming need for educational quality.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to single out two outstanding pioneers in this colossal undertaking. Without the vision and commitment of its president, Dr. Roberto Cruz, the dream of a National Hispanic University would not have materialized. Indeed, his dedication and beliefs that education is critical to the enhancement of society and democratic ideals has paved the way to make NHU a living reality; Dr. Edward Aguirre, the former U.S. Commissioner of Education and the current deputy superintendent of education in California has shown extraordinary leadership in promoting excellence.

His integrity and intellectual capacity has gained him the esteem of Americans everywhere and NHU is fortunate to have him in the important responsibility as its chairman of the board of trustees.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that my colleagues here in the House of Representatives would take note of this outstanding institution and its need to perpetuate career success for thousands of young people. In so doing, I would like to share with my colleagues the following excerpt from NHU's annual report:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

(B. Robert Cruz, Ph. D.)

This annual report of the National Hispanic University marks the second year of operations of the only state authorized degree-granting, national Hispanic university in the United States.

The National Hispanic University was built on eleven years of experience as the Bay Area Bilingual Education League. When the Bay Area Bilingual Education League was founded in 1971, the Board of Directors was concerned with equality of educational opportunity for students from other cultures who spoke limited English. As time passed, the needs and the scope of work kept expanding, both in terms of geographic territory and community needs.

A new structure was needed that could encompass a broader vision. The National Hispanic University and the National Hispanic Center for Policy Analysis were created by the Board of Directors on August 20, 1980. The Bay Area Bilingual Education League programs continue under the direction of the National Hispanic University.

The National Hispanic University is a quality, post-secondary institution that admits all qualified students while heavily emphasizing minority recruitment. It is the intent of The National Hispanic University not only to recruit minority students, but also to provide them with a learning support system that leads to their graduation.

The University's current departments include programs leading to careers in Engineering, Business, Medicine, Education and Communications. Additionally, there is a Center for Professional Development which addresses the particular needs of adults seeking a career change or growth within their professional or technical fields.

The National Hispanic Center for Policy Analysis is a research institute under the University which brings together outstanding scholars from various fields to seek solutions and recommend policies to improve the condition of Hispanics in the United States.

The tremendous amount of national support from community-based organizations, corporations, and individuals during our first academic year is a strong endorsement for the continuing need and quality of the programs offered by the National Hispanic University.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN WELLS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Washington has more lobbyists, both the registered professionals and the individual citizens fighting for their clause, than any other city in the United States. Thus, losing a lobbyist would normally be no cause for concern, and in fact might make some people happy. But, this is not so in the case of John Wells, who has in recent years so ably represented the Port of Long Beach and the city of Long Beach, in addition to some other clients, on Capitol Hill.

I have known John for almost the entire time that I have been in Congress. During these 14 plus years, I have grown to know and respect the position he takes on a wide variety of issues.

John Wells is not the type of lobbyist who rushes in breathless and confronts you with a crisis in which he has not developed all of the details and the pros and cons—in other words, has not done his homework. To the contrary, I have learned that I can always count on John to have looked at all of the angles on whatever position he is presenting, and to honestly and completely inform me of the points of those who are against the position he is supporting as well as those points supporting his position. In order words, he presents a complete case, and does do his homework.

John has not limited his activities solely to lobbying in the office. He, and his wife Dee, have been strong supporters of the California State Society and during the period of time a few years ago when membership was dropping off and the society needed strenthening, the two of them provided the necessary leadership for the revitalization of the society. As a result, membership is now well up and participation in all events is at the highest level in the society's history. Dee, incidentally, volunteered to serve as the society historian in addition to her other work.

As Dee and John Wells prepare to leave the hectic environment of our Nation's Capital, which they have known for so long, and relocate to Sun City, Ariz., I can honestly say they will be deeply missed by all who knew them here in Washington and relied upon them in the years past. The loss to our Nation's Capital is certainly the gain of Sun City, for I know as soon as they get settled in their new location, these two will not be content to sit back and let the world pass them by. Rather, they will be kicking it to make it move faster.

My wife Lee joins me in wishing Dee and John Wells the very best of the years ahead as they enjoy their well earned retirement. We will miss, them, both here and in Long Beach.●

THE STUDENT FREEZE CAMPAIGN

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today, the Student Freeze Campaign has been in Washington. This campaign is the work of a group of intelligent and concerned high school students who are dedicated to fighting the escalation of the arms race. They are here today specifically to urge Members of the other body to support the freeze resolution sponsored by Senators KENNEDY and HATFIELD. I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major groups that make up the student freeze campaign is the Students/Teacher Organization of Prevent Nuclear War of Newton, Mass. Several months ago, I had the privilege of meeting with several of the young people who are active in this organization and I want to congratulate them for the sensible and effective campaign they have organized in such a short period of time. The work these students is doing is important not only for those of us who share their belief in the importance of changing American policy so that we can bring about an end to the arms race. Their work is also an important example to young people throughout the country who have concerns with public policy.

The effort these young people—most of whom are not yet themselves of voting age—have put into this campaign is a model of how concerned citizens should function in our democratic society.

I wish to share with the Members here their explanation of their position.

STUDENT FREEZE CAMPAIGN

The Student Freeze Campaign formed so that we, as high school students, can have a voice in legislator's decisions that will profoundly affect our lives and the lives of our children. Present nuclear weapons policy, which permits the arms race to escalate out of reasonable control, jeopardizes our futures. Therefore, we call on our senators to support the Kennedy-Hatfield Joint Resolution (S.J. Res. 2) as the first step towards bilateral disarmament.

We support this resolution, which calls for a mutual and verifiable freeze on the production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons to be followed by reductions, for three basic reasons.

First, to permit real, stabilizing reductions in nuclear arms; not just cuts in some types that will be more than offset by increases in other types. Only by stopping nuclear weapons systems across the board can we then begin to reduce the stockpiles.

Second, it is now a good time to freeze; the United States and the Soviet Union have reached rough parity (the U.S. with 30,000 and the U.S.S.R. with 20,000 warheads). A freeze could also prevent the increase in the risk of nuclear war that will occur if new first-strike, counter-force weapons are produced.

Third, we feel that a freeze on the production, testing and further deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles and other delivery systems can be verified. A comprehensive freeze would be violated if activity in any category is detected.

Not only do we have the right to demand that our senators support the Kennedy-Hatfield Resolution, but we have the responsibility to do so. We owe our kids the right to learn, live and dream just as we have.

Signed by: Student/Teacher Organization to Prevent Nuclear War, Newton, Mass. chapters; Children's Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Wilmington, Del., Students for Peace, New York, N.Y.●

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I have introduced a bill to reauthorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission which is in essence a simple and rational alternative to the wrongheaded approach taken in H.R. 2668, the Consumer Product Safety Act Amendments of 1983. I intend to offer my bill as an amendment in the nature of a substitute when House consideration of the Consumer Product Safety Act Amendments continues later this week. My substitute presents an alternative which is fiscally sound and substantively fair. It is supported by a broad coalition of business and industry across the Nation, and many of my colleagues will no doubt recognize among the signers of the following letter, several businesses whose interests are represented in their own districts. I submit this letter for the RECORD and my colleagues' review:

JUNE 20, 1983.

We the undersigned businesses and associations strongly support the Shelby-Broyhill substitute bill, (H.R. 3015) to the Consumer Product Safety Commission Reauthorization bill, (H.R. 2668) introduced by Rep. Waxman. We are opposed to H.R. 2668 because the Waxman bill contains numerous amendments to the underlying Consumer Product Safety Act without adequate justification.

