

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PERSONAL JUSTICE DENIED

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today, the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians will deliver to Congress and release to the public its report setting forth the facts and circumstances surrounding Executive Order 9066 and the impact of the order on Japanese American citizens and resident aliens.

The report, entitled "Personal Justice Denied," sets forth the circumstances surrounding the initiation and implementation of orders from the highest authorities of our land to evacuate and intern American citizens and resident aliens of Japanese ancestry.

The commission, after 1½ years of study and after hearing from over 750 witnesses, has concluded that there was no military or security justification for the mass exclusion and detention. The commission identified the causes of these decisions as race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership.

Mr. speaker, I commend the members of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians for their outstanding report. It is a report that for the first time sets forth the tragic and shameful chapter of our history that is unknown to millions of Americans. It is a chapter in which over 120,000 American citizens and resident aliens were denied their freedom without consideration for their constitutional rights.

The grave injustice forced upon these Japanese Americans is truly a case of personal justice denied. I encourage all of my colleagues to read this report.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to include for the RECORD a statement by Joan Z. Bernstein, chairperson of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.

Today the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians is delivering to Congress and releasing to the public its findings with regard to the promulgation of Executive Order 9066 and the wartime events which followed from it.

On February 19, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. Under that Order 120,000 people—American citizens of Japanese ancestry and resident aliens of the immigrant generation from Japan, who were barred by law from becoming

ing American citizens—were prohibited from living and working on the West Coast. Almost all were later sent to "relocation centers"—bleak barrack camps ringed by barbed wire and military guards in isolated areas of the West. Most remained in the camps until the mass exclusion was ended in December 1944, more than two and a half years after the policy of exclusion and detention began. These events are unique in our history.

No program of mass exclusion or detention was imposed on German and Italian aliens nor upon American citizens of German or Italian descent.

The government justified the exclusion from the West Coast of all American citizens of Japanese descent and Japanese resident aliens on the basis of military necessity. The first task of the Commission has been to look at the facts and consider whether military necessity justified this course of action.

The Commission has found that the record does not permit the conclusion that there was any military justification for the mass exclusion and detention of American citizens of Japanese ancestry and their resident alien parents.

There were no documented cases of sabotage, espionage or fifth column activity by Japanese Americans on the West Coast. There was a widespread—but false—belief that the attack on Pearl Harbor had been aided by sabotage and fifth column activities. The President and his cabinet officers did not forcefully dispel these stories and rumors. On the West Coast, where there had been a long history of prejudice and discrimination against the ethnic Japanese, there were sustained and even louder demands for the exclusion of Japanese Americans. These demands were made by organized anti-Japanese interest groups, the press and the West Coast members of Congress—they came from every segment of the political spectrum.

The civilian clamour for exclusion was reflected in the actions of the War Department. Lieutenant General John L. DeWitt, in command of Army forces on the West Coast, recommended to Henry L. Stimson, the Secretary of War, that authority be sought to remove the Japanese Americans from the West Coast. DeWitt made his recommendation on the ground that loyalty was determined by ethnicity. "In the war in which we are now engaged," DeWitt wrote Secretary Stimson, "racial affinities are not severed by migration. The Japanese race is an enemy race and while many second and third generation Japanese born on United States soil possessed of United States citizenship, have become 'Americanized,' the racial strains are undiluted." The record shows that DeWitt's views were substantially influenced by the governors and public officials of the West Coast states whose views he sought out before taking his own position.

Secretary Stimson and President Roosevelt did not subject this program to sufficiently close and critical scrutiny. The Attorney General, Francis Biddle, did not believe the program necessary, but acceded to it when proposed by the War Department.

Few Americans were familiar with American citizens of Japanese descent. The opinions of those with intelligence responsibility, such as the FBI, who believed that there was no sound basis for mass exclusion, were ignored or drowned out in the frightened uproar of the time.

The Commission has carefully reviewed the extensive record of events which led to Executive Order 9066. It has found no evidence of a military or security threat from the Japanese Americans. As General DeWitt conceded at the time, no sabotage had taken place. The later justifications offered by DeWitt in his Final Report on the exclusion and by the Justice Department which defended the exclusion in court also fail to demonstrate any military or security threat. In fact the realistic estimates of the time suggested that there was as much or more danger from other segments of the population.

DeWitt's contention that ethnicity determined loyalty was answered as early as May 1942, by a Congressional Committee which examined the impact of the Executive Order in extensive hearings on the West Coast:

"This testimony has impressed upon us in convincing fashion the fundamental fact that place of birth and technical noncitizenship alone provide no decisive criteria for assessing the alignment of loyalties in this world-wide conflict."

True of aliens, that statement can only be more powerful with regard to American citizens. Our legal system is founded on determining guilt or fault on an individual basis, and citizens must be given the presumption of loyalty. Moreover, the conclusion that ethnicity determined loyalty was not a military judgment deserving of any deference. Generals are not experts on race; their views on the political loyalties of civilians are only as good as the facts they can marshal in their support. The lack of any evidence of disloyalty on the part of Americans of Japanese ancestry in 1942 speaks for itself.

The Commission has concluded that the broad historical causes of the Executive Order were race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership. Widespread ignorance about Japanese Americans contributed to a policy conceived in haste and executed in an atmosphere of fear and anger at Japan.

Ending the exclusion was bitterly and forcefully opposed on the West Coast, just as the decision to exclude and detain had effectively been promoted. The Commission's report provides substantial new information on those events.

Secretary Stimson and John J. McCloy, who served as Assistant Secretary of War, approved the original order of exclusion, but they were men who were open to an understanding of the facts and they did not accept General DeWitt's views on race or believe that the Japanese Americans should be excluded from the West Coast for the duration of the war.

McCloy and Stimson opposed professional military opinion in deciding that the Army would seek volunteers among the Japanese

Americans, thus opening the door to persuading even the most prejudiced of the loyalty of Japanese Americans who returned from European battlefields loaded with honors won in the service of the United States.

Most importantly, by the spring of 1943, the civilians at the head of the War Department had reached the position that no justification existed any longer for excluding loyal Japanese American citizens from the West Coast. In April 1943, McCloy laid out the basic points very forcefully to General DeWitt, who was on the West Coast. I quote the letter at length because it states succinctly the situation in the spring of 1943 and lays bare the differences of opinion with General DeWitt and those who supported exclusion:

"The threat of Japanese attack is far from what it was. We are better organized to meet such an attack if it occurred. And we know a great deal more about our Japanese population. Furthermore, the War Department has established a combat team for volunteer American citizens of Japanese ancestry. . . . [T]he War Department has initiated a process for loyalty investigations of all Japanese Americans to determine their eligibility for work in plants and facilities vital to the war effort. In other words, . . . the policy of the national Government, as well as that of the War Department, is presently looking toward the restoration to all loyal persons of Japanese ancestry of all their normal rights and privileges, to the end that they may be able to make their maximum contribution to the war effort. The very 'entering wedge' which you appear to dread is precisely what must be accomplished.

"That there is serious animosity of the West Coast against all evacuated Japanese I do not doubt, but that does not necessarily mean that we should trim our sails accordingly. The longer California luxuriates in the total absence of the Japanese the more difficult it will be to restore them to the economy of California. They have a place in California as well as in any other state as long as military considerations do not intervene. I cannot help but feel that social considerations rather than military ones determine the total exclusion policy. The Army, as I see it, is not responsible for the general public peace of the Western Defense Command. That responsibility still rests with the civil authorities. There may, as you suggest, be incidents, but these can be effectively discouraged by prompt action by law enforcement agencies, with the cooperation of the military if they even assume really threatening proportions."

McCloy was entirely correct in his view that the military situation no longer justified exclusion (if indeed it ever could). A program for returning the Japanese Americans to the West Coast needed to be started and McCloy urged the gradual return of Japanese Americans beginning at once.

Unfortunately it did not happen as McCloy told General DeWitt it should. The exclusion was not ended for another eighteen months. General DeWitt continued to support the exclusion with every tactic available until he left the Western Defense Command in the fall of 1943. Anti-Nisei feeling was whipped up by the Dies Committee in the early summer of 1943 when the West Coast newspapers carried hearsay reports of the rift between McCloy and General DeWitt. Throughout 1943 and 1944 there continued to be virulent and widespread opposition in the West Coast press,

among West Coast politicians and interest groups to the return of Japanese Americans to the West Coast. These views prevailed. For at least the last six months of that period, immediately before the Presidential election of 1944, the decision to continue the exclusion was that of President Roosevelt.

By any analysis with the least sensitivity to American constitutional values there was no justification for holding loyal American citizens of Japanese descent in detention or prohibiting them from traveling, living and working where they chose.

In his memoirs, Secretary Stimson cogently called the evacuation of "personal injustice" to loyal Japanese Americans. It was a personal injustice precisely because the country failed to apply justice in a personal or individual manner. Men, women and children were uprooted from their homes and their lives shattered because the United States failed to provide personal justice in time of war. It is important to emphasize that we are dealing here with American behavior. It is not a question of how the Japanese or the Nazis treated Americans or other prisoners which is one of the darkest chapters of modern history. What the Commission has examined and taken testimony about is how the United States dealt with American citizens and residents.

The damage done by this country to its own citizens and residents is a mosaic made up of thousands of lives and thousands of personal histories. The Commission's hearing record is replete with searing and painful testimony. There is the economic loss of farms and homes sold in distress circumstances, of elderly people having to start from scratch a second time after the war, of families detained in camps without employment and unable to meet tax and mortgage and insurance payments; of education and careers disrupted.

Over time and with perseverance material losses may be repaired, but the hidden scars of lives damaged by this experience remain. Each individual excluded from the West Coast and sent only with the baggage he could carry to spend two and a half years behind barbed wire carries his own marks from that time. For people who knew their innocence and the injustice of their treatment the burden was not light. They bore the stigma of having been branded potentially disloyal, the deprivation of liberty and the loss of the common decencies of daily life. An essential foundation of our government—the citizens trust that the government will deal with him individually and fairly—was deeply damaged. The injuries inflicted by the country on these citizens were different in kind from the suffering and loss which the Second World War brought to all Americans.

In Hawaii, we did things differently. Despite the Pearl Harbor attack, there was no exclusion or detention of any significant number of Japanese Americans. Calmer minds with a better sense of justice prevailed and today neither the material nor the intangible injuries of the Japanese Americans on the mainland remain to haunt us in Hawaii.

No recommendation which this Commission will make can undo this history. No redress to Japanese Americans can assure that we will not repeat the errors of 1942. What happened after Pearl Harbor is particularly sobering because men of the greatest stature with careers of the most distinguished public service—Democrat and Republican, conservative and liberal, judges, legislators

and cabinet members, the President himself—were personally involved in a course of action which today we can only find gravely unjust and deeply injurious. The bulwark of our Constitution did not withstand it. Ignorance was a major contributing factor in these events; knowledge is the surest guardian against their repetition. We can only hope to abide by our better judgement in the future if we have made our past our own and are determined to learn by its lessons.

Ronald Reagan, speaking in 1970 as Governor of California, pointedly and accurately underscored what each American should take from this history:

"A lesson was learned in California during World War II, which should be made a part of the record and the heritage of Americans everywhere who cherish liberty, freedom, and constitutional guarantees."

The Commission's second important task was to review the evacuation of the Aleuts from the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands and their treatment in camps in Southeastern Alaska.

The situation in Alaska was very unlike that on the West Coast. The Japanese attacked the two most western islands in the Aleutian chain in the summer of 1942 and took 42 Aleut prisoners. As part of the reaction to that attack, the military evacuated the Aleuts from the Pribilof islands and from a large part of the Aleutian chain. The evidence shows that the evacuation was a rational response to the danger presented. Both whites and Aleuts, apart from those necessary to defense work, were removed. The protection of an exposed population was the motivating force for the evacuation.

The camps to which the Aleuts were taken are an entirely different matter. Approximately 850 Aleuts were housed in abandoned buildings, typically at gold mines and fish canneries. The conditions and the care were deplorable. In some camps there were inadequate sleeping quarters and sanitation. Health conditions were particularly bad. Epidemics raged throughout the Aleuts' stay in southeastern Alaska; they suffered from influenza, measles and pneumonia along with tuberculosis. Twenty-five died at Funter Bay in 1943 alone, and it is estimated that probably ten percent of the evacuated Aleuts died during their two or three year stay in southeastern Alaska. The standard of care which the government owes to those under its protection was clearly violated by this treatment.

The Aleuts were only returned to their islands in 1944 and 1945. On arriving home, they found that their communities had been vandalized and looted by the military forces. Many homes were uninhabitable and many heirlooms of great spiritual as well as material value, particularly religious icons, had been destroyed. Other possessions, such as furniture, boats and fishing gear, were also gone. The Aleuts rebuilt their homes themselves, being "paid" with free groceries, and military surplus goods. The Aleuts' ancestral treasures can never be replaced. The Aleuts have never received full or fair compensation for their war time losses.

The World War II history of the Aleuts is largely unknown or forgotten. The Commission's report is an important step to provide knowledge and recognition of the treatment of this people under the pressures of war.

In sum, despite the fact that the Aleutians were a theatre of war from which evacuation was sound policy, there was no justification for the manner in which the Aleuts were treated in the camps in south-

eastern Alaska, nor for failing to compensate them fully for their material losses.

As to the Japanese Americans on the West Coast, the promulgation of Executive Order 9066 was not justified by military necessity and the decisions which followed from it—detention, ending detention and ending exclusion—were not driven by analysis of military conditions. The broad historical causes which shaped these decisions were race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership. A grave injustice was done to those American citizens and resident aliens of Japanese ancestry, who without individual review or any probative evidence against them, were excluded, removed and detained by the United States during World War II. ●

MODIFIED DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

HON. WAYNE DOWDY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was pleased to introduce a bill, along with Mr. FOWLER of Georgia, Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina, and Mr. MOORE of Louisiana, which will give needed relief to dairy farmers and benefit American consumers as well. We have called our proposal the modified dairy price support program.

Enacted in 1949, the dairy price support program was designed to provide an equitable return to dairy farmers while insuring a stable supply of milk to the consumer. The program has come under fire in recent years because of the large surplus of dairy products which has developed and which has been of grave concern to all of us.

In seeking a solution to the problem of overproduction, I do not think it is fair to punish dairy farmers from the southeastern region of the United States, who have not been responsible for the surplus. That is why I voted against the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act last year which contained a provision allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to deduct 50 cents per hundredweight from the proceeds of the sale of all milk marketed commercially and remit the proceeds to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Although the provision has been enjoined by the Federal District Court for the State of South Carolina, the Secretary of Agriculture recently announced his intention to try to collect both the original 50 cents and an additional 50 cents, for a total of \$1 on all milk marketed as of April 1 of this year.

The bill we have introduced would repeal the dairy tax enacted in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act and substitute a decrease in the price support for milk. The price support will be lowered \$1 from \$13.10 per hundredweight to \$12.10 per hundredweight

for the period beginning April 1, 1983, and ending September 30, 1984. If during that time the Secretary determines that the CCC will purchase less than expected quantities of dairy products, he would have the authority to raise the support price up to a maximum of \$1.

Effective October 1, 1984, we would revert to a price support based on the concept of parity. The exact price support level would depend upon the quantity of dairy products that the Secretary expects the CCC to purchase during the forthcoming fiscal year.

The current situation requires prompt and decisive action, for the benefit of both dairy farmers and American consumers. The current tax on dairy production has been rendered unenforceable by the court, and would most likely prove an ineffective solution, since it would only encourage more production to compensate for the loss of the 50-cent tax.