There were substantive reform amendments to the Consumer Product Safety Act during the 1981 reauthorization that represented positive changes in the Commission's regulatory process. We believe the 1981 amendments need time to be fully implemented, to be evaluated, and to function, prior to making new or additional changes in the Act.

Additionally, the Shelby-Broyhill substitute reauthorizes the Commission to continue its important work at inflation adjusted funding levels, which are in line with recent Appropriations' Committee action rather than the 40% increase envisioned by Rep. Waxman's bill.

The Shelby-Broyhill substitute enables the Consumer Product Safety Commission to fulfill its responsibilities in a cost-effective manner. We urge you to cosponsor and support H.R. 3015 when it reaches the House floor shortly.

Sincerely,

American Retail Federation, Armstrong World Industries, Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers, Ball Corporation, B. F. Goodrich Company, Bicycle Manufacturers Association.

Carpet and Rug Institute, Chainsaw Manufacturers Association, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association, Closure Manufacturers Association, Ebco Manufacturing Company, Federated Department Stores, Formaldehyde Institute, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., General Electric Company, Glass Packaging Institute, Hamilton Beach Division, Scovill Incorporated, Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Association, In-Sink-Erator, Industrial Heating Equipment Association, International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions, International Snowmobile Industry Association, Johnson Controls Incorporated, Juvenile Products Manufacturers of America, KitchenAid Division of Hobart Corporation, Magic Chef, Martin Industries, Maytag Company, Metal Ware Corporation, National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, National Association of Manufacturers.

National Electrical Manufacturers Association, National Forest Products Association, National Kitchen Cabinet Association, National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, National Paint & Coatings Association, Inc., National Particleboard Association, National Presto Industries, Incorporated, National Retail Merchants Association, National Swimming Pool Institute, Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Owens-Illinois, Incorporated, Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Company, Resilient Floor Covering Institute, Sears, Roebuck & Company, Society of American Wood Preservers, Southern Furniture Manufacturers Association, Sun Company Incorporated, Sunbeam Corporation, Teledyne Still-Man, Toastmaster Inc., Toy Manufacturers Association, Waring Products Division, Dynamics Corporation of America, Westbend Company, Whirlpool Corporation, White Consolidated Industries.●

NEW JERSEY FEATURED IN FESTIVAL OF AMERICAN FOLKLIFE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I join with Congressman ROBERT ROE in saluting the 17th annual Festival of American Folklife, sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service, which begins Thursday on the National Mall. Our home State, New Jersey, is honored to be featured in this year's event. We share in this participation with America's great friend and ally, France.

We are pleased to show thousands and thousands of Americans that we are rightly called the Garden State and are grateful for this chance to put on display the customs and mores and traditions that are the product of our State's diverse ethnic heritage.

The festival runs from June 23 to June 27 and from June 30 to July 4. I hope that many of my colleagues and their families will have the opportunity to visit the mall and to share in the heritage of which the residents of our States are justly proud.

More than 100 of my fellow citizens will take part in this festival, re-creating ethnic celebrations with their music, crafts, folklore, and foods. A list of the participants follows. I thank them for their contributions that will surely make the festival an outstanding success.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MARITIME TRADITIONS

Beryl Whittington, Port Norris—oyster shucker/gospel singer.

Donald Cisrow, Port Norris—oyster shucker/gospel singer.

Evelyn Cisrow, Port Norris—oyster shucker/gospel singer.

Sarah Cisrow, Port Norris—oyster shucker/gospel singer.

Joseph Gibbs, Port Norris—oyster shucker/gospel singer.

Harry Shourds, Seaville, decoy carver.

Anthony Hillman, Seaville—boatbuilder, decoy carver.

Charles E. Hankins, Lavallette—boatbuilder.

Bernie Borrelli, Lavallette—boatbuilder.

Sam Hunt, Waretown—boatbuilder.

William R. Richardson, Keyport—lobster trap maker.

Mrs. William Richardson, Keyport—assists lobster trap maker.

Henry Weldon, Millville—rush-seat weaver.

Owen J. Carney, Port Norris—salt-hay-rope maker.

Gary Giberson, Port Republic—decoy carver.

AFRO-AMERICAN ALABAMA DAY

Thurma Britt, Newark—cook.

Glennie Davis Franklin, Hillside—shape-note singer.

Mary Alice Phillips, Elizabeth—shape-note singer.

Mabel Jackson, East Orange—shape-note singer.

Mabel Upshaw, East Orange—shape-note singer.

GALICIAN QUEIMADA RITUAL

Arturo Lopez-Dominguez, Newark—celebration coordinator.

Carlos Corbacho, Newark—director, Andurina, a group of Galician bagpipers.

Francisco Lara, Newark—drummer; bagpiper with Andurina.

Jose Noguerol (father), Newark—bagpiper with Andurina.

Jose Noguerol (son), Newark—bagpiper with Andurina.

Alvaro Castro, Bayonne—bagpiper with Andurina.

Jorge Fernandez Jr., Newark—bagpiper with Andurina.

Amador Lopez, Irvington—bagpiper with Andurina.

Julia Lara, Newark—cook.

Manuel Garcia, Califon—choral director.

Francisco Platas, Linden—choral member.

Alezandro Cobelo, Newark—choral member.

Manuel Alonso, Kearny—choral member.

Juan Alvarez, Roselle Park—choral member.

JAPANESE BON FESTIVAL

(Mrs.) Iddy Asada, Bridgeton—cook.

(Mrs.) Harumi Taniguchi, Seabrook—cook.

(Miss) Fusaye Kazaoka, Bridgeton—embroidery.

(Mrs.) Suzi Takata, Bridgeton—crafts.

(Mrs.) Shigeko, Kazaoka, Bridgeton—crafts.

(Mrs.) Hisano Tazumi, Bridgeton—crafts.

(Mrs.) Sunke Oye, Vineland—dance.

(Mrs.) Kazuyo Nakao, Seabrook—dance.

(Mrs.) Ellen Nakamura, Elmer—Obon dance coordinator and kimono demonstrator.

(Mr.) Kiyomi Nakamura, Elmer—technical director for Obon dance.

Drummers for Seabrook community celebrations (from New York): Theodora Yoshikami, Sandy Ikeda, Dr. Peter Wong, Jenny Wada, Wendy Takahisa and Audee Williams.

GERMAN OKTOBERFEST

Bernie Bunger, Piscataway—bandleader.

Betty Bunger, Piscataway—cook.

Bernie Bunger, Sr., Scotch Plains—dancer.

Elfriede Bunger, Scotch Plains—dancer.

Karl Pfeifer, Franklin Lake—singer and brass-instrument player.

Bill Mueller, Union—singer and drummer.

Dana Sylvander, Englewood—brass-instrument player.

John Van Decker, Avenel—brass-instrument player.

ITALIAN FEAST OF OUR LADY OF CASADRINO

The Joseph Colletti Marching Band:

John Peraino, Trenton—director.

Russ Jenkins, Trenton—trumpet.

John Bonfante, Trenton—trumpet.

Sarah Peraino, Trenton—assistant.

Carmine DeLorento, Trenton—trumpet.

Louis Cordas, Trenton—clarinet.

James Peraino, Cranbury—saxophone.

James Penkala, Trenton—baritone.