Along with the other cosponsors of this bill, I strongly urge the members of the Committee on Agriculture to give immediate consideration to the modified dairy price support program. ●

A STUDY ON IDEAS FROM EUROPE THAT COULD IMPROVE U.S. FIRE SAFETY

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology, which has jurisdiction over the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act, I am concerned about the future of the Nation's fire effort. Last year the Reagan administration proposed to eliminate the U.S. Fire Administration. However, Congress restored \$4.1 million to the Federal Emergency Management's fiscal year 1983 budget to keep the U.S. Fire Administration alive. Unfortunately, Congress is faced with the proposed elimination of the Center for Fire Research at the National Bureau of Standards. The Center for Fire Research performs and supports research in all aspects of fire and develops scientific knowledge applicable to the prevention and control of fires. This proposed elimination comes at a time when approximately 8,000 people die annually in fires in this country. The majority of these deaths occur in homes. Well over \$5 billion worth of property goes up in smoke each year.

In contrast, Europe has only half the fire death rate of the United States. Death rates in European coun-

tries are already below the level set as the goal for the U.S. Fire Administration at its creation, when the long-term objectives was to cut the U.S. fire death rate in half in a generation. Several countries, such as Switzerland and West Germany, have death rates less than a quarter of ours. They achieve this in spite of having smaller fire departments.

Some of the key factors that explain Europe's good track record are described in a recently released study by Philip Schaenman. The study was started in 1980 while he was Associate Administrator of the U.S. Fire Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and has been completed under a grant from the Tobacco Institute to TriData Corp.

Successful fire protection in Europe was found to be less a matter of novel solutions or high technology than persistent, widespread application of basic fire prevention principles. Perhaps the key difference is that the public is aware of the fire problem and provides political support for a wide range of fire prevention efforts.

Most European practices are transferable to the United States, and some are already being used. Others can be adapted. We should consider European practices as a stimulus to our own thinking. The U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy seem particularly well suited to identify practical ideas that can be disseminated here.

Among the European fire protection practices that contribute to their success are:

PUBLIC AWARENESS AND PUBLIC FIRE EDUCATION

The European public is more aware of the need for fire safety as a result of its history of cities which have burned down and their desire to protect their family and civic heritage. The public knows more about fire safety, teaches it at home, and practices it. They seem to exercise more care with hot objects such as portable heaters, woodburning stoves, cigarettes, and matches.

CODE ENFORCEMENT

Plans for new buildings or alterations to old buildings are more rigorously reviewed by the fire service, insurance agencies, or building departments. A greater percentage of such construction is reviewed by more highly trained personnel than in the United States. Building in rural areas receive almost as much screening as in cities. The fire service has more discretion and is more likely to be backed by the courts both for the initial plans review and subsequent inspections.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY

All electrical products, heating appliances and systems, and gas-powered appliances and systems must be government tested and approved in some countries. Different countries share

their testing results and abide by them.

INSURANCE AND ARSON

Insurance philosophy is that someone who has a fire should not profit from it and that the purpose of insurance is not only to prevent large losses to individuals but also to preserve the appearance of the community. Thus, insurance is paid in full only when a building that has burned is restored on the same site. This policy provides a disincentive for arson. The ability to obtain insurance is often tied to whether a building is up to code.

CHIMNEY SWEEPS

Chimney sweep visits are mandatory in several countries and strongly encouraged in most others. Most homes are visited from one to four times a year by sweeps. The sweeps often provide advice on woodburning stoves and heating systems, and help test and maintain them. Sometimes the chimney sweeps also perform fire safety inspections. The sweeps often are trained at national fire academies, plus serve an apprenticeship. The result is that there are proportionately far fewer heating-related fires in Europe; in the United States heating is the leading cause of residential fires.

FIRE PREVENTION BUREAUS

Most European fire departments emphasize fire prevention—especially plans review and code enforcement—more so than in the United States. European senior fire officers spend the majority of their time on prevention.

FIREFIGHTER TRAINING

The average European fire officer receives far more training than his U.S. counterpart and also greater technical education. The training is more uniform within a country, and senior officers usually have experience in several cities before assuming command of a large fire department. Firefighters have higher entrance requirements—they often must have a trade, such as mechanics or carpentry—and receive more training, too.

FIREFIGHTER HEALTH AND SAFETY

The European firefighter is generally not better equipped than his American counterpart. However, European firefighters are more uniformly equipped, more likely to use their safety equipment, and receive more safety training. They also are not expected to take high risks to save property. These factors, coupled with a lower fire rate, result in dramatically lower death and injury rates.

These and other issues are described more fully in "International Concepts in Fire Protection: Ideas From Europe Which the U.S. Might Adopt," by Philip S. Schaenman, 1983, available from TriData Corp., 1500 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209, telephone (703) 841-2975.●

THE CONTINUING PLIGHT OF IDA NUDEL

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to once again speak before the House of Representatives on behalf of Ida Nudel, my "Prisoner of Conscience," a truly remarkable, heroic, and courageous woman. As we begin the 1983 Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jewry under the able chairmanship of our colleague, TIM WIRTH, of Colorado, I believe special attention should be paid to the plight of Soviet Jews, for at this time, emigration is at its lowest point since 1970. As chairman of the 1982 Vigil, I urge my colleagues, especially our new colleagues, to actively participate in this year's Vigil.

For over 11 years, Ida Nudel has been one of the leaders of the Soviet Jewry movement in the Soviet Union. Ida, affectionately known as the "Guardian Angel" for her activities on behalf of Soviet Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, was charged and convicted in June 1978 of "malicious hooliganism" and sentenced to 4 years of internal exile.

Although Ida Nudel has returned from her 4-year exile in Siberia, the Soviet Union continues to harass and intimidate her in hopes that she will surrender her tireless campaign for the rights of Soviet Jews. The Soviet authorities have denied her legal residence in Moscow and Riga, and she remains homeless, but still committed to securing a visa to Israel.

Today, Ida Nudel needs our help. Although she has been released from internal exile, her dream to emigrate to Israel is unfortunately, still a dream. Our efforts in the past have accomplished a great deal, as Ida Nudel's release points out. But we must not stop short of our goal of freedom for this brave woman. Soviet officials must know that we are very aware of the difference between appeasement and justice. Ida Nudel's struggle continues as long as she is denied the right to emigrate to Israel and is at the mercy of Soviet officials.

We, as Members of Congress, must continue to actively fight for her freedom. The Soviet Union's oppressive tactics should never be tolerated by free-thinking people around the world. I therefore urge the Soviet Union to grant this true champion of liberty an exit visa.

Ida, we are with you all the way. You have continued the fight. We will, too.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1983, marks the 65th anniversary of Estonian Independence.

As you know Estonia is one of those Baltic nations that became a victim of the Hitler-Stalin, Nazi-Communist alliance of 1939-1941. The principles of both totalitarian systems are, of course, the same, so it is no wonder that the people of Estonia are now the victims of a Soviet campaign to deprive them of their very national identity through directives against the Estonian language and culture.

I have learned that Yuri Andropov, the Soviet KGB master who is now the head man in the Kremlin, is the only Russian Communist leader ever to have personally visited Estonia. He came there in 1980 to oversee the suppression of expressions of Estonian nationalism.

People say: Be realistic. Estonia has for over 40 years been enslaved by communism. What can be done? Let us just forget it and go on with business as usual.

Granted, not much can be done directly to regain Estonian lost freedom. But we can at least point out the fact that freedom has been lost and stop pretending that the people of Estonia are simply "citizens" of the Soviet Union. They are not. They are its victims.●

BARBARA M. WATSON

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1983, Ambassadors, Members of Congress, high U.S. Government officials, prominent city and community leaders, and friends attended "A Tribute and Thanksgiving for Barbara M. Watson" at the Washington Cathedral.

Barbara Watson, whose last official Government post in 1981 was as Ambassador to Malaysia, died February 17 at George Washington Hospital at the age of 64.

Although her contacts on the Hill were legion, we of the Committee on the Judiciary considered her as a very special person and an especially close friend. She served with the Department of State under Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, and Carter from 1968 to 1980, as Administrator and later Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs. It was in this posi-

tion that we came to know her, through her appearances on numerous occasions as a witness on behalf of the Consular Service, her attendance at international conferences, and, above all, in the informal meetings with the Members and staff concerned with matters of mutual interest.

Barbara was the first woman and first black to achieve the rank of Assistant Secretary of State. She frequently jokingly referred to herself as a "two-fer" minority person. She had tremendous diplomatic talents, a vibrant personality, and a commitment to excellence.

Barbara Watson was born in New York City, the eldest daughter of Judge James S. and Violet Lopez Watson. She graduated from Barnard College and New York Law School. Her desire to render public service was immediately evident when she worked as assistant corporation counsel for the city of New York and later as executive director of the New York City Commission to the United Nations where she represented the mayor and maintained close liaison with various missions in the U.N.

In 1980, President Carter appointed Barbara Watson as U.S. Ambassador to Malaysia where she became an influential and distinguished member of the Diplomatic Corps.

Barbara was largely responsible for enhancing the status of the Consular Service in the Foreign Service, an achievement which has served as a solid foundation for its continued advancement.

Although Barbara had left public life several years ago, she continued to exercise her considerable talents in many humanitarian fields. We shall miss her.

On behalf of her many friends on the Committee on the Judiciary, I express our profound sympathy to her distinguished family, her two brothers, Douglas C. Watson and Judge Samuel Watson of New York, and her sister, Grace Elizabeth Watson, of Washington. ●

LET'S GET AMERICA'S ECONOMY GOING AGAIN

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, Ben Hall, city editor of one of the newspapers in my district, the Madisonville Messenger, Madisonville, Ky., has written an excellent editorial which I would like to share with my colleagues. My constituent's comments about America's economy which President Reagan inherited and his efforts to work the country out of a "monumental morass" are timely and worthy

of consideration. Mr. Hall's January 19, 1983, editorial follows:

[From the Madisonville (Ky.) Messenger, Jan. 19, 1983]

PRESIDENT REAGAN DOING THE BEST HE CAN (By Ben Hall)

At any given time, there are certain things that it is fashionable to be in favor of and another list that it is fashionable to be against, if you are in the writing business.

A man who drives a nine-year-old car is not particularly worried about being fashionable and my car came out of Detroit in 1974.

The President is an example of something, or someone, against whom, to be fashionable, one must write.

I supported Ronald Reagan when he ran for office and I still think that he is doing about as well as anybody could considering the unbelievable mess he inherited when he took office two years ago.

There is nothing party-political about the mess; both Republican and Democratic presidents and congresses had a hand in creating the monumental morass we are trying now to work our way out of.

The remarkable aspect of all this is the widespread feeling expressed by a local woman recently when she said "Reagan could change all this tomorrow if he wanted to."

Nobody could "change all this tomorrow" and everybody does want to. Probably Ronald Reagan more than most.

The hard fact is that the country had been going the way of all flesh for a considerable amount of time and rather than continue to ride the rocket, Reagan is trying to bring the whole thing down to earth.

It is not easy and it is not painless and nobody who thought about it at all ever expected it to be.

But the simple fact is that neither a government nor an individual can consistently spend more than he makes and stay out of trouble indefinitely.

Our trouble finally caught up with us and, as difficult as it is now and is going to be for a while, there shouldn't be anything shocking about it.

Perhaps the shock, if there is any due, should be because the recession (or depression if you prefer) is now worse than it is.

Since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we have been building the psychology that "the government" owes everybody something.

Any politicians who could see perfectly well as far as the next election but not much farther, have not only fed this fantasy but made it come true.

The sad fact is that government produces no money (just confusion, someone has said) but must take its funds from those who do produce income.

The upshot is that there has been a great shell game going on for nearly five decades. It is a kind of bureaucratic Robin Hood act with government using various Merry Men to take from those who had and giving to those who have not.

After a while, those who had "had not" had as much or more than those who had "had." And they got it a lot easier.

In effect, those who had the git-up-and-go to get up and go to work to make a living found that they were supporting a segment of the population that chose to get up around noon and go out when they felt like it.

The people who got weary supporting the "poor" whose only contribution to the socie-

ty was to feed and breed, elected Reagan partly to clean up the abuses of the programs that began with the best intentions in the world and wound up as the biggest monument to greed in the world.

Now the President is getting flak from all quarters because he is doing what we elected him to do.

It is unfashionable to be critical of "the poor," of course.

I doubt if there is anyone who is critical of the truly poor who are needy because of circumstances beyond their control.

But many of us find reason to be critical of the professional poor who live off the fruits of our labor after those rewards are filtered through the hands of the federal and state Merry Men.

I have no objection to giving my mite to feed and clothe some hungry folks in Alabama, or Detroit, or Houston; but I get less than ecstatic over supporting people half my age who simply choose not to support themselves because it is more fun to drink beer and sleep around.

It is not fashionable either to be in favor of a strong defense and against "peace" as if the two were opposite.

In my short but dull life, I have seen enough of wars to have some appreciation of peace.

But neither my limited experience nor a study of history shows examples of nations plunged into war because they were over prepared to defend themselves and make the starting of a war a profitless proposition for an adversary.

Are those who still march the streets of the nation crying "Peace" so naive as to think that the entire western world should throw itself on the mercy of the Soviet Union and say, in effect, "Look, we have disarmed and are helpless. Now, play fair, and destroy your weapons?"

Perhaps they are.

Although it is not fashionable to say so, if I am given a choice, I'll put my faith in the Pentagon with all its boondoggles and empire building, rather than leave myself to the tender mercies of the Kremlin.

Jimmy Carter tried, and apparently succeeded, in impressing the world with the country's weakness and the purity of his motives, until a maniac with a handful of rabble behind him could hold an entire American embassy staff hostage until the captors were good-and-dammed-ready to turn them loose.

That, too, was something we elected Ronald Reagan to correct. But it seems that it had to be done without inconveniencing anybody.

The irony in the present situation is that the President is doing about as well as anybody could to carry out the tasks we set for him when we elected him to office.

If it is more painful than some segments of the society thought that it would be, that is their lack of foresight, not his lack of performance.

After all, Ronald Reagan was elected to the highest executive office in the land, not to the position of chief magician. ●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. BRUCE A. MORRISON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues and Lithuanian people everywhere in commemorating the 65th anniversary of "Lithuanian Independence Day." It was 65 years ago that Lithuania, after centuries of domination, issued a declaration of independence in the city of Vilnius to form an independent and united nation.

Today, the small country of Lithuania is again forced to fight for its freedom and independence. In June of 1940, using the Nazi-Soviet alliance of Hitler and Stalin, the Soviet Union demanded a Soviet-installed government in Lithuania and held single-party elections. One month later, Lithuania was annexed by the Soviet Union, occupied by German troops until the end of World War II, and then reoccupied by Soviet forces. Our Nation has never recognized this illegal annexation by the Soviet Union and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former independent government.

The history of Soviet occupation has been one of oppression of hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians forced to flee their native land for the strength of their beliefs and their fierce desire for a free Lithuania. Unknown thousands more were imprisoned in Siberia: Those who fought for a sovereign state, for their religious freedom, and for the rich culture and heritage of their homeland dating back more than 700 years to the founding of the Lithuanian state.

This day of commemoration, February 16, 1983, serves as a symbol of our support of the Lithuanians and their heroic struggle for human rights, and I am honored to have the opportunity to show them that we are with them in their quest for a free and independent Lithuania.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to share my thoughts on the importance of Estonian Independence Day. Today marks the 65th anniversary of the declaration of Estonian independence. As we know, the celebration of freedom in Estonia was short-lived as Soviet troops moved with brutal force to occupy and subjugate that nation, and

her neighboring Baltic States of Lithuania and Latvia.

We are greatly alarmed by continuing Soviet efforts to remove Estonia's unique national character by a campaign of russification. Estonians are being publicly harassed for speaking their native language, and for observing national customs and culture which predate the illegal Soviet occupation of their land.

I hope it is some relief and support to the embattled people of Estonia that we in Congress join them in commemorating today's anniversary. Our interest, and that of the people we represent, in the rightful cause of renewed independence for Estonia will continue unabated until the dream becomes reality. When that day comes, we will truly celebrate.●

THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF
ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues today in commemorating the 65th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the Estonian people. On February 24, 1918, the proud people of Estonia proclaimed their just right to self-determination. As we know, however, the Soviet Union invaded Estonia before the year was out, and thus denied the Estonians of their freedom.

Despite the signing of a treaty in 1920 in which the Soviets explicitly renounced "voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty over the Estonian people and territory," they again violated the sovereignty of Estonia in 1939 when the Soviets signed a pact with Nazi Germany. They forcefully invaded Estonia again, and have continued to occupy this tiny Baltic nation ever since. The Soviets' actions in 1918, 1939, and up to the present day constitute a flagrant violation of the bilateral pact with Estonia, international law which recognizes the rights to self-determination, and the Helsinki accords on human rights, to which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

The plight of the Estonian people, and all other peoples annexed by the Soviet Union, continues to be one of repression and Russification. The effects of Moscow's policies on Estonia are clear. The Estonian culture—a colorful language, and creative literature and rich heritage—is being systematically destroyed. Demographic statistics provide irrefutable evidence that the Russians are succeeding in several aspects of their policies. The percentage of Estonians in Estonia decreases each year while the percentage of great Russians increases.

The availability of periodicals, journals, and school books in the Estonian language continues to decline. Religious persecution is carried on, and the routine violation of basic civil rights is well-known. Still, in spite of these hardships, the Estonian people have not lost their love for basic freedoms and their desire to live as a sovereign nation. The demonstrations which took place in 1980 throughout Estonia are strong witness to this.

As Americans, we must continue to identify with the Estonian people. They carry the flame of freedom in their hearts—the very flame our forefathers carried in founding our Nation, and that for which our Nation stands today. Earlier this year, the European Parliament passed a resolution reiterating the right of all the Baltic nations to self-determination. The resolution also called for their case to be brought up at followup meetings for the Helsinki accords. The U.S. Government has endorsed this resolution, and I am proud to state my support for it here today.

We must continue to recognize the courage of the Estonian people in their fight for freedom and maintain our refusal to legitimize the Soviet annexation. They are a proud people and truly deserve this recognition.●

WORTHLESS AT 65

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues attention to an article written by Mr. Sheldon Weinig entitled, "Worthless at 65." The article appeared in INC magazine's January 1983 issue.

Mr. Weinig is a close personal friend and his article alerts us to the opportunity before this Congress to "rethink" our attitudes toward mandatory retirement. I think Mr. Weinig's perspective on this issue is innovative and deserving of our serious consideration.

[From INC magazine, January 1983]

SPEAKING OUT WORTHLESS AT 65

(Retirement marks the point at which we cease being overpaid and start being underemployed. What a silly system!)

(By Sheldon Weinig)

Government policymakers—in Congress and the White House—tend to view the Social Security crisis as a choice between two equally unpalatable alternatives: higher taxes and lower benefits.

But the crisis really presents an opportunity, even if politicians aren't imaginative enough to see it that way. It is an opportunity not only to bring government spending on Social Security into line with revenues, but also to solve a lot of problems created, for businesses and for people, by the way we

now go about rewarding and retiring people in this country.

Our reward and retirement policies proceed from the mistaken notion that the U.S. worker operates on a curve of increasing talent and productivity until age 65, when he or she suddenly becomes completely useless, leaves the company, and begins drawing Social Security.

Just about everything is wrong with this system.

First, it is going to bankrupt the government. People are retiring faster than they are entering the work force. In 1950, there were 16 taxpaying workers to support each retiree. Today there are only 3.2. By the early part of the next century, there will be only 2 workers paying taxes to finance the benefits paid to each Social Security recipient.

Second, and maybe more important, the system is not fair to employees, and it is terrible for business. I am suggesting that we scrap it. Not immediately. We are used to our current system, even if we don't like it. But over time, we could get used to a new system that better serves companies and employees.

The current system is unfair to employers because it institutionalizes the Peter Principle. When you go to a retirement party, you never see the honored guest smiling. It is always his boss who is smiling, happy to jettison—under honorable circumstances—an employee who has been earning increasingly more than he is worth.

It is true that most people perform better as they spend more time in their careers; they acquire both knowledge and experience. We reward them with more responsibility, more prestige, and more money.

But it is also true that most people reach the peak of their performance well before they reach their 65th birthday. They don't suddenly become useless but their effectiveness and contribution to the company gradually trail off. By the time they actually retire, they are overbearing, overpaid, and overpaid, and we are anxious to see them leave.

Among other things, the practice is cruel. Every year we traumatize millions of retirees with a sense of worthlessness that is tragic and generally unjustified. While most people at age 65 are no longer at their peak, most are certainly able—and usually eager—to continue making a contribution. I would like to open my next plant in some location like Miami or San Diego, where hundreds of thousands of retirees are desperate for the chance to work a couple of hours a day. They would probably pay me for the privilege of enhancing their own self-esteem.

The notion of mandatory retirement at age 65 has thrown millions of Americans into geriatric depression. It has also cost U.S. industry the talents of many experienced workers, contributed to the imbalance between employees entering and leaving the work force, and overwhelmed the Social Security system.

There must be a better way, a system that abandons the expensive myths of the past and compensates employees in accordance with reality. We need a system—call it Potential Lifetime Employment—that reinforces the employee as he travels up the curve to his performance peak but also recognizes when he begins to slide down the other side. Responsibilities, titles, and wages could all begin a slow deceleration, one that involved no loss of face.

The question of who decides when a worker—either in the executive suite or on

the production line—has reached his or her peak is obviously troublesome. It would be less so if each of us were not culturally indoctrinated to believe that someone is less of a man (or woman) at 64 than he or she was at 34. There is no reason, other than cultural conditioning, to label a failure the person who, at 55 or 59 or 63, decides he no longer wants to carry the responsibilities of vice-president or shift foreman.

An easy system to design and put into place? Of course not. It flies in the face of much of what we have been taught to expect throughout our lives. It demands new criteria of success, security, and accomplishment.

But I would bet that millions of Americans would jump at the opportunity to remain useful, contributing members of society well into their seventies and beyond. They would love to trade their Social Security checks for a paycheck and a chance to remain involved.

Can we design—and market—a system that recognizes that people, even after peaking, can still contribute? Can we find a way to bring them down slowly, in a culturally acceptance deceleration of working hours, responsibilities, pay, and prestige? Can we do it all without causing loss of self-respect?

We could try. The results couldn't be much more damaging than the effects of our current retirement system.●

THE PLIGHT OF LITHUANIAN CATHOLICS

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw congressional attention to the intensification of antichurch activities in the Soviet Union.

Any Soviet official will tell you that individuals can worship as they please in the U.S.S.R. The Soviet Constitution, he says, guarantees freedom of religion and freedom from religion. A clever phrase, but what does it mean? It means religious sites are razed, religious processions are disrupted, and religious officials are prevented—sometimes violently—from carrying out their functions.

In the wake of the Polish unrest—and the strong role of the Catholic Church in that protest—religious repression has become more widespread and more brutal, particularly in Poland's small but strategic neighbor Lithuania. Since October 1980, three priests have been murdered under suspicious circumstances in Lithuania. Eyewitnesses saw one of the victims, Father Bronius Laurinavicius, thrown beneath the wheels of a speeding truck. The KGB has been implicated in all three deaths and numerous other physical assaults on priests. The young Father Ricardas Cerniauskas was warned by Soviet security police to silence his criticism of the system or face an extraordinary death. And now, for the first time in 10 years, a priest faces imprisonment in Lithuania for

religious activity. On January 26, the Soviet news agency Tass reported that Father Alfonsas Svarinskas had been charged with anti-Soviet activity for giving sermons that systematically instigated believers, to wage, an open struggle against Soviet power.

The opening of criminal proceedings against Father Svarinskas coupled with heightened harassment of Catholics in general is a clear sign from Moscow to the Lithuanian Church: It will not enjoy the latitude allowed the Polish Church. At the same time, the unusual announcement of a human rights arrest by Tass may be regarded as an ominous test of Western opinion before a renewed crackdown on human rights activity in Lithuania.

The Soviet Union adheres to a clear double standard on human rights issues. It is fine for the government to profess its commitment to liberty and freedom, but any individual who requests that these promises be kept is subject to intimidation, imprisonment, or even death. We cannot allow this brutal disregard for human dignity to go unnoticed. The people of Lithuania—a nation that has always received steadfast U.S. support—deserve our attention and concern. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in public protest against religious repression in Lithuania.●

LEGISLATION TO DESIGNATE JANUARY 4, 1984 AS ALASKA STATEHOOD DAY

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this June, Congress approved the Alaska Statehood Act, paving the way for Alaska's entry into the Union as the 49th State. I am proud to introduce today in the House of Representatives a resolution commemorating the silver anniversary of Alaska statehood.

Alaska's entry into the Union was not easily accomplished. World War II had pointed to the necessity of statehood for Alaska. The Japanese invasion of the Aleutians, lend lease flights across Alaska to the Soviet Union, and later the cold war and its resulting early warning radar stations convinced the Nation that Alaska was vital to the national defense. Even so, the Alaska statehood issue was a hotly contested subject during the 1950's with the chief arguments against statehood being Alaska's alleged inability to pay its own way and the fact that Alaska was not contiguous to the continental United States. In June 1958, after numerous proposals and counterproposals, Congress approved statehood for Alaska. On July 7, 1958,

President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed into law the Alaska Statehood Act. Alaska formally entered the Union as the 49th State 6 months later on January 3, 1959.

Alaskans reacted with unrestrained joy to the news of the signing of the Statehood Act. Bold, half-page headlines declared, "WE'RE IN," residents danced in the streets, and church bells and factory whistles spread the news.

Most citizens of the lower 48 knew very little about the new State of Alaska. Despite the infrastructure buildup resulting from World War II, vast areas of the State were underdeveloped. Basic services, such as roads and schools were in poor condition. When I arrived in Fort Yukon, Alaska, to begin my work as a school teacher, my teaching facilities were located in a one-room log cabin, built around the turn of the century. Even in Anchorage, Alaska's largest city, very few streets were paved.

I can proudly report, however, that Alaska has made impressive progress in all areas over the past 25 years, and for an initial investment of just over \$7 million, the Nation has reaped a bonanza in return. Anchorage is now a modern city of 220,000 people, and the State has established a fine system of State universities, and communication and transportation facilities. Alaska produces one-eighth of the Nation's gold; one-fifth of the Nation's oil; and two-fifths of its harvested fish; 74 percent of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, containing vast amounts of resources, lies off the coast of Alaska. In sum, Alaskans are proud and productive Americans.

Clearly, the United States has benefited from the inclusion of Alaska as its most northern and western State, just as Alaska has prospered as the 49th State. The Alaska Statehood commission has recently released its findings after a reexamination of Alaska statehood, and has determined that statehood is in the best interest of Alaskans, and to the interest of all the people of the United States.

I therefore respectfully submit this resolution designating January 3, 1984, as Alaska Statehood Day in honor of the 25th anniversary of Alaska's entry into the United States of America. ●

PASSENGERS' FLIGHTS INCREASE AT DULLES AIRPORT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in the Northern Virginia Sun edition of February 11, 1983, which comments on an encouraging upward trend in passenger and

flight levels at the federally owned Dulles International Airport.

UP, UP, AND . . .

The moral battle over Washington's airports is finally taking on material proportions. Ever since Dulles International Airport was unveiled in 1964, this newspaper and hundreds of thousands of Northern Virginians have known it was better than National Airport for most of the things the area needs from airports. Now, finally, there are signs that common sense is beginning to take hold on people's travel habits.

The Washington Dulles Task Force announced Tuesday that in 1982 the number of flights out of Dulles increased steadily. So did the number of passengers using the airport. The gains are strong and from a large enough base that one can say it is a sustainable trend. That sense is even stronger when one takes into consideration that 1982 was the roughest year for air travel in ages. The recession has taken a real chunk out of people's travel dollar, and the result is they are flying less. Yet, somehow, Dulles enjoyed 2.6 million travelers—12.3 percent more than in 1981.

The reasons are many. Community leaders have pounded home the airport's superior qualities for nearly 20 years. The Air Florida crash last January revealed the tenuous safety of National Airport. The air controllers strike forced a limitation of flights at National. And the completion of a Washington to Dulles roadway devoid of traffic lights came very close to reality. All these factors combined in people's minds to say, "Hey, why not fly out of Dulles this time?"

At 2.6 million passengers a year Dulles remains a distant third in Washington area airport use. National drew about 14 million, and Baltimore Washington International drew about half that. The fact remains that Dulles is fighting an uphill battle. National enjoys the benefits of being located on a Metro line and at a central location. BWI boasts the aggressive support of the State of Maryland, complete with a huge advertising budget and its own Amtrak rail stop. Dulles, by contrast, has struggled ahead with the minimal support of the Commonwealth of Virginia and an ugly duckling attitude from the Federal Aviation Authority, which owns both National and Dulles.

In the absence of powerful help from government, private citizens like those in the Washington Dulles Task Force have taken the responsibility to lobby airlines for more and better flights out of Dulles. They are providing an invaluable service. We thank them for their efforts and hope that someday the federal government can be persuaded to listen to common sense—just like 2.6 million people did last year. ●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1983 marks the 65th anniversary of the formation of the free and independent Republic of Estonia. On this occasion, let us call attention to the proud history of the Estonian nation.

The struggle for independence that has characterized Estonia's history began in 1918. The Estonian people, aided by England, Finland, Sweden, and Denmark, threw off the yoke of Communist rule. In 1920, the Soviet Union renounced all claim over Estonia. For the next 20 years, the independent Republic of Estonia flourished, developing a rich national culture and a prosperous economy.

But the liberty was not to last. In flagrant violation of the peace treaty of 1920, the Soviets signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, condemning Estonia and its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Lithuania, to the harsh burden of Soviet rule. The Soviet forcibly annexed the territory of Estonia in 1940 and subjugated a free people.

Today, the culture of Estonia is in peril. Russification is rampant, and the Estonian language and culture are threatened with extinction. Fundamental freedoms have been virtually abolished; human rights violations are commonplace, and dissidence is punished swiftly by arrest, deportation, or even execution.

The Estonian people, however, refuse to this day to succumb to Soviet tyranny and oppression. In the struggle for independence, Estonian youth continue to resist subjugation through their demonstrations and appeals to the free world. In support of this quest for freedom, the United States refuses to recognize the annexation of the Republic of Estonia by the Soviet Union. We who live free urge the government of the Soviet Union to comply with the provisions of the Helsinki accords, and grant the citizens of Estonia their basic individual liberties and human rights.

The brave people of Estonia deserve international recognition today for their never-ending struggle for liberty and emancipation from Soviet control. I join Estonians and Estonian-Americans in their hope that their quest for independence will end in victory, and the Independent Republic of Estonia will again take its deserved place among the free nations of the world. ●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor a people who, in the face of great danger, are struggling to keep their identity as a nation intact. I am speaking of the people of Estonia, long a proud and accomplished nation, but now a Russian colony under the shadow of Soviet oppression. Today is their independence day, which cannot be celebrated in Es-

tonia, but serves to remind Estonians worldwide of their identity.