Ron Hansen, Morrisville, Pa.—trombone.

Andrew Wierzbowski, Trenton—clarinet.

Frank Miller, Hamilton Square—saxophone.

Al Procassini, West Chester, Pa.—trombone.

Bill Felter, Bordentown—drums.

Joseph D'Ambrosio, Trenton—drums.

Nate Pratico, Trenton—tuba.

Aldo Stagi, Yardley, Pa.—baritone.

Paul Farinella, Trenton—drums.

Franz Mayer, Trenton—drums.

Roy Hasty, Trenton—tuba.

Nick Sciarrotta, Trenton—trumpet.

AGRICULTURE

Mary Sorbello, Mullica Hill—produce sales.

Susan Sorbello, Mullica Hill—produce sales.

Julie Sorbello, Mullica Hill—produce sales.

Joan Sorbello Adams, Mullica Hill—produce sales.

Anthony Catalano, Salem—produce sales.

Joseph Catalano, Salem—produce sales.

Terry Wikoff, Englishtown—farmer.

Charles Wikoff III, Englishtown—farmer.

MUSIC

Bishop Jeff Banks, Rev. Charles Banks and the Revival Temple Mass Choir, Newark—gospel choir.

Saul Betesh, Deal—Sephardic oud player.

Tex Logan, Madison—fiddle (and his band).

"Doc" McKenzie and the Gospel Hi-Lites:

Milbert "Doc" McKenzie, Paterson—vocals.

David McKenzie, Paterson—vocals.

Abraham McKenzie, Paterson—vocals.

William Wribbee, Paterson—vocals.

Greg Herbert, Paterson—organ.

Darryl Henley, Paterson—guitar.

Marvin Bradshaw, Paterson—bass.

Henry Redmond, Paterson—drums.

"Purewater":

Johnny Shipley, Newark—leader.

Charles Banks Jr., Newark—vocals.

Wayne Johnson, Irvington—vocals.

Terrance Forward, Newark—vocals.

Joe Briscoe, Newark—vocals.

Walter Rhodes, Paterson—blues singer, guitar.

SILK

Joseph Grauso, Elmwood Park—Paterson silk weaver.

Roy Harris, Bensalem, Pa.—Paterson silk weaver.

Prince Hatley, Philadelphia, Pa.—Paterson silk weaver.

TRADITIONAL MEDICINE AND PHARMACOLOGY

Dr. Alvin B. Segelman, Piscataway—pharmacognosist.

Efrain Osorio, Newark—herbalist.

Evidio Espinosa, West New York—herbalist.

Louis Molinari and Fred Anderson, of Ciba-Geigy Corp., Summit, N.J.—glassblowers.

Dr. Graham M. Smith, Scotch Plains—molecular systems chemist (of Merck, Sharp & Dohme Research Labs, Rahway).

Dr. Robert B. Nachbar, Scotch Plains—molecular systems chemist (of Merck, Sharp & Dohme Research Labs, Rahway).

Herbert Schuster, East Hanover—bench chemist (of Sandoz Inc., East Hanover).

Dr. Nathan Steinberg, Rahway—bench chemist (of Merck, Sharp & Dohme Research Labs, Rahway).●

TRIBUTE TO SILVIO CONTE

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon an uncommon event took place on Capitol Hill. A Member of Congress was honored by his peers for his personal commitment to this body and for his excellence as a legislator.

Special orders for retiring Members of this body are common occurrences; 1 minute speeches can be heard for days after a Member of Congress dies. This Member, however, is not recently deceased or retired. He is a hardworking and powerful Member of this House—a man known for his strong personal conviction and his ability to colorfully convey those beliefs in this Chamber. This afternoon, I had the honor of hosting "A Salute to a Great Salutor"—the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, SIL CONTE.

SIL CONTE's leadership on the Appropriations Committee is respected by all Members of this House. His 25 years of experience is a valuable resource. When he speaks on transportation and health issues, we listen. When he defends an attack on the environment, we recognize his expertise. When he fights for additional education funding, we respect his position, and when he salutes a colleague Italian style, we quickly head for the cloakroom—everyone hopes it is not meant for them.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member—regardless of his or her political philosophy—appreciates the contribution of SILVIO CONTE. Not only does he add substance to House debates, but his colorful style is a unique and unpredictable element in our proceedings. The people of the First District in Massachusetts are lucky to have a Congressman like SIL CONTE, and we are fortunate to have him as a colleague and friend.

INTERNATIONAL FIRE STUDY SHOULD BE APPROACHED WITH CAUTION

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1983, hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment on H.R. 1880, the Cigarette Safety Act. At those March hearings, Philip S. Schaeman, a former Associate Administrator of the U.S. Fire Administration in charge of the National Fire Data Center, testified on behalf of the Tobacco Institute in opposition to fire-safe cigarette legislation. Mr. Schaeman based his remarks on a recent study which he authored and which was financed by the Tobacco Institute, pertaining to international fire protection concepts.

The validity of Mr. Schaeman's remarks, based on his study, "International Concepts in Fire Protection: Ideas From Europe That Could Improve U.S. Fire Safety," have recently come under public criticism from the National Association for Public Health Policy. What follows is a letter from NAPHP which concludes:

This report should be read as a descriptive review of fire safety practices currently used in Europe. It should not be permitted to deflect attention from specific ignition sources, such as the cigarette. It is not a document to guide policy decisions by Fire Service officers and legislators responsible for the prevention of deaths in fires in the United States.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH POLICY,
South Burlington, Vt., May 18, 1983.

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The Tobacco Institute has recently funded a study entitled "International Concepts in Fire Protection: Ideas from Europe that Could Improve U.S. Fire Safety." [1] The expressed intent of the study has merit. The United States and Canada have fire death rates at least double those of European countries. The author, Philip S. Schaenman, states that he undertook the study: "to better understand the reasons for the success of European fire protection and to identify practices we might adopt in the United States."

The report includes a graph presenting rates of fire deaths per million population for seventeen countries, reproduced from "Selected International Comparisons of Fire Loss." [2] Rates (1977-78) for the USA and the five countries featured in the Schaenman report are listed below:

References at end of article.

Deaths per million population

Country:	
United States	29.4
Sweden	16.2
United Kingdom	14.6
France	14.5
Germany	8.6
Switzerland	7.0

While it is clear that the United Kingdom and France have a fire death rate only half that of the United States, it is also true that Germany has a death rate approximately half that of Sweden, and Switzerland only half that of the United Kingdom and France. What is it that explains these differences in fire death rates?

The report fails to address in any systematic way the fundamental issue of the causes of fires and fire deaths in either the United States or the five European countries. There is no examination of distribution of ignition sources, consumer product ignition or structural involvement across countries. Despite this, the implication of the report is that the fire safety practices which differ in kind or intensity from those in the United States might explain Europe's better record. Before Mr. Schaenman or any researcher can advocate that the United States adopt European fire prevention techniques, he or she must demonstrate that those techniques, not already in place in the USA, are effective for the type of fires prevalent in the United States. Had documentation of fire cause been supplied, a reader could correlate fire safety practices with fewer deaths due to specific ignition sources. This might permit informed decisions about which practices would have the greater likelihood of success in fire prevention in the United States. It is true that information on cause of fatal fires has not been gathered centrally at any university or agency, and must therefore be sought singly from national fire reports. However, the absence of this data nullifies the attempt by Mr. Schaenman to associate fire safety practices with lower fire death rates.