The Estonians have lived on the same land for over 2,000 years, developing a rich Estonian tradition from a culture that is neither Slavic nor Germanic. Although, since the 13th century, the Estonians have often been ruled by others, an independent Estonian state was declared on February 24, 1918, and freely ruled until 1940, when it was invaded and annexed by the Soviet Union. Currently, Estonians are facing the greatest threat ever to their language, culture, and their very existence as a nation.

Ever since Estonia unwillingly became part of the Soviet empire, Estonian culture and identity have been repressed. Although nominally an independent state in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Estonia is, in reality, totally controlled by Moscow, which does not tolerate any autonomy in its subject states. The Soviet Union is now attempting to destroy the Estonian, and replace him with the "new Soviet man", who, schooled to believe in the tenants of Soviet communism, would reject the culture of his ancestors, and embrace that of the Soviet Union. In reality, this is a policy aimed at crushing any culture other than the prescribed Russian Communist model.

In Estonia, this policy has already had many serious consequences, including the suppression of the Estonian mother tongue. Russian language is granted preferential status at all official, educational, and even cultural levels, whereas the status of Estonian has diminished.

The Soviet Union is also attempting to destroy Estonian culture by flooding the area with Russian workers. This has upset the demographics of the region, as well as the Estonian national identity. Russians now make up almost half of the population of the capital city of Tallinn, and may outnumber native Estonians after the completion of the new harbor there. Currently only about two-thirds of the country's population is Estonian, and that ratio is falling as increasing numbers of Russian workers are brought in.

There are signs of hope, such as the student anti-Russian protests in 1980. On January 13 of this year, the European Parliament passed a resolution reiterating the right of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, to self-determination, and called for their case to be brought up at the followup meetings for the Helsinki accords, and to be submitted to the U.N. Subcommittee on Decolonization, inasmuch as these countries are, in effect, Soviet colonies. Every sign of encouragement that the West did not abandon the Baltic States at Helsinki will help keep hope alive for Estonians, both in this land, and in Estonia itself. Let us hope that some day soon, Esto-

nian Independence Day can have real meaning again.●

STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TAKE NATIONAL STAND

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) has taken a position of leadership within the higher education community by viewing the problems of higher education in the broad context of national policy. The AASCU board of directors called for a delay in the 10-percent tax reduction scheduled for this July and for no further reductions in Federal aid to States. AASCU represents 354 State colleges and universities which enroll more than 2 million students. The text of the resolutions follows, and I call it to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Whereas the growth rate in funding for domestic programs, including higher education, has been slowed and, in some cases, has been cut; and

Whereas defense spending has increased dramatically; and

Whereas tax cuts have reduced available revenues; and

Whereas the federal deficit is projected to be \$185 billion in FY 83, over \$200 billion in FY 84, and in excess of \$288 billion in FY 88; and

Whereas further cuts in domestic spending cannot offset the revenue losses resulting from the tax cuts, provide the revenue necessary for planned increases in defense spending, and therefore will not have a significant impact on the size of the deficit; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, representing 354 public colleges and universities in the United States, urges the delay of the 10 percent tax cut scheduled for implementation in July of 1983.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Whereas the recession has resulted in substantial losses of state revenues, including more than \$8 billion lost since revenue estimates were made last spring; and

Whereas the federal government will have cut over \$57 billion in aid to the states by the end of fiscal year 1983; and

Whereas State expenditures already have been cut substantially in the last two years and are estimated to have fallen by \$5 billion since last spring; and

Whereas cuts in expenditures by state governments have had a significant and damaging impact on public higher education institutions; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, representing 354 public

colleges and universities, urges that no further cuts be made in aid to state governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of AASCU urges that programs which are currently the responsibility of the federal government not become the responsibility of the states, unless the federal government provides the necessary funding.●

PLIGHT OF THE SPERM WHALE

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, in 1975, the sperm whale was designated as the State animal of Connecticut, not only for its special contribution to the State's history, but in recognition of its current plight as an endangered species. It is estimated that even if all hunting of sperm whales was to cease immediately, some populations would continue to decline for another 20 years. Commercial catch limits imposed on the remaining whaling industry are more a reflection of the dwindling numbers of whales in existence than of serious conservation efforts. For these reasons, I applaud the recent passage of a ban on all commercial whaling by the International Whaling Commission (IWC) effective in 1985. I address you here today, however, because this spectacular victory is gravely threatened.

Japan, Norway, the Soviet Union, and Peru, all member nations of the IWC, have filed objections to the IWC ban. Since the IWC is without the power to enforce its own rulings, these nations will ultimately become exempt from the ban if their objections are not withdrawn. The tragedy and the irony is that it is these nations that harbor the last vestiges of the archaic whaling industry.

Many conservation and environmental groups were urging Congress to put pressure on these nations by denying the approval of their U.S. fishing rights. Under the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, countries wishing to fish within our 200-mile fishery conservation zone must have a Governing International Fishing Agreement, or GIFA. Japan, who depends heavily on the fish they obtain from U.S. waters, was seeking reauthorization of their GIFA last year. Japan's GIFA was, in fact, approved during the lameduck session as a part of a larger package of fisheries matters. Their agreement is effective for 5 years.

While the GIFA was passed, it is only the first step. Subsequent determination must be made regarding how many and what types of fish may be taken under the GIFA. The U.S. Department of State conducts a quarterly review of these allocations during

each year the GIFA is in effect. The first review of Japan's GIFA will be conducted next month. It is here that the United States can still bring pressure to bear on nations to withdraw their objections to the whaling ban.

To this end, I am introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the U.S. Department of State should give consideration to whether or not a nation has filed an objection to the IWC ban when determining the level of allocations a nation is to receive under a GIFA. While the Fishery Conservation and Management Act contains two amendments—the Packwood-Magnuson and the Pelly amendments—through which unilateral sanctions can be leveled against countries who violate IWC rulings, these provisions will not be triggered into effect until the ban, which takes effect in 1985, is actually violated. My resolution is intended to affect the quarterly reviews of allocation levels being set under the GIFA beginning next month and continuing for the duration of the agreement.

This resolution gives Congress an opportunity to reaffirm the U.S. policy of preventing the continuing decline in the world's whale populations through the conservation and protection of whale species. It sends a strong message to the nations who have filed an objection to the IWC ban that the United States finds the cruel and unnecessary slaughter of whales unacceptable.

I must point out that the continuation of whaling by these nations is hardly justifiable from an economic standpoint. Japan, which has the largest of the remaining industries, is the only market for whale meat in the world. Most important, the market for this meat accounts for a mere 0.3 percent of the total annual Japanese protein consumption. It is clearly not a staple of the diet. We are looking at the potential annihilation of the greatest and most intriguing of nature's marine marvels for the production of such items as pet food, fertilizer, and industrial lubricants. Adequate substitutes for these products are readily available at reasonable cost. Not one need that is being met through the extermination of whales cannot be met in a less drastic way. The products derived from whales are either disposable or replaceable. The whales themselves are not.

These purely economic considerations, which alone are a compelling argument in favor of the ban, do not even touch on the scientific and humanitarian concerns at stake. The administration has endorsed the imposition of the legislative sanctions against the nations refusing to withdraw their objections to the IWC ban in 1985. It is my hope that these objections will be withdrawn before more vigorous ac-

tions contained in the Fisheries Conservation and Management Act are triggered, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in conveying this message.●

LEGISLATION TO AVERT UTILITY SHUTOFFS IN WINTER MONTHS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced the "Home Heating Protection and Utility Regulation Act of 1983" (H.R. 1594). This bill would amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to provide for uniform, mandatory Federal standards governing terminations of natural gas and electric home heating service by the utilities.

The legislation seeks to prevent the involuntary termination of utility service in households that are unable to pay their bills on time and in cases that would endanger the health of individuals. The bill establishes standards and procedures for State regulatory authorities to avert shutoffs during the winter period and requires arrangements between affected households and the utilities for the scheduling of deferred payment and repayment of past bills. The legislation builds on the voluntary standards set in the 1978 law, which in many instances have proved inadequate, and incorporates key features of the best State regulations currently in force.

The record number of utility shutoffs this winter, along with the steep increase in gas prices and the insufficient funding of the low-income energy assistance program, have produced a crisis for tens of thousands of low-income households. Across the Nation, the Citizen Labor Energy Coalition estimates, more than 300,000 households have experienced gas shutoffs this winter. Preliminary data collected by the National Consumer Law Center indicate that the number of shutoffs this winter far exceeded the average in the past few years, and low-income families are disproportionately affected. Since there are no Federal or State reporting requirements on terminations, the data collected is likely to understate the dimensions of the problem. Associated with utility shutoffs is the dramatic increase in the number of households that have fallen into arrears. The increase in unpaid utility bills has reached critical levels in several States.

Under the pressure of the situation, some progress has been made to establish reasonable standards and procedures to assist households to avert shutoffs. Often these standards rest

upon voluntary compliance. In too few cases have State regulatory authorities protected individuals whose health can be affected by terminations. For example, only 17 States permit utility customers to request a formal hearing before a regulatory body. Only 10 States have procedures to protect young children and elderly persons. Only a handful of States compel utilities to enter into repayment or deferred payment agreements. The disparities in State regulations and indifferent enforcement of existing standards present sufficient reasons to propose uniform, mandatory Federal standards. The alarming increase in illness and death attributable to loss of body heat points to the inadequacy of existing standards.

The legislation I have introduced provides for: First, the adoption and enforcement by State regulatory authorities of standards to protect against termination of service of households who lack financial resources and can demonstrate a danger to health; second, standards and procedures to require the reinstatement of service to households that meet certain criteria; third, standards and procedures permitting customers to have hearings before a State regulatory authority; fourth, procedures to encourage agreements on deferred payment or repayment of past bills, and to compel such arrangements if voluntary efforts fail; fifth, standards and procedures to protect tenants in buildings whose landlords are in arrears, and to permit direct payment by tenants through the use of escrow accounts; sixth, collection of comprehensive data on utility service shutoffs by each State regulatory authority, and the filing of such reports with the Secretary of Energy for public use; and seventh, an authorization of funds to cover the additional costs and responsibilities imposed on State regulatory authorities under this legislation.

Sooner or later—if not this winter, then next—uniform, mandatory Federal standards have to be adopted to protect citizens against heating shutoffs during the winter months. Access to heating, like access to food, should not be treated as a privilege. Too many households already confront life-threatening choices between paying for food and paying fuel bills.

This legislation provides safeguards to insure that the utility companies are paid for the services they provide. It also calls upon the utilities to act responsibly in emergency situations, and strengthens the role of State regulatory authorities in fulfilling their public obligations.●

ONE BILLION DOLLARS SPENT IN STEEL CREATES 52,000 JOBS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in my recent special orders on the Buy American amendment to the Surface Transportation Act I said that an estimated \$918 million will be spent on manufactured goods a year under the bill; the correct estimate is that \$918 million will be spent on manufactured goods over the life of the plan.

Nevertheless, it still would be a significant blow to the intent of Congress and the plan to exempt nearly \$1 billion in manufactured goods from the Buy American provisions, which the Federal Highway Administration is considering.

This \$1 billion would lead to substantial activity.

Information recently developed by the Congressional Research Service indicates that every \$1 billion spent on steel generates 52,000 jobs; and that every \$1 spent on steel leads to \$2.20 in economic activity.

This means the Federal Highway Administration—by exempting manufactured goods from Buy American—would waive almost 52,000 jobs and \$2.2 billion in economic activity.

These jobs and this activity should remain in the United States, and I say again that creating jobs in the United States was what Congress intended in passing the bill and in passing the Buy American amendment.●

FINDING A CURE FOR NEUROFIBROMATOSIS

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish a National Commission on Neurofibromatosis (NF). This disorder received national attention several years ago by the Broadway play, "The Elephant Man," a remarkable saga of a man struggling with this disorder.

Neurofibromatosis is a genetic disorder of the central nervous system occurring in 1 out of every 3,000 births.

It afflicts approximately 100,000 people in the United States and occurs in both sexes and in all ethnic and racial groups. Each child of an affected parent has a 50-percent chance of inheriting the gene and developing NF. Dr. Frederick von Recklinghausen first published medical literature on the disorder in 1882.

Manifestations of the disorder usually appear in childhood or adolescence,

though they can appear later in life. Children with NF can frequently be identified shortly after birth by the appearance of a number of light brown spots. NF patients may develop a number of problems, including many small tumors under or on the skin, large tumors just under the skin, curvature of the spine, enlargement and deformation of bones, and tumors of the auditory, and optic nerves. These problems can lead to other problems like deafness and blindness which then create severe educational, economic, and social problems.

Presently there is no cure for NF and medical opinions on treatment vary tremendously. In my view, we need to bring into focus what we are doing as a Nation to find a cure for NF and identify what more we need to do. I am hopeful that my bill will lead us in that direction.

The bill I am introducing today will establish a national commission that will have 2 years to assess the nature and extent of public and private research into neurofibromatosis and to develop a plan to identify the research needed to develop a cure for NF. The Commission would be composed of 12 members, including representatives of the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke, the Director of the National Cancer Institute, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, the National Institute of Child Health and Development, and the Department of Education. These representatives would be joined by three scientists or health professionals, and three individuals who have experience with the disorder. This approach is modeled after the National Commission established by the Congress for Huntington's disease in 1977.

In the last Congress, we took a big step by enacting the Orphan Drug Act which offers hope to many people afflicted with rare diseases. I hope that my colleagues will join me in pressing the Nation to combine its resources to eradicate the many diseases for which we have not found a cure.

The text of my bill follows:

A bill to establish a National Commission on Neurofibromatosis

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Commission on Neurofibromatosis Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Neurofibromatosis (also known as Von Recklinghausen's Disease) is a genetic disorder of the nervous system. Fifty percent of all cases of neurofibromatosis are inherited from one of the victims' parents. The other 50 percent are a result of a spontaneous change or mutation of a gene. The cause of this mutation is unknown.

(2) While the exact incidence of neurofibromatosis is unknown, it is estimated that the disorder affects one in every three thousand persons.

(3) Neurofibromatosis occurs equally in both sexes and in all racial and ethnic groups. It often imposes severe economic, social, and emotional hardships on individuals and on the families of individuals affected by the disorder.

(4) Neurofibromatosis is one of the world's most serious genetic disorders.

(5) Characteristic signs of neurofibromatosis may be present at birth. Manifestations usually appear in early childhood or adolescence, but can occur later, particularly at times of increased hormonal activity.

(6) There is a critical shortage of specialized programs and properly trained professionals in the United States for neurofibromatosis research, treatment, care, education, and rehabilitation.

(7) The training of health and educational professionals in the treatment of neurofibromatosis deserves the highest national priority.

(8) The people of the United States have an inadequate understanding of the nature of the personal, medical, social, and economic impact of neurofibromatosis.

(9) There is a great potential for making advances in the treatment of neurofibromatosis and other genetic disorders through the National Institutes of Health and other research centers.

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary"), in consultation with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, shall within sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act establish a National Commission on Neurofibromatosis (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

DUTIES OF COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall assess the nature and extent of public and private research into neurofibromatosis and shall develop a plan to identify the research needed to develop an effective treatment and a cure for neurofibromatosis. In formulating such plan the Commission shall consider the incidence of neurofibromatosis, its epidemiology, its economic and social consequences, and the most effective application of scientific and health care resources.