Although reliable information on ignition sources is missing from data bases accumulated for international comparisons, the role of the cigarette as the ignition source in fatal fires is well documented for the United States. Data analyzed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Fire Data Center, of which Mr. Schaenman was director, indicates that fires started by smoking materials accounted for 22% of all fire deaths in the United States in 1978.[3] Heating apparatus accounted for 13% of the deaths, while fires caused by cooking, incendiary actions and children playing with fire each contributed an additional 6% to the total. When the "unknown cause" category is distributed proportionately among the known causes, 32% of all fatal fires are caused by smoking materials. Of these smoking materials, 79% are known to be cigarettes, while only 1.1% are known to be pipes or cigars.

Evaluation of strategies to reduce fire deaths in the USA must consider what is known about the behavioral and environmental factors associated with specific types of fires. The primary ignition source in fatal fires in the United States and the United Kingdom is the cigarette. The population most at risk from starting, and dying in, cigarette-ignited fires are those who smoke and drink alcohol before going to sleep. It is the deadly combination of alcohol and cigarettes, and the habitual behaviors of those who mix them, which militates against public education to increase awareness and carefulness as an effective strategy to prevent fire deaths. A more effective strategy would be to modify the cigarette to reduce its propensity to ignite smoldering furniture and bedding fires. Similar analyses should be done for fires ignited by cooking appliances, heaters, arsonists and children. While it is true that smoke detectors have life-saving potential after a fire starts and should be installed in every dwelling, it is irrational not to try to prevent the fire from starting.

Knowledge of the role of the cigarette in fatal fires in the USA suggested that there might be an association between cigarette consumption and the fire death rate. Below are listed the six countries featured in the study, their fire death rates (1972-1974) and the number of cigarettes consumed per adult per year (1973).[4]

Country	Deaths per million population	Cigarettes per adult per year
United States	31	3,850
United Kingdom	17	3,230
France	15	1,920
Sweden	14	1,580
Germany	9	2,610
Switzerland	6	[1] 2,360

[1] Consumption figures for Switzerland have been adjusted to accommodate note in report about high rates of purchase of cigarettes by borderers, toursts and seasonal workers.

A simple linear regression on these points produces a correlation coefficient of .67, and an r^2 of .45, which means that 45% of the variability in overall fire death rates can be explained by the variability of cigarette consumption. If cigarette consumption had nothing to do with fire deaths, one would expect a correlation coefficient close to zero. Further analysis is required before one can rule whether this association is coincidental, confounded or real. However, the association is maintained when one plots fire deaths against cigarette consumption for the sixteen countries presented on the graph in the report; 39% of the variability in death rates can be explained by the variability in cigarette consumption (see Figure 1). One wonders what the correlation coefficient would be if rates of death resulting from cigarette-ignited fires were plotted against cigarette consumption. If one could show that the volume of cigarettes smoked rather than the behavior of the smoker determined national rates of fire deaths, the conclusion about effective preventive strategies would be to alter the ignition propensity of the cigarette rather than the behavior of the smoker.

Nevertheless, approximately 60% of the variability in overall fire death rates is unexplained by these analyses. One must consider fire safety practices, as well as such other societal facors as "income distribution, education, degree of government regulation, family life, and attitudes toward the law," as Mr. Schaenman acknowledges.

This report should be read as a descriptive review of fire safety practices currently used in Europe. It should not be permitted to deflect attention from specific ignition sources, such as the cigarette. It is not a document to guide policy decisions by Fire Service officers and legislators responsible for the prevention of deaths in fires in the United States.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH MCLOUGHLIN.

REFERENCES

1. Philip S. Schaenman, "International Concepts in Fire Protection: Ideas from Europe that Could Improve U.S. Fire Safety." Arlington, Virginia: Tri-Data, (December, 1982).

2. Jerry Banks, "Selected International Comparisons of Fire Loss 1979-1980." Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Institute of Technology, (September, 1982).

3. Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Fire in the United States: Deaths, Injuries, Dollar Loss and Incidents at the National, State and Local Levels in 1978," U.S. Government Printing Office (July, 1982).

4. P. N. Lee, "Tobacco Consumption in Various Countries," London: Tobacco Research Council (1975).●

DEMILITARIZATION OF BZ

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering the military construction authorization and appropriations bills. Both of these bills contain $10.2 million for the Pine Bluff Arsenal to demilitarize BZ, which is an incapacitating chemical agent that was developed for use in bombs in the 1950's.

I think the demilitarization of BZ is a good idea and I strongly support the funding included in these bills for that purpose. The Army informed me last year that the Secretary of Defense had directed that all BZ be destroyed that is currently in the U.S. stockpile because the effects of BZ cannot accurately be predicted, and the agent was therefore not classified for standard use by the Army. It is a shame that we spent so much money to produce a weapon that does not work. I hope we can prevent those same mistakes in the binary program, should we ever decide to produce them.

As I said earlier, I support the demilitarization of BZ, just as I support the demilitarization of all chemical weapons that are leaking or have deteriorated to the point that there is no way they are usable. However, it does concern me that a 1977 GAO report entitled, "Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Munitions and Agents—Better Management Needed," cited the fact that the Department of Defense had demilitarized and disposed of large quantities of usable lethal chemical agents and munitions. While we were not able to prevent those from being destroyed, I hope that that will not occur in the future. I was pleased to hear, however, that the latest GAO report makes note of improvements made in the upkeep of the chemical weapons stockpile, which resulted in an actual increase in the size of our stockpile of usable, unitary chemical weapons. Incidentally, that further proves my point that we do not need binary chemical weapons because we already have an adequate stockpile of unitaries that seems to have the potential to increase even further with better management and upkeep of our stockpile.

Another concern that I have is about the use of the facility for the demilitarization of BZ. I know full well that studies and plans were discussed to use this facility for the demilitarization of other agents and munitions—specifically nerve agents and munitions. I will be carefully watching the BZ demilitarization operations and will strongly object to any move to demilitarize other agents without prior approval of Congress. While the Pine Bluff Arsenal does possess a stockpile of nerve agents, I do not believe the arsenal should be made into a regional demilitarization facility for all the nerve agents stockpiled in various locations around the country. I know there are leakers that need to be destroyed—and they should be destroyed—but the drill and transfer system (DATS) should be employed to the extent possible before any plans are made to haul the weapons to any regional demil facility.

In short, we need to be sure that the agents that are being demilitarized are only those that are leaking or hopelessly unusable, such as BZ, and that the facility at the Pine Bluff Arsenal is used only for the purpose stated by the Army and that is the demilitarization of BZ.●

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND: THE UNNOTICED HOLOCAUST

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a threat to the security of this Nation when members of our Armed Forces are getting mixed signals on the matter of resistance to totalitarian socialism, which is in fact—communism.

Back in 1947, the Reverend John P. Noonan, S.J., authored the text, "General and Special Ethics." It had the imprimatur or approval in the matter of faith and morals of Samuel Cardinal Stritch of Chicago. I quote a couple of passages from that text on the matter of communism, which appropriately is carried under the heading of socialism. Concerning the abuse of private property Father Noonan states:

> The difference is that socialists assert that these evils are inherent in the system of private property, while the Popes insist that they are an abuse of it and could be corrected. And of course the Popes teach that the remedy of socialism is far worse than the disease of capitalism.