(b) The plan developed under subsection (a) shall provide for—

(1) research into the epidemiology, etiology, prevention, and control of neurofibromatosis which shall include studies involving the disorder's social, environment, nutritional, biological, and genetic determinants and influences;

(2) research into the development, evaluation, and application of techniques and drugs used in, and approaches to, the treatment and prevention of neurofibromatosis and its consequences;

(3) the education and training of scientists, clinicians, educators, and allied health personnel in the fields and specialties requisite to the conduct of programs concerning neurofibromatosis; and

(4) development of a system for collection analysis, and dissemination of all data useful in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of neurofibromatosis.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. (a) Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of Health and Human Services (or his delegate).

(2) The Director of the National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke (or his delegate).

(3) The Director of the National Cancer Institute (or his delegate).

(4) Director of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences.

(5) Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

(6) The Secretary of Education (or his delegate).

(7) Three individuals appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government, who are scientists or health professionals representing the various behavioral, biomedical, and educational specialties concerned with the research, treatment, and remediation of neurofibromatosis.

(8) Three individuals appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services from the general public with personal experience with neurofibromatosis.

A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments was made.

(b) If any member of the Commission who was appointed to the Commission by virtue of such individual's office leaves that office, or if any member of the Commission who was appointed from individuals who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government becomes an officer or employee of the Federal Government, such individual may continue as a member of the Commission for not longer than the thirty-day period beginning on the date such individual leaves that office or becomes such an officer or employee, as the case may be.

(c) Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-18 of the General Schedule for each day (including travel-time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(2) Members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government shall receive no additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Commission.

(e) The Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(f) The Commission shall first meet on a date specified by the Secretary, not later than thirty days after the Commission is established, and thereafter shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members, but on at least three occasions during the life of the Commission.

DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have an Executive Director who shall be appointed by the Commission and paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level 5 of the Executive Schedule.

(b) With the approval of the Commission, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as the Executive Director considers appropriate.

(c) The Executive Director and staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51

and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(d) Subject to such rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, the Executive Director may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5 of the United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed \$200 per day.

(e) Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(f) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) Any member or agent of the Commission may, if so authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(c) The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

REPORT

SEC. 8. The Commission may transmit to the President and to each House of the Congress such interim reports as it considers appropriate and shall transmit a final report to the President and to each House of the Congress not later than twenty-four months after the date the Commission is duly organized. The final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as it considers appropriate.

TERMINATION

SEC. 9. The Commission shall cease to exist three months after the submission of the final report under section 8.

PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK AND SAVE ENERGY

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the large-scale unemployment across the United States. In 1982, I orchestrated a discussion on the floor of the House of Representatives on the positive impacts of renewable energy development on our Nation's employment. I believe we must put the American people back to work in occupations with high future growth potential. The employment title of the Solar

Energy National Security and Employment Act (SENSE) is a rational step in this direction. I would like to submit the article by the Christian Science Monitor published February 7, 1983, titled "A Way to Help Put America Back to Work—and Save Energy."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7, 1983]

A WAY TO HELP PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK—AND SAVE ENERGY

(By Leon Lindsay)

One of the best job-producing moves government could make, according to energy-conservation advocates, would be an investment in weatherization and solar-energy devices for homes and businesses across the United States.

People involved in such conservation activities say their potential for producing new jobs, business expansion, and energy savings has been demonstrated. A much larger commitment than has been proposed either by the Reagan administration or congressional Democrats is justified, the conservationists argue.

A \$5.4 billion Democratic jobs bill, passed by the U.S. House late last year but not acted upon by the Senate, would have provided \$250 million for weatherproofing homes and apartments occupied by low-income residents.

Although Department of Energy funding for conservation projects is cut almost in half in President Reagan's proposed fiscal 1984 budget—from \$670 million in fiscal '83 to \$383 million in the budget year beginning next July 1—statistics gathered over the past several years by agencies involved in weatherization and solar energy projects indicate these activities are very efficient employment stimulators.

The Solar Lobby in Washington, D.C., will announce later this month a "Solar Energy, National Security, and Employment Act." The measure would provide major impetus to the energy conservation effort. It will not require any new funding in fiscal 1984, according to Scott Sklar, the lobby's political director.

The bill has four parts, explains Mr. Sklar, dealing with small business, national security, employment, and consumer information. "Basically they either protect or broaden certain programs to help renewable energy or extend programs that are due to be cut off in the future," he says. Energy tax credits for small businesses and homeowners, due to expire in 1985, would be extended to 1990. Under the bill, skill training for workers in renewable energy and conservation activities, such as solar and weatherization, would be allowable in all federal jobs programs.

A bipartisan group of 20 U.S. senators and representatives, several of them chairmen of key committees, are sponsoring the legislation.

Ted Rauh, chief of the Division of Conservation of the California Energy Commission, points out that conservation activities are a close second to highway construction in providing jobs and stimulating business activity—with the added benefit of cutting energy consumption and costs. Energy efficiency programs and businesses in California provided \$750 million worth of jobs and investments in 1982, Mr. Rauh reports.

Representatives for the AFL-CIO's Industrial Union Department project that energy conservation activities could create 600,000 jobs by 1990.

Michael Gordon, program director of The Institute for the Human Environment in San Francisco, says: "An expanded effort to 'button up our homes' would provide many thousands of jobs in both the public and private sectors—through production of home weatherization materials; retail sales of insulation, weatherstripping, caulk, water-heater blankets, low-flow shower heads, and other products; and the organization, administration, and implementation of coordinated local weatherization programs throughout the United States."

He cites Santa Clara County, Calif., as an example. It is estimated, Mr. Gordon says, that "if even 25 percent of homes in the county needing weatherization were made energy-efficient, almost \$30 million in local sales of material could be realized."

Portland, Ore., which began an ambitious weatherization and energy-conservation program in 1979, provides impressive evidence of what it can mean to a local economy.

According to Jeanne McCormick, director of the Portland [Ore.] Energy Office, that city's weatherization and energy-conservation program has produced many benefits in terms of residential and business savings—and jobs saved as well as created. "We have found," she says, "that, generally, investment of \$15 million by local businesses in such projects such as insulating buildings, or changing to more energy-efficient ways of making their products, create—directly—525 jobs."

"There's not only the contractor who comes in to do the job, there are engineers who perform energy audits and architects who design changes. They there's what we call the 'leveraging effect,' where you have the secretary who works for the contractor, and so forth."

"We have done energy audits for 146 small businesses, which have been able to cut energy consumption (an average of) 19½ percent as a result. Even though energy costs in Portland are lower than in many other areas of the country, those firms collectively are saving \$525,000 a year. They can reinvest that money in expansion."

"So it's not just the number of jobs created by the weatherization itself, but how much money that business saves that can be used to diversify or expand or spend on training or use it to keep people on the job."

Mrs. McCormick and others point out that little retraining of workers is involved in these energy-conservation activities. Most come from the existing pool of unemployed skilled workers—carpenters, pipefitters, boilermakers, and plumbers, and other in light construction and light manufacturing. Other direct and indirect positions are created in marketing, retail sales, business management, lending, and the appraisal and real estate fields.●

INTRODUCING THE NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION ACT

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with Congressman BILL COYNE and 26 cosponsors, the Neighborhood Development Demonstration Act of 1983. We drafted this legislation because of the urgency

of augmenting existing housing and community development programs. With proposed budget cuts in economic development, assisted housing, and community development block grants, we must turn to new avenues to promote business, jobs, and adequate housing for the needy.

The act would authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a 3-year demonstration program to provide Federal matching funds to private nonprofit neighborhood organizations. For each participating organization, the Secretary would establish a ratio by which voluntary charitable contributions made by individuals and businesses would be matched by Federal funds. Depending on the economic conditions and the number of households and businesses in the neighborhoods involved, this ratio would be set no lower than 3 Federal dollars for every dollar of voluntary contribution, nor higher than 10 Federal dollars for every dollar of voluntary contribution. Perhaps the most significant objective of this legislation is to encourage a stronger financial base, for neighborhood groups through increased private sector donations.

Neighborhood organizations often provide the most successful programs in depressed urban areas, such as my congressional district, the Bronx. Neighborhood groups can serve as a unifying force around which concerned citizens can work for the betterment of their communities. During a time marked by decreases in social spending and aid to urban regions, it is vital to augment the neighborhood development organizations that strive for the revitalization of our cities. I urge your support of the Neighborhood Development Demonstration Act of 1983 so that we can assist community groups in their effort to revive urban America.●

MAUMEE BAY STATE PARK

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to authorize a shoreline erosion protection project at Maumee Bay State Park in northwest Ohio.

Maumee Bay State Park is a multi-use facility located in Lucas County, Ohio, on the south shore of Lake Erie near Toledo. The park covers 1,700 acres and adjoins the federally owned Cedar Point National Wildlife Refuge. The shoreline protection project is critical to the future of this parkland. Shoreline erosion is occurring at the rate of 12 feet each year. Without the shoreline protection project, the beach

will continue to erode. Until the shoreline is stabilized, the State of Ohio cannot go forward with its major development plans for the park. The State is committed to significant capital improvements for the park. To date, the State has already contributed \$440,000 for purchase of the property and \$1,500,000 for campground development. A recent \$60,000 study has been funded to design a lodge complex. The State of Ohio's investment in the Maumee Bay State Park is already in excess of \$2 million.

The estimated current cost of the shoreline project is \$10,396,000, with the State of Ohio providing approximately a third of that amount. In addition to its contribution to the shoreline project, the State has expressed its intent to complete the overall development of Maumee Bay State Park currently estimated at \$36 million.

The revitalization of the Maumee Bay State Park would provide much needed short- and long-term employment opportunities in a region suffering from high unemployment. During the span of the park's construction, 2,000 new jobs are expected to be generated. In addition, permanent jobs will be created in the park and in related industries. The permanent jobs that will result can be filled by area residents lacking specific job skills. The overall park investment is expected to generate \$3 per visitor. With an estimated 1 million visitors per year, this would yield \$3 million in new annual revenues for the Toledo area. The park will also serve to attract industry and provide for new Toledo convention trade. The park, the only major State park in northwest Ohio and the only one in close proximity to a major metropolitan area, will directly serve five congressional districts. It will capture local tourism and recreation dollars which are being spent out of the State.

Given the tremendous national development potential of Lake Erie, a fresh water lake, and the need for a major State park to serve northwest Ohioans, I believe that the jobs and dollars that would be generated by the Maumee Bay State Park warrant its immediate development. An indispensable first step is to halt the shoreline erosion. Ohioans have already made a significant investment in the park. It is time they receive a return on their investment.●

TRIBUTE TO COUNCILMAN NORMAN REEVES

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, my entire city of Baltimore still mourns

the death of Norman V. A. Reeves who was serving on the Baltimore City Council at the time of his passing. He was such a remarkable human being that as much of his life history as possible must be shared with as many as possible.

I urge my colleagues to read the story of this man, a victim of muscular dystrophy, who lived a life much more full than many of us.

NORMAN V. A. REEVES

(By Langston Hughes)

Norman V. A. Reeves' life is a statement that is both profound and simple. His role as a father, husband, freedom fighter, city councilman, businessman, educator are all variations on a single theme—the burning desire to succeed. His family life, his reaction to his physical handicap, and his successful pursuit of public office are elements that provide a study in the positive expression of the black experience.

He was born on April 27, 1935. His mother, Lucy Mason Reeves Jones, is one of Baltimore's first black women podiatrists. His father, Norman V. A. Reeves, Sr., died when Norm was five-years-old. When Norm was three-years-old, it was determined that he had muscular dystrophy. His doctor predicted that he would be in a wheelchair or dead by the time he was 13, and advised Norman's mother to restrict his physical activities. Norm's reaction was to become even more active and he was able to participate in sports as a fierce competitor up until age 13. His old doctors marveled at his general good health as the disease slowly took its toll. Not until several years before his death was he confined to a wheelchair, from which he continued to pursue an active public life.

He attended Douglass High School, graduating in 1953. Later, at Lincoln University, Norm majored in psychology and minored in economics and philosophy, graduating with honors in 1957. His active involvement in college life is chronicled in the 1957 edition of "Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities". Upon graduating from Lincoln, he joined the Baltimore City Department of Social Services as a caseworker. Here he met Walter P. Carter, a local leader in the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), who was later to become known as Baltimore's "Mr. Civil Rights". The two started Howard University together in 1961 to pursue a Masters degree in Social Work. This was during a period when Walter was heavily involved in the Route 40 demonstrations and other CORE campaigns. Walter and Norm discussed strategy and tactics on the daily trip between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. Newspaper headlines during the height of the Maryland fight against segregated public accommodations was an indirect result of some of these discussions and Norman's commitment to an ongoing involvement in efforts to effect change deepened. At Howard, Norm met Iris Gant of North Carolina who was also studying for an MSW. The couple exchanged vows in August of 1962. "Little Norm" was born in 1963, and daughter Traci in 1969.

Norm was the first black supervisor serving the Baltimore County Department of Welfare in the late 1960's. During this time, black militancy was generating fear and confusion among whites. Norm conducted race relations seminars and pointed out numerous areas of racism within the County department, providing many whites with

their first real glimpse into the black ethos. It was also during this period that Norm headed up the William L. Moore Foundation and its Center for Afro-American Studies. The Foundation headquarters was established in the former home of the late William Moore, the Baltimore postman gunned down while on a freedom walk through Alabama. During the hectic 1960's, the Foundation was a frequent and important meeting place of community organizations and activist groups. The Center maintained an extensive library on black history and sponsored annual symposiums during Black History Week focussing on the historical and cultural aspects of the Black Movement. It was the first local group to demand that the City of Baltimore and the State of Maryland declare a Black History Week.

Norman worked as a counselor at the University of Maryland Baltimore County Campus in 1969, where he founded the Black Caucus of Faculty and staff. Within a year the Caucus became the basis for a larger organization, the Black Coalition of University of Maryland Campuses. Norm served as co-chairman of the coalition, along with Howard "Pete" Rawlings, a UMBC instructor who is now a delegate from the 40th district. The coalition's efforts resulted in an increase of black faculty and students on the undergraduate and graduate level, and integration of the Board of Regents.

In 1971, Norm accepted the position of principal of the Ralph Young School for Boys, a Catholic school. It was during this period that he decided to run for political office. His first try in 1971 produced a spirited grassroots effort, but no victory. A second try in 1975 brought together an even greater community based organization and victory seemed within reach. However, the opposition also recognized the threat, and the use of the same name ploy—an unemployed truck driver named "Reeves"—cost the Fifth District their first Black city councilman.

There was never any question in Norm's mind as to whether he should run again for the prize that had twice eluded him. He had proven that he could build a political organization and that his community involvement could translate into political action. He had also answered the often unspoken question in the minds of many—whether he could withstand the rigors of the campaign trail. The stage was set for a history-making victory and Norm did just that, leading the Fifth District field of candidates by a wide margin.

One of the remarkable aspects of Norm's election was the diversity of his vote, which included a sizable percentage of Jewish and white liberal voters. His appeal as a candidate experienced in the problems of race relations and urban blight was seen by many as a bridge across the gap of race and class that often inhibits community progress. Norm promised to represent the needs of all his constituents and considered the diversity of his vote a mandate to promote a new era of political cooperation in the Fifth District. And because the district was itself a microcosm of Baltimore—ranging from lower Park Heights to Roland Park—Norm saw it as a basis for a citywide attack on urban problems.