On the ethical and religious bases of socialism, Father Noonan states:

> The philosophy of socialism is purely materialistic. Ordinary religious terms such as God, the soul, and the moral law have an interpretation taken from materialistic pantheism. Everything, says socialism, is constantly in a state of flux, evolving towards a higher goal. There is no fixed of immutable morality or truth . . . Religion is the opiate of the people and similar slogans have been used too frequently to be explained away; and any—if such there are—who still doubt their intentions are too naive to stand in need of deception.

Pius XI in his encyclical on atheistic communism—Divini Redemptoris delivered in 1937 stated:

> Communism is intrinsically wrong and no one who would save Christian Civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever.

To that could be added nothing except to question the present day situation ethics of the bishops of America who preach that there is no room for nuclear defense, and in fact, call for a unilateral freeze of American weaponry to defend this Nation and its citizens. I do not remember who said it but I do remember the quote that stated: "How do you sit down and negotiate with anyone who refuses even the right of our society to exist on the face of the earth?"

Now columnist John Snyder of Washington Dateline, in an article titled, "The Unnoticed Holocaust," calls attention to yet another genocidal atrocity being committed with poison gas against peoples of Afghanistan and Southeast Asia. It is genocide no matter which way the pie is cut, yet the bishops remain silent. The Hmong or Meo tribesmen of northern Laos are fierce defenders of the right to live on their own land and will die down to the last child rather than surrender to atheistic communism. The communists know that and that is why the Meos have to be exterminated—totally—and that is genocide or as John Snyder suggests: Holocaust.

If there is any further doubt with regard to the naive or perhaps sufferers of the disease of surrenderitis, let it be noted with regard to the Catholic Church, that even the Washington Post in its June 19, 1983, edition documents what really happened when Pope John Paul II went to Nicaragua. Do the American bishops want that to happen here?

For the benefit of my colleagues and the American Catholic military personnel I submit both John Snyder's timely article of June 6, 1983, and the Washington Post article, titled, "Protest of Papal Visit Part of Anti-Church Plan, Nicaraguan Says." Articles follow:

[From the Washington Dateline, June 6, 1983]

THE UNNOTICED HOLOCAUST

(By John Snyder)

By an overwhelming vote, the Catholic Bishops of the United States recently endorsed a freeze of nuclear weapons, which may or may not ever be used.

On the other hand, chemical weapons, with their agonizing effects, have been and are being used by the Soviets and their militaristic stoolies in different parts of the world. Yet, the Bishops as a group have not condemned this barbarity.

Why not? Why this apparent hypocrisy?

Why condemn the possible use of nuclear weapons for the defense of the United States and ignore the actual use of chemical weapons in aggressive war by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Before we bring charges against the Bishops, let's review some of the facts.

On February 5, 1982, James A. Phillips of The Heritage Foundation reported that the Soviets and their proxies "are waging a clandestine war of chemical terror against the political and ethnic groups that have refused to be subdued by conventional arms" in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Laos.

In his report, Phillips wrote that as early as 1976, "terror-stricken refugees began streaming out of Laos carrying news of a gruesome new addition to the arsenal of the Soviet bloc. They told of a poisonous yellow cloud that they called 'Yellow Rain' because small particles in the cloud made sounds like raindrops as they settled on the roof of their huts and on the surrounding fields. The mysterious yellow poison, delivered by aerial bombing and artillery attacks inflicted bizarre and grievous injuries on the victims, often resulting in quick, painful death. Direct exposure to the clouds caused breathing difficulties, extreme irritation of the eyes, skin, nose, throat and lungs. Small, hard blisters formed over exposed body surfaces. This was accompanied by coughing of blood-tinged material, choking, dizziness, multiple hemorrhaging of mucous membranes, vomiting massive quantities of blood, the seeping of blood from eyes, ears and nose, convulsions and death. All this happened within hours, sometimes, minutes. Shortly after death, the skin turned black."

Similar symptoms have been documented in Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

On March 22, 1982, then-Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr., in a report to the Congress on "Chemical Warfare in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan," stated that the evidence "has led the U.S. Government to conclude that Lao and Vietnamese forces, operating under Soviet supervision, have since 1975, employed lethal chemical and toxin weapons in Laos; that Vietnamese forces have, since 1978, used lethal chemical and toxin agents in Kampuchea; and that Soviet forces have used a variety of lethal chemical warfare agents, including nerve gases, in Afghanistan since the Soviet invasion of that country in 1979."

The question remains: What in the world or out of it is wrong with the Bishops?

If they're impelled to condemn warfare, why not condemn actual aggressive chemical warfare by the Soviet Union rather than possible defensive warfare by the United States?

In the opinion of this commentator, these men are not acting as spiritual shepherds should.

However, the buck does not stop there. It must stop with the Vatican officials who promoted these men in the first place and, specifically, with the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Bishops, Sebastiano Cardinal Baggio, 10 Piazza Pio XII, Rome, Italy.

There are two courses of action which may be taken. One is to write to Cardinal Baggio and let him know that you think he has contributed to an intolerable situation. Another very effective action is to stop giving to Sunday church collections until the Bishops stop acting like ill-informed military strategists.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1983]

PROTEST OF PAPAL VISIT PART OF ANTI-CHURCH PLAN, NICARAGUAN SAYS

(By Joanne Omang and Don Oberdorfer)

Demonstrations against Pope John Paul II in Nicaragua last March were carefully orchestrated as a part of a wider effort to discredit the church among the Nicaraguan people and neutralize its resistance to the Sandinista regime, according to a recent defector from the Nicaraguan intelligence service.

Miguel Bolanos Hunter, 24, said the plan was to associate priests and the existing church hierarchy with "the two enemies of the Nicaraguan people: the United States and the wealthy class, the bourgeoisie."

A "mob" of handpicked activists kept devout Catholics trapped in a church and away from the pope, who was then insulted and heckled as he tried to pray, Bolanos said, in order to make him appear isolated from the people during his visit to Managua.

The overall Sandinista effort against the church, according to Bolanos, has included close surveillance of Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo and a faked sex scandal last year involving one of his priests, the Rev. Bismarck Carballo.

Bolanos said the intelligence unit called F7, which had responsibility for mobilizing citizens for demonstrations, was ordered to pick 200 block leaders who each brought five or six trusted residence to the public square where the pope was to speak in March. Anyone trying to attend independently was turned away, Bolanos said.

Catholics who did not want to heckle the pope went to the churches the night before his visit in order to pray all night, Bolanos said, intending to march together to the square the next day. Instead, he said, F7 agents organized crowds to heckle the people in the churches and to keep them in there until the pope finished speaking.

Bolanos said he was in a command post, just off the square, that coordinated the various groups, putting in the forefront groups of women carrying pictures of sons who had died during the Sandinista overthrow of dictator Gen. Anastasio Somoza in 1979. The women were urged to ask the pope to pray for their sons' souls, which in the Sandinistas' eyes would have allied him with their struggle.

"He didn't want to do it because if he had, it would have meant he was in solidarity with the communist army," Bolanos said. As the pope began praying on another subject, one of the women gained control of the microphone system and begged him to pray for her son the martyr. Her act was "practically a sacrilege, an act of total disrespect," he continued.

The pope left the square without finishing the prayer, Bolanos said. "It was a success, because many people thought the lack of respect was spontaneous, and that the pope was simply against the revolution."

The church in Nicaragua originally backed the Sandinista government but in 1980 Archbishop Obando y Bravo began complaining of growing censorship and repression of dissent. He became a major target of surveillance after the pope's visit, Bolanos continued. When the archbishop tried to remove a priest favorable to the Sandinistas, mobs were organized to pose as parishioners, take over the church and beat up the new priest, according to Bolanos.

Lenin Cerna, head of the Interior Ministry's department of state security, issued written orders that all existing information and all new material on the bishop was to be sent to an analysis center, and the order was posted on intelligence office walls, Bolanos said. "They are collecting all the information to design a plan to destroy him."

An earlier part of that effort involved the archbishop's spokesman, the Rev. Carballo, who initially came under Bolanos' jurisdiction because of Carballo's friendship with many Americans in Nicaragua. Bolanos said he was told that the F4 section of the security operation—assigned to keep track of the churches, unions and political parties—was planning to use a prostitute "known and used by all the Sandinista high command" to disgrace Carballo.

The prostitute, named Marixsa, posed in 1982 as a penitent asking Carballo's counsel on personal problems. She tried to win Carballo's confidence, hoping eventually to seduce him, Bolanos said.

Finally, while the two were talking over lunch one day last August, an F4 agent burst into the room, pretending to be the woman's husband. He attacked the priest, ripping his clothes off, and pushed him into the street where people organized by the F7 unit were waiting with cameras. Also waiting outside was a van with dark windows, in which Cerna and Interior Minister Tomas Borge had front-row seats from which to laugh at the naked priest, Bolanos, said.

Government media played up the event, claiming Carballo had been caught in a love triangle. The archbishop—correctly, Bolanos indicated—said the whole incident had been "a show to slander the church."●

INNOCENT VICTIMS OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the State Department, in conjunction with the Attorney General, has recently reprimanded Cuba for their refusal to take back certain undesirable Cuban nationals who entered the United States during the Mariel boatlift of 1980. On May 25, Assistant Secretary Thomas O. Enders announced that the United States would discontinue the issuance of immigrant visas in Cuba indefinitely. While immigrant visas to immediate relatives—spouses, minor children, and parents—and nonimmigrant visas will still be issued, immigrant visas in all the preference categories—married and unmarried brothers and sisters, et cetera—will not, except to Cuban applicants in third countries.

The recent action by the State Department is consistent with the provisions of section 243(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; however, it nonetheless raises serious questions. First, since no visas have been issued to otherwise qualified preference category applicants since 1980, on what grounds have they been previously withheld and what new hardship does the new ruling inflict? Second, is this action designed to legitimate and formalize what has been previously a de facto policy? Third, whom do we intend to punish for the sins of the Castro government? Does not this action penalize U.S. citizens seeking to be reunited with their relatives in Cuba?

These and other questions were recently addressed by the former chief of the U.S. Interests Section in Havana in a letter he wrote to the editor of the New York Times critical of our immigration policy toward Cuba. He suggests that political considerations may have supplanted the law in our policy toward Cuba.

There is a disturbing irony in this affair. Thousands of Cuban nationals have been placed in limbo since 1980, even though they had fully complied with our immigration laws and had qualified for immigrant visas under the preference categories. Yet while there is general agreement that the Castro government is a repressive dictatorship, the United States has simultaneously closed the door on those wishing to leave. I would hope that we can resolve this inconsistency.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1983]

FROM LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: INNOCENT VICTIMS OF U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

(By Wayne S. Smith)

To the Editor: On May 26, you reported that the Reagan Administration had just asked the Castro regime to take back criminals and other excludables dumped on us during the Mariel exodus. According to the report, the Administration threatened to suspend the issuance of preference immigrant visas in Havana if they were not taken back.

This is another instance of flimflam on the Administration's part. In belatedly making this public demand on the Cuban Government, it is simply trying to give some legal basis to what it has in fact been doing without any authority under law for over two years.

The Administration has refused to authorize visas for these divided Cuban families ever since it took office, turning a deaf ear to the pleas of the Interests Section in Havana that the only ones hurt by the refusal were the innocent applicants themselves, who had all their documentation and were eligible to receive visas to join their immediate families in the United States.

No explanation was given to the Interests Section, but in a memorandum dated Oct. 31, 1981, the State Department suggested that the purpose was to emphasize how cool were our relations with Cuba (though how refusing to unite divided families was to do that was never explained). The memo recognized that refusal to begin processing these visas might lead to serious legal problems. Ways were therefore suggested to finesse the matter with the public and the Congress.

When Congressional inquiries mounted, however, the department was hard-pressed for a legal explanation. In late 1982, it finally cited Section 243(g) of the Immigration Act which gives the President authority to suspend issuance of visas in countries whose governments will not accept the return of excludables.

The applicability of 243(g), however, was most doubtful. For one thing, the Reagan Administration had never asked the Cuban Government to take back the excludables. For another, it had ignored Cuban offers to resume negotiations on the matter—negotiations that had begun under Carter but had not, as of January 1981, produced agreement. After the inauguration, the Cubans indicated there was more flexibility in their position and suggested new rounds of talks. The Reagan Administration did not even bother to respond.

Castro will probably respond to the Administration's latest démarche by suggesting that the discussions be resuscitated. The Administration will say there is nothing to discuss, and there the matter will stand. After over two years of mishandling the issue, the Administration will now at least have half a legal leg to stand on. The divided families, however, will remain divided. One really must ask, To what purpose?

The case of some 1,500 former political prisoners is a separate issue but one in which U.S. motives are even more difficult to fathom. The Government has a clear commitment to process these people for entry into the U.S. I know. I transmitted that commitment to them on May 2, 1980.

On that day, some 800 of them had gathered at the Interests Section to ask when processing might begin. Many had been waiting for months. I told them that we had just received authorization. Numbers had been requested for them under the Refugee Act, and processing could begin.

Unfortunately, because of the consequences of the violence that broke out that day between the ex-prisoners and Cuban Government sympathizers, the Interests Section had to close its doors to the public for several months. We always assumed, however, that when we reopened, our first priority would be to these former prisoners, who were the victims of the violence, not its instigators.

We reckoned without the Reagan Administration, which turned its back on them, and, in so doing, dishonored the word of the U.S. Government. The President often speaks of his sympathy for the Cubans living under the Castro regime. He has a strange way of showing it.

MOUNT CARMEL TOWNSHIP ALUMNI ASSOCIATION FIRST ANNUAL BANQUET

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

• Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 3, the Mount Carmel Township Alumni Association will be conducting its first annual banquet.

The association was formed in 1982 and is comprised of alumni of the Mount Carmel Township's school district, which was disbanded in 1951 with the creation of the new jointure school board.

The price that was paid for progress in this case, Mr. Speaker, was the dissolution of a school with a long and proud history. Mount Carmel Township High School began in 1919. Its colors were green and gold and the nickname of its teams was the "Golden Bears." It was located in Locust Gap and over the years produced a series of championship teams. In 1934-35 the Mount Carmel boys basketball team were the champions of the Susquehanna League. In 1942-43, they were the champions of Keystone League. In 1931-32 and 1934-35, their girls basketball team were the champions of the Susquehanna League.

Over the years, the Mount Carmel football team achieved many records. They were frequently on the list of All American and All Opponent teams. They had many significant players, some of whom went on to college and professional ball.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, the Mount Carmel Township Alumni Association will celebrate on July 3. Today it has a membership of over 1,000 and is still growing. Its president is Reno Benidetti, its treasurer is Lorraine Waters Tuefel, and its recording secretary and historian is Ann Coyne.