The range of issues Norm became involved in during his brief tenure on the City Council reflected his broad interests and concerns. He passed consumer protection legislation setting safety standards for the installation of woodburning stoves. He passed housing legislation designed to keep out-of-

state property owners from evading their responsibility for housing conditions by requiring that they appoint a local residential agent to respond to notices. He passed a bill requiring for the first time the registration of single family and duplex rental units. The bill will raise \$600,000 to a million dollars a year and should bolster the housing inspection services for the City of Baltimore.

He passed other resolutions calling for a study of the feasibility of using City pension funds for home mortgages (before a similar State program was announced) and a study of the City Civil Defense program. His work on the Budget and Finance Committee and Urban Affairs Committee has resulted in commitments of several thousand jobs for blacks and assistance to a number of black businesses. He also passed a resolution calling for a task force to study the problem of black economic development and black unemployment in the City of Baltimore, which he chaired.

As a community activist, Norm had been a strong advocate for peace and asserted that a world view is necessary to combat the forces impacting on people at the local level. He successfully sponsored resolutions for the condemnation of South Africa and the role of the United States in El Salvador, and co-sponsored a resolution urging a nuclear weapons freeze.

Councilman Reeves was in full stride at the time of his death. He had become recognized as a hard-working, effective legislator who did his homework and attempted to represent his district with integrity and compassion. At a salute held for him on April 25, 1982, it was clear that a future in the City Council was assured. No one knew better than he how short that future was to be. He is quoted in one news account shortly after his 1979 election as saying: "I want to see that my agenda is finished before I am finished." There is no question that Norm's agenda, viewed as a statement which speaks eloquently of the aspirations of a man and his people, is complete.

Norman V. A. Reeves died in Provident Hospital on February 13, 1983. He was 47 years old. He is survived by wife, Iris; son, Norman III, 19; daughter, Traci, 13, and mother, Dr. Lucy Mason Reeves Jones. ●

HARRIS COUNTY PHYSICIANS PROVIDE SHINING EXAMPLE OF VOLUNTARISM

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in these hard economic times, millions of American workers are facing unemployment and, as a consequence, loss of their health care benefits. Some would have us believe that the best way to deal with this kind of personal hardship is for the Federal Government to step in with various welfare programs.

But there is another kind of solution—a solution that is a proud tradition in America. This solution comes through the private, voluntary efforts of individual Americans.

This course of action—voluntary help on an individual basis—has been chosen by over 1,000 physicians in the Houston area. These doctors, members of the Harris County Medical Society, are providing free medical care to those in the Houston area who are temporarily unemployed, or lack medical insurance.

I believe this effort on the part of Harris County physicians and the Harris County Medical Society is an inspiring example of the spirit of generosity and community that characterizes our great Nation and our people.

We are often told that it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide help to the needy and the unfortunate, because people will not choose to help others voluntarily. This recent action by Harris County doctors proves just how wrong that attitude is. I salute these fine physicians for their willingness to help those in need.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 14, 1983]

MORE THAN 1,000 PHYSICIANS OFFERING FREE CARE TO UNEMPLOYED
(By Ruth Sorelle)

More than 1,000 of the Harris County Medical Society's 4,500 members began offering free care today to area residents temporarily out of work or without health insurance.

"We have long maintained that no person in Harris County should ever go without care because of an inability to pay," Dr. Joel Reed, society president, said. "This voluntary effort is designed to provide physician care to that segment which finds itself temporarily out of work and in many cases out of health care coverage."

"We are aware that some individuals and families have fallen through the cracks of the system and we are ready, willing and able to augment the existing city, county and state assistance programs by addressing the recession-distressed segment of our population."

This month Reed asked all physicians in Harris County to consider volunteering their time in their private offices or at one of the many free clinics through the area.

Many physicians were already volunteering their services to patients unable to pay, he said, but many still volunteered to help others.

The volunteer physicians' names have been entered into a special computer at the medical society by physician specialty and zip code so patients and their families will not have to travel far to obtain care.

"While we believe we will be able to handle almost any professional need, we do not have the ability to cover the hospital, drug or lab costs," Reed added.

However, he said, the physician group is working with drug companies and the Greater Houston Hospital Council to obtain their support in these areas.

Reed said Mayor Kathy Whitmire has authorized the city Health Department to provide some lab tests.

A medical society spokesman said the effort is not designed to cover indigents who have traditionally obtained their health care through city, county or federal programs.

"We are attempting to address those who because of the economic climate need temporary help," Reed said.

Referral to a doctor participating in this program can be obtained by calling 790-1838 Monday through Friday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

The medical society spokesman said patients should first call their personal physicians to determine if they are participating in the program.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 65th anniversary of Estonian Independence day. In honoring this day it is important to remember that Estonia was once a free and independent sovereign democracy. It was forcefully absorbed into the U.S.S.R. in 1940 along with its sister states in the Baltic.

The Soviets have tried to create a "new Soviet man." They have done this by systematically attempting to suppress the culture, religion, and existence of these former states. This program of Russification has been resisted vigorously by the people of Estonia. Its purpose is clear: to crush the individuality of the many nationalities within the Soviet Union, and to subjugate them to the dominance of the Russian majority.

The proud people of Estonia have fought to be independent, and will surely continue their fight until they have achieved their goal of rejoining the free and independent nations of this world.

There are hopeful signs on the horizon in the future. The European Parliament on January 13 passed a resolution reiterating the right of the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia to self-determination. This resolution called for their case to be brought up at followup sessions of the Helsinki accords, and to be submitted to the U.N. Subcommittee on Decolonization, because these countries are Soviet colonies. The United States has endorsed this in a Voice of America editorial. The 1983 Defense appropriations bill insisted that all maps of the U.S.S.R. clearly print the names of each Baltic state, as if they were sovereign nations.

The United States has refused to legitimize the Soviet seizure of the Baltic states. I am hopeful that this policy has given strength to dissidents in Estonia to continue their brave struggle against the tyranny of their Soviet masters. Estonian Independence Day gives Americans who cherish their freedom an opportunity to remind the Russians that we have not forgotten Estonia. We will never forget the cause of Estonian independence and will continue to fight for its restoration along with all the other subjugated nations of the U.S.S.R.●

EFFECTIVENESS OF CHAIRMAN CHUCK MANATT

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to two recent articles that were published in the Washington Post.

I hope that all the Members will take a minute to look them over, because they provide an excellent overview of the great strides taken by our party under the able leadership of Chuck Manatt.

During his 2 years as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Chuck Manatt has worked closely with the Democratic House and Senate leadership to rebuild our party from the ground up.

While the GOP got lazy, Chairman Manatt took the DNC back to basics after 1980. There has been renewed emphasis on fundraising and grassroots party building. And there are many other accomplishments as well, most notably our tremendous success in the 1982 elections.

Perhaps the strongest testimony to Chairman Manatt's effectiveness is a recent statement made by the new Republican National Committee chairman, who said that his goal is to catch up to Chairman Manatt.

Mr. Speaker, thanks in large part to the fine stewardship of Chuck Manatt, our party has experienced a revival at all levels.

As we prepare for 1984 and beyond, we can be confident that the DNC and Chuck Manatt will continue to take a leading role in the effort to rebuild our party.

I ask unanimous consent that the Post articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1983]

MANATT REBUILDING DEMOCRATS, STEP BY STEP, FOR 1984 BATTLES

(By David S. Broder, Washington Post Staff Writer)

He came to town two years ago, a bespectacled, largely unknown Los Angeles lawyer-banker. If people wondered anything about Charles T. (Chuck) Manatt, it was why a successful, self-made millionaire would have worked as hard as Manatt did after the 1980 election to outdistance four rivals for the dubious honor of taking over the debt-ridden Democratic Party in the wake of its worst defeat in a generation.

Today, with the Democratic National Committee in the midst of its annual winter meeting here this weekend, its chairman remains largely anonymous in the capital, but he is no longer inconsequential.

Manatt, 46, has consolidated his grip on the Democratic headquarters and has put himself in a position to play a major role in what happens to his party and its candidates at least through convention time in the summer of 1984.

From the "down-draft" he says he felt when he took over in February, 1981, "a time when we had no idea who we were or what we were up against," until today, Manatt has witnessed a revival of his party's political prospects, which many party activists attribute in part at least to his stewardship.

Among the accomplishments for which he receives a share of the credit from Democratic governors, members of Congress and state party officials:

A midterm election rebound, including a strikingly successful demonstration project in state party-building that will serve as a model for the 1984 contest.

A healthy start on a direct-mail fund-raising mechanism that could, in time, cut down the Republicans' still-growing financial advantage.

Negotiation of the formal return of organized labor as a participating and contributing part of the Democratic Party and partial repair of the Carter-era breach with business and the Jewish community.

The peaceful acceptance by the party's women, minority and liberal caucuses of a substantial revision in the delegate-selection system, which will set aside one-seventh of the seats at the 1984 convention for members of Congress and other elected and party officials, whose voices may dilute the influence of the grass-roots activists.

A thin but reasonably noncontroversial outline of a Democratic policy alternative, given public exposure in a harmonious midterm conference, campaign ads and the coordinated responses to President Reagan's television and radio speeches.

To cap off this effort to reassemble the elements of the Democratic coalition that fell to quarreling in the 1970's, Manatt expects to announce within a month firm plans for financing and constructing a long-sought Democratic headquarters building on Capitol Hill, the first permanent home in the long history of the nation's oldest party.

"Little by little," said one Democratic congressional leadership aide, "Chuck has accomplished quite a lot, maybe more than he gets credit for."

One reason for the lack of credit may be Manatt's stiffness as a spokesman for the party. His speeches, though earnest, rarely soar, and his style interviews and news conferences is pallid when compared with that of his two Texas predecessors in the chairmanship, John C. White and Robert S. Strauss.

Strauss' continued high-profile presence on the Washington scene is a particular problem for Manatt, who contested the flamboyant Texan for the party chairmanship a decade ago and lost.

Paradoxically, Manatt's public statements over the last two years rank among the most consistent and strongly worded indictments of the record and intentions of the Reagan administration.

On Jan. 23, 1981, three days after Reagan was inaugurated and while Manatt was still campaigning for his job, he told the Democratic state chairmen that "there can be no honeymoon era for Ronald Reagan Republicanism," which he characterized as "people who dress their wives in minks and \$10,000 dresses cutting programs for the aged and the children."

He never relented, nor he did he mince words when many other Democrats were granting Reagan that honeymoon.

At the National Press Club, less than a week after the assassination attempt on Reagan, Manatt moved in seven paragraphs

from expressing his wishes for a "speedy recovery" to voicing his conviction that "Republicans have a hidden agenda. In the name of fighting inflation and stimulating the economy, they are attempting to roll back 50 years of progressive tax and social policy. They want more for the rich and less for the average American family."

"I knew these people," Manatt says now of the Reaganites, "and I knew where they were coming from, even if other people didn't back then. I had seen them operate in California, and their view is that 'we got ours,' and everyone else ought to shift for themselves. They think if you go to the government for help, you're not as strong and not as virtuous as they were."

This kind of populism came naturally to the Iowa farm boy who worked his way through George Washington Law School with a job at the Democratic National Committee as executive secretary of the Young Democrats and once was fired from its staff in an economy move.

But it sounds strange to many people coming from a Century City bank president and senior partner in an aggressively expanding law firm with lots of high-powered clients.

Manatt insists there is no paradox.

"I never got the GI bill or a VA loan for myself," he says, "but I believe in government as a way in which we help each other cooperate in this country. In my mind, I'm an Iowa farmer, and when the American Banking Association voted in 1981 on endorsing the Reagan tax bill, I was outvoted 400 to 6."

Despite opposition by Senate Minority Leader Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.) to formation of a DNC policy arm, Manatt has been able to work cooperatively with Hill Democrats in orchestrating an effective Democratic propaganda attack on such issues as Social Security and the recession, using some paid advertising but relying mainly on the free response time the networks have granted Democrats to answer Reagan speeches. The line, "It isn't fair—it's Republican," came out of one of the Manatt-financed ads.

Every couple of months, he presides at a meeting of the House and Senate Democratic leadership. Participants say that Manatt sets the agenda and moves the discussion along, usually on what one called "safe topics," like the plans for the mini-convention or the next big fund-raiser.

"He comes in with his flip-charts, just like a Harvard MBA," said one participant, "and that's unusual enough up here, so they all listen."

Manatt has had some failures outside the policy area. His effort to shorten the presidential campaign season was overwhelmed by the ambitions of contenders to get a head start and of individual states to get to the head of the line in staging primaries, caucuses and straw votes.

The strength of his chairmanship, almost all those who have watched him agree, has been in the basics: fund-raising and grass-roots party-building. And he has been helped mightily in both areas by the alarm traditional Democratic constituencies have felt at some Reagan policies.

Organized labor ended an eight-year estrangement even as he took over, gaining 15 seats on the Democratic National Committee and contributing about 20 percent of its budget. Manatt pushed the party into vocal opposition to Reagan's sale of Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) planes to Saudi Arabia, reaping a reward from revived Jewish support.

His biggest potential fund-raising success is in direct mail, where aides say the DNC has gone from 25,000 contributors to 230,000. The startup costs of that drive mean that Republicans have continued during the last two years to increase their lead in both receipts and expenditures. But as time goes on, aides say, the expanded contributor base will put the Democrats back into a more competitive position.

Similarly, in organizing efforts: Manatt took one small state, New Mexico, and used it as a laboratory for a coordinated voter registration, targeting and turnout effort, using national funds to pay consultant Matt Reese to pull together the efforts of individual campaigns.

The payoff was spectacular: Democrats held the governorship against a serious challenge, captured a Senate seat and a newly created House district, and other offices. Next year, Manatt says, the program will be expanded to as many as 10 states.

Probably the biggest compliment to Manatt's work came this week from the new Republican national chairman, Frank J. Fahrenkopf Jr. Manatt had come to office in 1981 saying publicly that he wanted to emulate what Bill Brock did at the RNC in the period from 1977 through 1980. Fahrenkopf said Thursday that his goal was to catch up to Manatt. "We made a mistake in reading our press reviews," he said, "and thinking that we were so technologically advanced over the Democrats they'd never catch up We have to get back to the basics"

Manatt is moving into a position where he has goodies to hand out. He will have the controlling voice in the decision where the Democrats meet and in the arrangements for the convention, giving him leverage with the aspirants.

He told the state chairmen Thursday night, "The next two years will be more fun." For Manatt, they probably will be.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 9, 1983]

THE INVALIDS ARE SITTING UP

(By David S. Broder)

The Republican and Democratic national committees have met in Washington during the past two weeks, and the news is that both parties are in pretty good shape.

The Republicans control two-thirds of the national government—the presidency and the Senate. The Democrats control two-thirds of the state and local governments. Each is prepared to defend what it has and raid the other's territory, in the kind of healthy competition that makes for good government and lively politics.

There would be no news in this, except that we are accustomed to thinking that every institution in America is either going to hell or is already there. Having written at considerable length on the weakness of the parties myself, at various times past, I am personally delighted to see that the invalids are sitting up and taking nourishment.

Just how this came about is not entirely clear, but, it is certain that for both Republicans and Democrats, catastrophe was one mother of recovery.

For the GOP, that calamity came in the form of Richard Nixon, who drove his party deeper than ever into minority status with his Watergate crimes and then cost it the presidency via the pardon he obtained from Jerry Ford.

The revival of the GOP organization, under the 1977-80 chairmanship of Bill Brock, began only after everyone in the

party had a vivid demonstration of the danger of letting it become a wholly owned subsidiary of a particular president. When he wrecked, the party had no lifeboats of its own.

Though his failings were political, not criminal, Jimmy Carter provided the same lesson to the Democrats, costing them the White House, the Senate and a slew of House seats in 1980.

In both cases, the effect was to revive interest in the party machinery from officeholders, constituencies and interest groups that had deluded themselves into thinking they could make it on their own in Washington—or with just a friend in the White House to lend them a hand.

Since 1980, the Democrats, under their chairman, Charles T. Manatt, have been doing what the Republicans did under Brock; raising money and pumping it back into party-building projects at the state and local level, while cementing relationships with mayors, governors, state legislators and members of Congress.

The Democrats' progress has been less dramatic so far, than the GOP's under Brock, but it is sufficient to make the Republicans nervous about their financial-organizational edge. After two years in which the Republican National Committee was afraid even to burp without a signal from the Reagan White House, it has a new chairman, Frank J. Fahrenkopf Jr., of Nevada, who at least says he is going back to Brock-style basics, without waiting for Ronald Reagan to decide his own 1984 plans.

The result is a healthy aura of competition, centering around not just the presidency but control of the Senate in 1984 and a multitude of state and local contests—and the constituencies that decide them.

Manatt was down in Florida last week, pitching for money to the biggest bunch of businessmen the Democrats have been able to corral in years. Fahrenkopf is going to Florida in a couple of weeks to tell the AFL-CIO leadership why it would be a mistake for them to sign up early with the Democrats for 1984.

Democrats are finally building an effective direct-mail fund-raising program for themselves, moving into an area where the Republicans have had a virtual monopoly. Republicans, in turn, are finally getting serious about listening to the gripes working women have with the Reagan administration, ending an ostrich policy that was costing the party dearly.

All this comes under the heading of good news, because healthy, competitive parties make for better government. As a case in point, look how the Republicans in Congress, who showed extraordinary cohesion in support of the Reagan program in 1981, have been exerting steady, strong and effective pressure on Reagan for the past year to modify his policies to meet the changed economic and political realities.

That is what should happen in a healthy party. One reason those Republican legislators can do what they are doing is that they know the party will support them strongly—with money and organization—whatever Reagan thinks or does in 1984.

The Democrats are not at that point yet, but they are moving toward it. And that promises that if and when they come back to power, they will not have to suffer the vagaries of another Jimmy Carter—or the dire consequences of his kind of insulated presidency.

It's good news—just what the White House has been begging us reporters to give

you. So even if you don't buy a new car or house this week to celebrate the Reagan Recovery, at least send a few bucks to the party of your choice.●

DOMESTIC CONTENT AND HIGH TECHNOLOGY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for some years workers in the auto, steel, rubber, electrical, and other basic industries have been suffering widening layoffs and unemployment as jobs and investment in these industries have moved abroad. A number of people have viewed this as perfectly natural and, indeed, desirable, arguing that the American economy should shift away from these "old smokestack industries" and into new "high tech industries." The problem is that the same forces which are undermining our heavy industries also affect the new technologies. Unless we understand our role in the evolving world economy and develop pragmatic policies to deal with the new realities, we may lose both old and new industries.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Washington Post business section yesterday. It should be noted that in moving to East Asia, Atari is joining one of its principal competitors, Apple, which already does much of its manufacturing in Hong Kong.

The article follows:

ATARI TO FIRE 1,700, SHIFT PLANTS TO ASIA

(By Martha M. Hamilton)

Atari Inc., the video game and home computer manufacturer that has sometimes been used to symbolize America's employment future in high-technology jobs, said yesterday it will fire nearly a quarter of its U.S. work force in a shift of Atari's manufacturing operating overseas.

Atari said that 1,700 workers in California will lose their jobs as a result of the company's decision to shift production from Sunnyvale, Calif., to Hong Kong and Taiwan. The layoffs will be phased in from now to June or July with 600 workers out of a job yesterday.

The production move comes only weeks after Atari's parent, Warner Communications, reported lower-than-expected earnings for 1982 for its consumer electronics division.

Analysts said the production shift, which follows the pattern of consumer electronics items such as watches and television, results from economic pressures in the highly competitive home computer and video games industries. Atari said yesterday it is designed "to reduce escalating manufacturing costs"—such as labor, the value of the dollar and regulatory costs.

The announcement of the move and the large layoff is bound to raise questions about projections that jobs lost in the foundries and auto plants can be replaced easily by jobs in high technology industries and

that high-tech industries can preserve the U.S. position in international trade.

"It clearly indicated that the high-tech firms are also moving abroad and that they are no guarantee for absorbing the nation's jobless," said Rudy Oswald, director of research for the AFL-CIO.

The value of high technology in America's future has been espoused by a group that has been dubbed the "Atari Democrats," who advocate shifting resources away from declining industries, such as steel and automobile manufacturing, into the high technology and service industries where growth is expected to occur.

President Reagan, too, echoed some of those sentiments in his State of the Union speech, earning for himself the label "Atari Republican"—a label likely to be revised as a result of yesterday's announcement.

Atari has said that financial considerations dictate that some of its production be moved abroad. "Our computer production costs will go down dramatically in 1983," John Cavalier, president of Atari's Home Computer division, is quoted in Electronic News, a trade publication.

Atari already manufactures some video games in Taiwan and in Limerick, Ireland.

Interviewed by that magazine at the Consumer Electronics Show, Cavalier noted that "there were no [Atari] computers manufactured offshore in 1982. There will be a significant percentage manufactured offshore in 1983." In fact, an Atari spokesman said yesterday, virtually all its home computers will be manufactured abroad.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 65th anniversary of the Declaration of Estonian Independence. While Estonian-Americans today observe this anniversary, Estonians in their homeland continue to face serious threats to their language, their culture, and their very existence as a nation.

The United States, to this day, refuses to recognize the Soviet seizure of the Baltic States which took place nearly 40 years ago. Concern for human rights plays a major role in the foreign policy of the United States, and we should take this opportunity to assure the people of Estonia, as well as the people of Latvia and Lithuania, that their struggle for self-determination is not forgotten.

I encourage my colleagues to continue their support for the cause of freedom on this anniversary of Estonian Independence.●

NEEDLES HIGH SCHOOL AWARDS RECEPTION

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1983, the San Bernardino County schools and the Constitutional Rights Foundation will be sponsoring an awards reception and dinner honoring the finalists in the California State mock trial competition. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and commend the team from Needles High School who will be representing the county of San Bernardino.

Over 2,500 students from 14 counties statewide participated in the mock trial program this year. The competition involved 15-member teams working with a teacher, Mr. Sonny DeMarto and attorneys John and Louise Closs, to prepare a criminal case which was presented in courtrooms before municipal and superior court judges. Through the mock trial program, students of varied ability levels increased their proficiency in communication skills, developed self confidence and furthered their knowledge of the content and process of the legal system. Approximately 200 students will compete for the State championship and participate in activities which will familiarize them with the workings of State government from March 1 to 3, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in commending to my colleagues not only the team of Needles High School, but also the attorneys, judges, and teachers for their countless hours of work and preparation that were volunteered to make this mock trial competition such a success.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 65th anniversary of the Estonian Declaration of Independence. I am pleased to join my colleagues in Congress and the members of the Estonian-American community in showing my support for their fight for freedom from Soviet domination and to state that we in the United States shall support their cause until they are once again free.

Independent Estonia emerged from the turmoil of World War I and the Russian revolution, when the small country proclaimed its independence on February 24, 1918. Although Estonia was soon invaded by Soviet armies,

the small country was able to repulse them in 1920 and win freedom for 20 years. Estonia enjoyed a generation of independence and economic and cultural growth, until 1940 when the Soviet Union annexed Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in the wake of the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact.

During the last 40 years of foreign rule, the Estonian people have bravely and stoutly resisted Soviet efforts at Russification, or the subjugation of their language, culture, and religion to Russian practices. The importation of foreign workers and the often brutal industrialization of their country have made this a tough fight.

The plight of Estonia and the other captive nations becomes more urgent every year, as the Soviets continue to pursue a massive military buildup to tighten their hold on the countries under their rule, and to discourage other free nations from challenging their empire. As a longtime advocate of a strong defense for the United States to meet the Soviet threat, I hope that this will serve to undermine their hold on other, smaller nations.

With admiration and respect, I salute the people of Estonia and their friends and families in the United States and throughout the world in their struggle to regain their independence from the Soviets. I reaffirm my support for their fight and renew my conviction that Estonia will soon be free again.●

DILLONITES RAISE SCHOLARSHIP FUNDS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday night, February 26, a very special event will be held in Newark—the third annual dinner dance held by an organization known as the Dillonites.

These dedicated individuals are originally from Dillon, S.C., and the proceeds from the event will be donated to a scholarship fund for high school students in that town.

The distinguished guests will include Mayor Kenneth Gibson and members of the city council and the featured speaker will be Dr. Fred Means from Jersey State College. Among those being honored by the Dillonites are Joseph Benucci, Newark's postmaster; Dorothy Gould, the assistant executive superintendent of the Newark schools; Carl Jones, president of the Bridge Club; Verdell Roundtree, the New Jersey director of the United Negro College Fund; Miles Berger, president of the Berger Hotel Corp.; Eutha Grier, historian for the Garden State Chapter of the Dillonites; and

Louise Epperson, director of patient relations of the University of Medicine and Dentistry, who will receive the 1983 Health Education Award.

I am extremely proud of this chapter of the Dillonites, and president Thomas Carmichael, for their generous spirit and hard work assisting these young people of Dillon in obtaining an education.●

SOCIAL SECURITY CARDS SOLD TO ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I introduced H.R. 1272, the Social Security Alien and Foreign Resident Limitations Act. The intent of this measure is to reform certain aspects of the social security system's overseas program, as well as prohibiting people who have worked unlawfully in this country from collecting benefits.

The introduction of my legislation coincided with the release of a General Accounting Office study I requested on this subject nearly 2 years ago, the findings of which are highlighted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1983, on E306.

Mr. Speaker, I testified a few weeks ago before the Subcommittee on Social Security, which is conducting hearings on the long-term financing problems facing the social security system. Observing that "we need to correct this," Chairman J. J. PICKLE announced that his subcommittee will conduct hearings on this issue as soon as possible.

In the few weeks since I introduced H.R. 1272, I have received letters in support of this measure from citizens throughout the country.

One of the major problem areas associated with this issue is the relative ease in which individuals can obtain social security cards.

A few days ago, WLS-TV in Chicago ran a series of stories compiled by its team of investigators on the illegal alien issue. One segment was particularly enlightening in showing what lengths people will go to in obtaining and providing social security cards. The following transcript of that segment details how a Federal employee engaged in selling social security cards at \$75 apiece to illegal aliens. The employee has since been arrested and charged with in connection the sale of the cards. The transcript follows:

ILLEGAL ALIENS: ABUSE ON BOTH SIDES

ROSA CHAVEZ (illegal alien). When you go to apply for a job, they ask you for a social security card.

ROBERTA BASKIN. Rosa Chavez is an illegal alien. But she now has a real, American

social security card. She needed it last April so she could work . . . so she could support her seven children.

This is Eduardo Medina. Inside the Social Security Administration, he makes it possible for people in Rosa's situation to get a card.

ROSA CHAVEZ. The man came with the applications. He filled them out. And all I did was sign them. After about six weeks, the cards arrived.

ROBERTA BASKIN. This social security card cost Rosa \$175. The card is supposed to be free. Social Security officials are supposed to ask for certain documents.

Did you show any documents at all to get the social security card?

ROSA CHAVEZ. No. Nada.

ROBERTA BASKIN. And social security also requires an interview . . . in person . . . in the social security office. But Rosa never had to show up.

ROBERTA BASKIN. This is the alley behind the social security office on North California. At the end of the alley is a Chicago police station. This is the spot that Eduardo Medina chooses to sell social security cards . . . out the back door.

Target 7 sent in Tony Prince. He told Medina he needed three social security cards for friends.

TONY PRINCE (target 7 researcher). He looks kind of nervous, you know. And he goes to me, the price will be \$75 each, which equal \$225. Can you make sure you bring the money tomorrow, and I give you the receipts.

ROBERTA BASKIN. We paid the money, and filled out applications in the names of three illegal aliens, people Medina never met. He did check this box to say that he interviewed them, and he falsified our applications, claiming he'd seen some documents that don't even exist.

He got away with it because of a flaw in the social security system.

JIM STOKES (Office of Inspector General). The current social security enumeration system did not have a sufficient safeguard. This lack of safeguard allowed the employee to process numerous social security card applications without bringing an alert to the social security management.

ROBERTA BASKIN. We gave Tony more money to make one last buy from Eduardo Medina. They met near the social security office and went inside a doorway to do business. Tony counted out the money to buy the social security cards. As soon as he got the receipts, we caught up with Medina to introduce him to those illegal aliens he'd gotten cards for.

Have you ever seen these people before?

EDUARDO MEDINA (Federal employee). No ma'am.

ROBERTA BASKIN. Did you ever see him?

EDUARDO MEDINA. No ma'am.

ROBERTA BASKIN. And did you ever see her?

EDUARDO MEDINA. No ma'am.

ROBERTA BASKIN. Well, you sold two social security cards in their name last week, and you put down—here it is—on the application for her, you put down that you did an, that you did an in-person interview again.

EDUARDO MEDINA. Right.

ROBERTA BASKIN. Yeah, and what about this health card, the green card, and the library card? She doesn't have those things.

EDUARDO MEDINA. Okay, so that I put down.

ROBERTA BASKIN. So why'd you put that down?

EDUARDO MEDINA. That's a, that's just Tony told me to help him out.

ROBERTA BASKIN. And how much money did you make?

EDUARDO MEDINA. That's only \$75 I pay there, that's all.

ROBERTA BASKIN. \$75 for each social security card you sell.

EDUARDO MEDINA. That's the only one.

ROBERTA BASKIN. This person, Rosa Chavez is in the country illegally. You sold a social security card to somebody on her behalf.

EDUARDO MEDINA. No. I didn't make no.

ROBERTA BASKIN. So that she could work.

EDUARDO MEDINA. I didn't make no arrangement for that. The only thing I say was with Mr. Tony.

ROBERTA BASKIN. Do you know want a serious crime it is to put down that you did an in-person interview with somebody when you didn't?

EDUARDO MEDINA. Yes.

ROBERTA BASKIN. Tell me, because I don't know if you do.

EDUARDO MEDINA. Yes, I understand it's jail sentence, that you can get.

ROBERTA BASKIN. Then why'd you do it? For money?

EDUARDO MEDINA. Well, I just did that for money. That's all I did. But not any more.●

A FAIR ADJUSTMENT TO IMPROVE SELECTIVE SERVICE REGISTRATION

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent debate and controversy concerning the implementation of the Solomon amendment, which prevents distribution of Federal student aid to any individual who has failed to register with the Selective Service, has once again opened the entire debate surrounding registration. The failure of some 6 percent of those required to register to do so causes one to examine the opposition to such a simple procedure. However, what is relatively simple in practical implementation may cause severe emotional stress for some Americans. While approximately half of the nonregistered population is attributed to administrative difficulties, the remaining young American men have failed to do so intentionally for personal reasons.

Today, I am introducing legislation which will both facilitate complete registration while also giving young men the opportunity to indicate their intent to apply for conscientious objector status. This legislation is based upon the presumption that a high percentage of those who intentionally fail to register do so on the basis of conscientious objector principles.