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to join with all of the alumni of the Mount Carmel Township High School and, indeed, with the entire Northumberland County community, in congratulating the alumni association on its first annual banquet, in thanking its officers and active members for much hard work and in wishing all of them many, many more happy and successful years together.•

REGIONAL IMPACT OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

• Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, important votes will be cast today on the military construction appropriations and authorization bills for fiscal 1984. While spending for military construction comprises only a small portion of the DOD budget, these dollars can have a significant impact on the region in which they are spent.

Research done by the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition has pointed out some alarming trends in the spending of military construction dollars. In 1983, the proportion of total military construction dollars distributed to the Northeast-Midwest region stood at the same low level as it did in 1960.

In fact, even though the military construction budget increased by 43.4 percent between fiscal 1981 and 1983, the Northeast-Midwest's share of the national total actually declined from 20 to 15.3 percent. The Midwest's share dropped from 7.7 to 3.5 percent.

A representative example of the inequity in the distribution of military construction dollars is the case of California. California has one-third as many military installations as does the Northeast-Midwest region but will receive $81 million more in fiscal 1983 funds for military construction.

Not only do construction dollars translate into jobs, but the lack of funding for military construction in the region can only result in one thing; the breakdown of existing bases and equipment. As dollars are funneled out of the region, the long-term effect is to cause existing facilities to fall into disrepair. These facilities were closed. In fact, between 1969 and 1979, 208 facilities were closed in the Northeast-Midwest region. The closings of bases in the region means the security of half our Nation is jeopardized.

Congress should understand the implications of these spending trends. As a member from the Northeast-Midwest region, it is difficult to vote for a military construction bill which fails to adequately protect all parts of the Nation.

I hope that in future years, these patterns of spending are corrected to reflect the needs of the entire Nation.●

SIMPSON CELEBRATES 10TH YEAR AT JANES

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the achievements of Rev. Robert O. Simpson on the occasion of his 10th anniversary at Janes United Methodist Church in Brooklyn, N.Y. Reverend Simpson is a native of Brooklyn who has returned his time and his talents to the community through his leadership at Janes. He serves as an active member of the health committee for community planning board No. 3. The committee has oversight responsibility for community health and hospital services in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn. As president of the Janes Housing Development Corp., Reverend Simpson has promoted the rehabilitation and the acquisition of local properties for low-cost housing. His efforts, in the housing area, demonstrate a commitment to integrate the work of the church with the needs of the community.

Throughout his career, Robert O. Simpson has evidenced a concern for the needs of his community. He served as both a teacher and as a member of the school board in Brooklyn. In addition, Robert directed the "college bound program" for the United Interfaith Action Council. The council's program provided enrichment services for disadvantaged high school students with strong academic potential. From 1971 to 1973, Reverend Simpson helped countless youngsters to gain important academic skills prior to their freshman year in college. In addition to his community activities and a full-time pastorate at Janes, Reverend Simpson is also involved in several denominational organizations of the United Methodist Church.

Reverend Simpson's 10 years of service, to the Janes congregation and the Brooklyn community, has definitely improved the quality of life in my congressional district for many people. I want to offer my heartiest congratulations to Reverend Robert O. Simpson on his upcoming 10th anniversary on Sunday, June 26.●

HON. TOM STEED

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1983

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Tom Steed was a close and valued friend. His courage and commonsense served the people of his beloved Oklahoma for 32 years in the House of Representatives—longer than any other Oklahoman has served in the Congress.

Tom had a fine sense of humor as well, and he was likely to share a new story with his friends behind the rail, or in the cloakroom. He could always find the time to use a chuckle to take the edge off of a particularly trying day.

Tom Steed represented the people of Oklahoma with integrity and diligence. He brought good, sound, compassionate qualities to this House, and we are all the better for his having been here.

I am sorry that Tom is gone.●

NEED FOR HOUSING LEGISLATION STILL EXISTS

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we rise today to commend the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation on their recent offering of the new collateralized mortgage obligations. On June 7, Freddie Mac offered $1 billion of these new bonds, making it the single largest real estate offering ever. This offering is important for a number of reasons: First, all of the mortgages included in these CMO's represent new mortgages, not the repackaging of existing mortgages; second, and possibly more important, it appears that Freddie Mac may have found a way to tap into the large pool of assets currently controlled by our Nation's pension funds.

As many of our colleagues know, we have been working diligently for some time to reduce the restrictions placed on the path of pension fund investments in the residential mortgage market. Last year we introduced H.R. 6781, which garnered the support of 265 Members of the House. This session in H.R. 1418 we have exerted a similar effort. The recent offering of these CMO's represents a significant step forward in tapping into the vast pool of assets controlled by pension funds, currently estimated to amount to more than $700 billion.

Of the $1 billion recently offered by Freddie Mac, approximately $430 million was purchased by pension funds. This represents more than 40 percent of the entire offering, a figure far in excess of any offerings by any of the public or private issuers of similar securities. This is indeed a significant step forward, however, it does not eliminate the need for legislation such as H.R. 1418.

By removing the impediments to pension fund investment in the residential mortgage market, while still retaining the traditional conservative principles of pension fund investment, this legislation is designed to address two very important problems; the need to insure present and future employee benefit plan beneficiaries that their plan assets are safe; and the need to aid the housing industry through capital infusion into the residential mortgage market.

Under current law, unless an employee benefit plan invests solely in the securities issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation or the Government National

Mortgage Association (mortgage-backed securities) a plan must meet the conditions set forth in the Department of Labor class exemptions for residential mortgage transactions (82-7) or mortgage pool investment trust transactions (81-87).

Both sets of conditions set forth in these class exemptions are restrictive in that they impose higher standards for mortgage investments than for other types of investments. In addition, if a plan does not follow the conditions or is uncertain if a particular mortgage transaction is covered by the exemptions, the plan must request an opinion or seek an individual exemption from the Department of Labor. This procedure in itself is costly and burdensome, and it is unlikely that a Labor Department response could be expected in less than 90 days.

The most important factor lending support to H.R. 1418, however, is the attractiveness of investment in mortgage instruments. A recent survey conducted by Salomon Brothers which examined the returns of alternative investment opportunities, including mortgage securities, highlighted the attractiveness of mortgages as an investment medium. The survey concluded: "Results show that mortgages outperformed the three alternative investments: Corporate bonds by 15.3 percent; long Treasuries by 21.7 percent; and 10-year Treasuries by 2.4 percent." With the higher return that a pension fund might be able to receive on investment in mortgages it might be able to reduce contributions required of plan participants or increase the benefits to present and future beneficiaries.

In testimony last year before the House Banking Committee, Phillip Brinkerhoff, then president of Freddie Mac, indicated that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac together will not be able to service the entire secondary market.

> If the Mortgage Corporation and other federally related agencies purchased their historic (1976-1980) shares of total conventional originations, they could supply only $215 billion of the net conventional secondary market need. The shortfall of secondary market capacity would be $486 billion or $48.6 billion per year . . . As they are currently structured, the Mortgage Corporation and the Federal National Mortgage Association could not begin to make up the credit shortfall anticipated.

H.R. 1418 will allow for this necessary expansion of the secondary market by allowing pension funds to invest in a wide range of mortgage instruments while protecting the plan participants. Action such as that taken by Freddie Mac recently will certainly help. But, legislation such as H.R. 1418 is still needed.●

HONORING JOHN BERRIER

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, June 24, 1983, the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania will be honoring a man who has devoted his life to the education of his fellowman. His career has spanned nearly four decades, a career dedicated to a standard of excellence which few men attain. The man I speak of is Dr. John Berrier, the retiring president of Lehigh County Community College.