Under current law, an individual may apply for such status only at the time the draft is actually implemented. The application may be made to his local Selective Service board which will determine the acceptability of his case. In order to qualify for classification as a conscientious objector, a

person must be conscientiously opposed to participation in any war. Beliefs must be religious, moral, or ethical in nature, as opposed to those based solely on politics, expediency, or self-interest.

In addition, a conscientious objector is not relieved of the obligation to serve. Two types of service may be performed, depending upon the individual's specific beliefs: First, the person who is opposed to any form of military service (Class 1-0) performs a period of civilian service in a job which contributes to the national health, safety, or interest; or, second, the person whose beliefs will allow him to serve in the Armed Forces in a noncombatant capacity (Class 1-A-0) becomes a member of the Armed Forces but does not receive any training in the use of weapons. Many of these serve in the medical corps.

This legislation would simply add two questions to the Selective Service registration form which would allow the registrant to indicate his preference to be considered for classification as a conscientious objector serving in either noncombatant military service or available for alternate service. Notice shall also be provided on the forms that this indication is not binding on the United States and that the marking of such an indication does not assure that the registrant will be so classified.

It should be emphasized that this is not an attempt to circumvent registration, but to facilitate it. These changes in the registration form will not harm the intent of draft registration—early preparation and organization in case conscription should be required—but, in fact, will improve and economize the entire system by indicating to the Selective Service System those individuals who are likely to apply for conscientious objector status in either a non-combat or alternate service role.

At the same time, these changes will also facilitate the complete registration of the eligible population by removing the stigma that registration leads to immediate participation in a draft, without an opportunity to indicate ones desire to apply for conscientious objector status.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 65 years after the official declaration of Estonian independence, this proud Baltic nation is fighting for its very existence under the cruel jackboot of Soviet tyranny. The drive for Russification of this ethnically distinct people is characteristic of the Soviet

terror mechanism in one of its many contemporary forms.

In the individual human dimension, the death of Prof. Juri Kukk 2 years ago in a Volga labor camp represents both the perseverance and the tragedy so typical of the Estonian struggle. Even as Juri Kukk rests in peace, his codefendant, Mart Niklus, struggles on, serving a 5-year sentence in a Soviet labor camp. These two men are symbols of a much larger atrocity. The relative proportion of Baltic nationals to other ethnic groups in Soviet labor camps demonstrates the magnitude of this injustice.

It has been four decades since the Soviet empire swallowed Estonian and the other Baltic nations in perhaps the most repugnant act of blatant hegemony in our century. The hopes of these nations, the hopes of an Estonian people so capable of fulfilling their potential as a country, have been subverted to the wishes of a Soviet elite which differs little in essence from its progenitors. It is up to us in the free world to keep the light of publicity on the Estonian struggle—their hopes are our hopes, their dreams our dreams—the fate of the human community rests with the solidarity of its defenders.●

SERIOUS RISK OF RAPID DEFENSE BUILDUP

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed rapid defense buildup poses serious risks both to our national security and to the health of our economy. Congress, in considering the President's massive rearmament program, must weight its costs to the American people.

In his budget for fiscal year 1984, President Reagan proposed the continuation of the 5-year military buildup that he initiated 2 years ago at a cost of \$1.8 trillion, roughly a cost of \$20,000 in taxes per household over the next 5 years. This constitutes the largest peacetime defense spending program in the history of our Nation, at a real rate of increase after inflation of 7 percent. Yet, despite estimates of wasteful Pentagon spending ranging from \$30 to \$100 billion, the President's budget provides for no savings based on elimination of wasteful spending.

The President's military budget gives top priority to the development of new strategic nuclear weapons, a 37-percent increase in nuclear force funding in this year's budget. I fear that adding to our nuclear arsenal will only trigger another dangerous escalation in the balance of terror between the

United States and the Soviet Union. The administration's arms control policy, based as it is on arms increases, is a bankrupt policy. We need a President who will assume the leadership role in arms control negotiations with the Soviets. Congress must take its own lead on arms control by passing the resolution calling for a bilateral, verifiable freeze on nuclear weapons production, development, testing, and delivery systems.

The greater share of our defense budget should be spent on conventional systems, although streamlined, to insure readiness and sustainability, and to educate our service personnel. We now have complex weapons systems with personnel lacking the expertise to use them. In addition, I believe it is time for our allies to assume their fair share of their own defense, rather than relying solely on the American people to finance their defense-related expenditures. The President's budget includes no initiative for cost sharing with our allies.

At the same time that the military budget is being increased, spending on human needs program is being drastically reduced. In my estimation, our natural resources should be invested in activities which would put Americans back to work and put the United States on the road to prosperity. Our economic recovery must not be jeopardized by excessive defense spending.

Studies have documented that every dollar spent on military programs creates far fewer jobs than the same dollar spent in any other sector of the economy. Jobs in the defense industry are more highly skilled than in other sectors and thus open to fewer American workers. Furthermore, some influential economists have voiced concern that the planned rate of increase for military spending is too fast and might strain some sectors of the economy, thereby contributing to another inflationary spiral similar to those which occurred when the United States expanded its arsenals as rapidly in the past.

Excessive military spending also contributes to declining productivity. Concentrating scientific work on military projects reduces the share available for productivity that increases innovation in other sectors. With so much money and skilled labor diverted to military programs and away from civilian production, America's competitive advantage over Japan and other industrialized nations is bound to suffer.

Defense spending is one of the most regionally unbalanced categories of Federal spending. More than any other other Federal program, defense spending drains resources and jobs out of the industrial Midwest and transfers them to economically healthier areas of the country. According to Department of Defense figures, \$93.4 billion of the fiscal 1983 defense budget—

excluding procurement—will go to States in the South and West, while only \$28.6 billion will be spent in the Northeast-Midwest region.

This amounts to \$278 per capita in the Northeast and Midwest compared to \$739 in the South and West. Ohio receives \$3 billion less in Pentagon spending than it contributes in tax moneys which are channeled to the defense budget. Current military spending is contributing to idle capacity and unemployment in our area.

The costs of the proposed weapons systems, once approved, will grow dramatically in succeeding years and contribute to even greater deficits. Now is the time to rein in the administration's military spending proposals. A strong national defense cannot be minimized, but scarce Federal funds must be spent wisely. If we cannot create jobs for the unemployed, revitalize our basic industries, educate the next generation or care for the members of our society who depend on the Government for their basic needs, we will not be contributing to our Nation's security.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I join in the commemoration of the 65th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. The remarkable strength and proud heritage of the Estonian people in the Soviet Union, who face a never-ending quest to regain their freedom, has established a model for the world.

Today we mark the proclamation of independence for the Republic of Estonia. The Estonians made significant economic, educational, and cultural progress until their freedom and independence came to an end in 1940 when they were forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union. On a day-to-day basis in the Soviet Union, the Estonians are facing serious attacks to rid them of their strong sense of heritage. They face serious threats to their language and culture. This is yet another example of the Soviet attempt to Russify these people out of existence.

Free nations of the world must continue to speak out against this Soviet aggression. We will never recognize their seizure of Estonia. As a signatory of the Helsinki accords, the Soviet Union continues to deny these individuals their basic human rights—the free exercise of political, cultural, and religious freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I am very moved by the strength and conviction of these brave people. I am thankful for this oppor-

tunity to pay tribute to these courageous people and their overwhelming commitment to human rights and freedom that free nations of the world cherish so deeply.●

FTC OVERSIGHT OF PROFESSIONS BACKED BY PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, since renewed attempts will be made in the 98th Congress to restrict the authority of the Federal Trade Commission over professions, my colleagues should be aware that professional associations continue to line up in opposition to efforts by the American Medical Association to exempt the professions from regulation by the FTC. The 33 national organizations and their 800 affiliated organizations representing 17 million individuals formed a coalition to save the jurisdiction of the FTC over professions in the last Congress. I have been recently notified by the National Society of Public Accountants that their Board of Governors had unanimously adopted a resolution stating the National Society's opposition to any legislation which would exempt professionals from FTC jurisdiction and resolving support and assistance for continued FTC regulation and investigation of the activities of professionals. A copy of their correspondence follows along with a list of the member organizations of the Coalition to Save the Jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission Over Professions.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF
PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
January 14, 1983.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Energy and Commerce Committee,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: At its regular meeting in November, the Board of Governors of the National Society of Public Accountants unanimously adopted a resolution stating the National Society's opposition to any legislation which would exempt professionals from Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction, and resolving support for FTC to continue to regulate and investigate the activities of state-regulated professionals.

The National Society of Public Accountants is an individual membership professional association consisting of 17,000 members throughout the United States, who are vitally concerned with the issues and problems facing small accounting firms and the more than four million small businesses which they serve.

The members of the National Society firmly believe that the antitrust laws should be applied to state regulated professionals in order to ensure competition and fully competitive markets, regardless of the product, occupation or service provided.

The members of the National Society appreciate your efforts in behalf of a free-market system, and the position which you took and maintained as Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Should renewed attempts be made in the 98th Congress to restrict the authority of the FTC over professions, I hope that you or the members of the Committee's staff will call upon the National Society for whatever assistance we can provide.

Sincerely,

LOUIS MIRMAN,
President.

COALITION TO SAVE THE JURISDICTION OF THE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION OVER THE PROFESSIONS

American Nurses' Association.
American Society for Medical Technology.
American Association of Pastoral Counselors.
American Academy of Physician Assistants.
Association for the Advancement of Psychology.
American Psychological Association.
American Dental Hygienists' Association.
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.
American College of Nurse-Midwives.
American Public Health Association.
International Chiropractors Association.
National Association of Optometrists and Opticians.
National Association of Chain Drug Stores.
American Chiropractic Association.
Women's Equity Action League.
American Association for Clinical Chemistry.
American Medical Technologists.
American Association of Bioanalysts.
International Society for Clinical Laboratory Technology.
American Society of Allied Health Professions.
National Rehabilitation Counseling Association.
National Women's Health Network.
Women and Health Roundtable.
American Association of Retired Persons.
American Retail Federation.
Congresswatch.
U.S. Women's Health Coalition.
National Consumers League.
Consumers Union of America.
Consumers Federation of America.
American Association of Nurse Anesthetists.
United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
United Steelworkers of America.●

DISC REVISION ACT OF 1983

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1983

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H.R. 1673, the DISC Revision Act of 1983. Briefly stated, the purpose of the bill is to revise the existing Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC) provisions of the Internal Revenue Code so as to make them consistent with the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) while at the same time preserving significant export incen-

tives similar to those contained in the existing DISC provisions.

The United States is currently faced with a significant international trade problem because the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade have concluded that the existing DISC provisions violate GATT. In addition, the U.S. Trade Representative has assured representatives to the GATT that the United States will soon modify the existing DISC provisions to bring them into compliance with GATT. In the meantime, DISC has been a continuing thorn in our side as we attempt to further other important trade-related matters before the GATT, including many of those that were discussed at the GATT Ministerial in November 1982. The progress on these important initiatives will be stymied until a GATT legal DISC alternative has been presented. Although it is necessary to modify the existing DISC provisions, at the same time it is very important that the modified version continue to provide export incentives to our various domestic manufacturers, especially for those small manufacturers who may have only recently become exporters or who are in the process of considering to become exporters. The importance of encouraging export of products domestically in the United States cannot be underscored, because the alternative is to encourage manufacturers to locate manufacturing plants outside the United States, thus removing valuable jobs from our shores. The DISC solution also should not attempt to use gimmicks which will only temporarily avoid a GATT challenge. Rather, it should attempt to arrive at a solution which will be GATT defensible for the long term, thus avoiding another disruptive period in our trade policy similar to that which has accompanied the DISC dispute. Many proposals have been floated in the last year which would generally only modify the existing DISC provisions to require the use of a foreign corporation rather than a domestic corporation. This alternative presents many problems including the prospect of not being able to sustain a GATT challenge. From a tax policy standpoint, the use of a foreign alternative is also questionable because it is inconsistent with the administration's tax treaty negotiating policy which attempts to discourage the use of foreign tax havens by U.S. taxpayers. The modification of DISC so as to require incorporation in a foreign jurisdiction will only provide a sufficient economic benefit to the exporter if the foreign corporation is located in a jurisdiction which imposes little or no tax, in other words, a foreign tax haven.

The bill which I have introduced today attempts to address the problems identified above with the existing

DISC and with respect to the various foreign solutions which have been proposed in the last couple of months. As such, it attempts to achieve three important policy goals. First, the bill sufficiently modifies the existing DISC provisions so as to make them GATT defensible. Second, the proposal avoids the use of a foreign corporation as the solution to the existing DISC problem. By doing so, it avoids a significant inconsistency with our tax treaty negotiating policy. More importantly, it insures that small businesses will be able to continue to benefit from the DISC provisions. Modifying DISC to require the use of a foreign corporation would make it very unlikely that small exporters would be able to utilize the provisions due to the complexities of doing business in a foreign jurisdiction, especially if a substantial foreign presence is required. Third, the proposal insures that trade incentives provided for exporters, especially small exporters, will continue.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

The DISC Revision Act makes several significant changes in the existing DISC provisions. First, it provides for the imposition of an interest charge on the accumulated DISC income which has been subject to deferral. The interest charged for small exporters—those with less than \$250,000 of DISC taxable income—is 4 percent while the interest charge for larger exporters is the average Federal funds rate, that is, the rate at which banks in the Federal Reserve System borrow money from other banks in the system. Second, rules controlling the amount of income which is subject to

deferral are significantly simplified. The complicated incremental rule is eliminated. The amount of deferral which is permitted annually is increased to 100 percent for DISC taxable income up to \$250,000. The amount of deferral permitted for DISC taxable income in excess of \$250,000 is 45 percent. Third, all accumulated DISC income existing for taxable years beginning on or before December 31, 1983, will be permanently deferred. This provision is clearly sensible because many companies by following the rules of DISC under existing law could effectively achieve this result by simply avoiding a distribution of the accumulated income and investing in qualified assets. By statutorily providing that the income is permanently deferred it eliminates significant financial accounting problems while at the same time preserving the likely tax result which would occur under existing law. An added benefit of this change is that it effectively results in a liberalization of the DISC asset test because the substantial pool of capital consisting of accumulated deferred DISC income which must be invested in specified assets will have been reduced. Many companies both large and small have indicated a concern with meeting the qualified assets test under the existing law because of the large pool of deferred income which must be invested in a limited range of assets in order to satisfy the existing qualified asset test. By reducing the size of that pool of capital which must be so invested, the problems of meeting the qualified assets test will also be substantially eliminat-

ed. Fourth, the bill permits the use of excess investment tax credits to be used to pay the interest charge which is imposed on accumulated DISC income. In addition, excess net operating losses may be used to reduce the amount of accumulated DISC income which is subject to the interest charged. Finally, the bill provides that accumulated DISC income which has been subject to the interest charge will qualify for a permanent deferral at the end of 10 years and cease to be subject to the interest charge. It should be noted, however, that this provision would not have any effect if the parent of the DISC had made the election to utilize its excess net operating losses to reduce the accumulated DISC income subject to the interest charge prior to the expiration of 10 years.

The bill does not modify the gross receipts test to expand the use of DISC for the service sector of our economy. Because this is a matter of growing concern in view of the increasing portion of our economy which consists of service-type industries, it is my hope that the enacted legislation will direct the Treasury to study the advisability of extending DISC-type treatment to the service sector.

On balance, I believe that the bill provides the most workable solution to a complex problem facing us both with respect to U.S. tax policy and U.S. trade policy in a way that will continue important export incentives which are necessary for the United States to compete in the world trading markets.●