Beginning as an assistant registrar and coordinator of veteran's education at Temple University in Philadelphia, Dr. Berrier later moved on to become the school's admissions director. As Pennsylvania began to formulate plans for a community college system, it was Dr. Berrier who was called upon to help in establishing the community college at Harrisburg. Serving as consultant to the board from 1964 to 1966, he served as chief designer and was responsible for faculty recruitment, leasing of buildings, the admitting of students, organization of schedules, and the assigning of rooms and offices.

This experience served Dr. Berrier and the Lehigh Valley well as he was again called upon to establish Lehigh County Community College. This he did and the community has been the beneficary. Since the school began in 1966, it has known no other president. In its 17 years of operation, LCCC has welcomed thousands of Lehigh Valley students. Its reputation has grown through the quality of its teaching staff, its leadership, and curriculum. Dr. Berrier and his staff understand how important education is in the direction of our country. The students today are tomorrow's molders and shapers of a new and better society, a society which learns from the past and which seeks a positive future. We in the Lehigh Valley are indebted to Dr. Berrier for all that he has done in helping to raise the quality of life in our community and for instilling in our youth a better understanding of the world around them.

There is another side to the life of Dr. Berrier, one that is sometimes not seen publicly because of his many achievements in the education field. That side is the person John Berrier. His many friends and associates in and out of the field of education can attest to his being a good human being and a friend of the highest quality. One hears John described as an "activist," as a "doer." He is not one to take a back seat when work needs to be done. As an active member of the Redeemer Lutheran Church in Allentown, he served twice as a vice president and also on the church council. He is a veteran of this Nation's Armed Forces and a devoted father and husband. Yet, "Jack" Berrier goes about his work in a quiet, caring way seeking no higher reward or special thanks. He has returned to the community much of himself and has succeeded in making the Lehigh Valley a much nicer place in which to live.

Mr. Speaker, it is a high honor to add my words of sincere congratulations to Dr. Berrier on this important event in his life. And to you personally, Jack, I hope that you and your family will enjoy health and happiness in the years ahead.●

FIFTIETH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY, ALLAN AND HARRIET ROTHROCK

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, July 9, their family and friends will pay tribute to two very special people.

This will be the golden wedding anniversary of Allan and Harriet Rothrock. They were united in marriage by the Reverend Lotshaw on July 1, 1933, at the Methodist Church in Mauch Chunk, Pa., which has since, of course, been renamed in honor of the famous athlete, Jim Thorpe.

Two daughters were born of the marriage. Martha Ann later married Harry H. Warner and has presented the Rothrocks two grandchildren, Todd Allan, now married to the former Diane Andrasi, and Wendy Ann. Mary Louise married Wayne W. Reabold and, from that marriage, have come three grandchildren: Tammy Lynn, Melanie Ann, and Beth Susan.

Mr. and Mrs. Rothrock now reside at 54 Kline Street in Weatherly.

Fifty years is a long time, Mr. Speaker, and the duration of this marriage would, in itself, be a cause for celebration. But it is not only the years that have gone by but the good that has been done and the wonderful family that has come from these two people. These are the things that, really, we will all be celebrating on the evening of July 9. It will be my pleasure to be there, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to have had this opportunity to share this occasion with my friends and colleagues and the House.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE FINE YOUNG ARTISTS OF MARYLAND'S FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American public the selection of a drawing entitled "Garbo," by Arthur Welch of North East, Md., as the representative artwork for the First District in the 1983 Congressional Art Competition. Mr. Welch's artwork is an example of the high-caliber talent that this competition meant to secure.

The Congressional Art Competition, sponsored by the Congressional Art Caucus, is an excellent opportunity for Members of Congress to contribute to the education and progress of talented young artists, as well as present a forum at the U.S. Capitol for the general public to come and observe our youth's great artistic aptitude.

In addition to Mr. Welch's artwork, Sara Lewis of Lexington Park, Md., Steven Allen of Havre de Grace, Md., Scott Larson of La Plata, Md., and Dorothy Whealton of Preston, Md., all submitted winning entries, and deserve our congratulations for the talent they have displayed.

All the entries, in the course of the First District competition exhibited extraordinary sophistication, and it is my regret that only one piece of art can represent our district. The other meritorious entries included artwork by: Jonathan Hutt, Janie Racine, Mary Bloodsworth, Susan Jane Russell, Jennifer VanGinhoven, Andy Sigler, Jackie Dowdell, Timothy Cotton, Carol Adams, Bill Green, Laura McClister, Cheryl James, Bryan Collier, Jennifer Dowdell, Tony Lewis, Valerie Bratten, Mark Norman, Steve Bush, Kathy Stubbs, Cindy Clark, Browyn Phillips, Tony Scarborough, Brooke Wesley, Richard Norman, Sara Mason, Tim Morris, Donna Parks, Kim Latham, Sarah Hayne, Dean Brasure, Barbara Essaf, Howard Taylor, Mike Bartemy, Mark Realini, Susan Maddox, Allen Carter, Nancy Phillips, Mark Martin, Stanley Mibourne, Dwight Beckett, Scott Reeling, Cindy DeColigny, Heather Timmons, Brooke Roger, Jack Owens, Patty Cannon, Elizaeth Richards, Ken Siarath, John Noto, Lynn Gagnon, Tim Fisher, Mark Frostrum, Barry VanDenHeavel, David Hentosh, Barbara A. Hammer, Bryan McDilda, Lee Wolfe, Lisa Twining, Alfred Dukes, Bill Cumberland, Ken Sarahath, Donna Bonner, Sonya Burnette, David Macrae, Helen Salzman, Debbie Kidwell, Joe Barbour, Beth Bradford, Pamela Martin, Laurie Fortner, Kelly Shaide, and Jennine Auerback.

The Congressional Art Competition is a more than worthwhile project for Members of Congress; this year over 200 participated. I encourage every Member, in the future, to take advantage of this wonderful opportunity to showcase the talent of America's youth.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. SALLY RIDE

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1983

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, though cutting through the media hype is a challenge in itself, Dr. Sally Ride's journey into space—the first by an American woman—is a significant moment in American history that illustrates the continued progress of women in American society.

Dr. Ride serves as a pioneer in a traditionally male field—a field where more women will quickly follow. She was chosen, as one of five women, by NASA in 1978 to begin training as a mission specialist. Dr. Ride's excellent credentials enabled her to withstand the stringent selection process required for astronautical training. She earned her doctorate in astrophysics from Stanford University; served as capsule communicator relaying instructions to the flight crew during missions; and is a qualified jet pilot.

As our first female astronaut, Dr. Ride personifies the great advances that American women have made in the fields of science and technology. She will serve as an inspirational role model for generations yet to come.

One of those generations includes that of my 12-year-old daughter, Natalie, who often expressed her desire to be the first female astronaut. Though this first is no longer available to Natalie, Sally Ride has proven to her that the only obstacles in life are those that we set for ourselves in our own minds.

Sally Ride has responded to the extraterrestrial challenges of space, as well as the terrestrial challenges of the media, with a cool sense of professionalism, a warm sense of humor, and a dignity that does justice to the role she has earned. I appreciate this opportunity to thank her for her significant contribution and to commend her for her outstanding achievement.●